

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

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

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

Pagination is as follows: [1], [823]-1693, [i]-lxxxii p.

Page 824 is incorrectly numbered page 823.

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

SECOND SESSION—SIXTH PARLIAMENT.

51° VICTORIÆ, 1888.

VOL. XXVI.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF APRIL TO THE
TWENTY-SECOND DAY OF MAY, 1888.



OTTAWA :
PRINTED BY MacLEAN, ROGER & Co., WELLINGTON STREET.
1888.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 16th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. LAURIER moved that Mr. Meigs be added to the following Standing Committees: Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, Standing Orders, Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

THE OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved that the second report of the Committee on the Official Debates be concurred in. He said: The object of this report is to render justice to some officials who have been charged with responsible duties in connection with the Debates Committee and the publication of the Official Report. The first is in regard to Mr. Boyce, Assistant to the Chief Reporter, who is recommended to receive an increase of salary. Mr. Boyce has been employed the whole year, and his duties are very responsible and of a multifarious character. He has to see that copies are sent to members for correction, and that those corrections are made in the revised report; he has to keep track of matters connected with the printing, and in fact he is frequently compelled to remain two or three hours after the rising of the House. Every member of the committee is of the opinion that he fully deserves the increase recommended, and no one has found fault with the manner in which he has performed his duty. Moreover, he prepares the index of the Debates after the Session. The second recommendation is in regard to Mr. Brewer, who is accountant of the committee and charged with the performance of duties of a special and technical character. He has to measure the type and make up the accounts on which the printers are paid. This requires a special knowledge of printing, and, after enquiry by a sub-committee, it was found that his duties were of such a nature that he fully deserved the recommendation of \$100 a year and \$200 for past services. Mr. Hartney is also recommended to receive \$200 for past services and \$50 a year as clerk of the committee. He has to keep the records of the meetings of the committee, carry out the correspondence and everything connected with the meetings. We, therefore, considered it would be fair to acknowledge his services as well as the services of the others, and the

committee has therefore made the recommendation I have named. He has acted as clerk of the committee since 1878. These are the recommendations contained in the report.

Mr. LANDRY. As I have not the report under my hand at the present moment, I should like to ask if it contains anything respecting nominations to fill vacancies caused by the dismissal of three of the translators.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Not at all; it only contains a recommendation respecting salaries to be paid to old officers.

Mr. DAVIN. In rising to support this motion I may say that we went into the question of the claims of these gentlemen, not once but several times. We had Mr. Brewer before us, and I confess when I saw the responsibility that was cast upon him, I felt inclined, and other members of the committee felt inclined, to give him more than is recommended in this report. The responsible duties discharged by Mr. Brewer, that of measuring up the matter, are such—as any man who knows anything about printing will be aware—that if he was not a man on whom this House could thoroughly rely, the country might lose thousands of dollars in a year. In Mr. Brewer's case, therefore, there cannot be the least doubt that the recommendation of the committee is most moderate. I can speak, if I may use the term, with authority as to the claims of Mr. Boyce, because I had him associated with me on two occasions, during which I was able to measure his ability, his attentiveness, his accuracy and the reliability of the man to do any work he undertakes and to carry out with a skill, I have never known equalled, recommendations that might be made to him. Mr. Boyce was engaged with me in work requiring great care and great skill, and one had only to explain to him what was needed and he entirely carried it out. In connection with the *Hansard* his duties are of an onerous and also of a responsible character. He not only corrects the first proofs, but he sees that the corrections made by members are ultimately inserted in the speeches, and in addition to that he does work which is of the greatest importance so long as we have a *Hansard*, and that is to make an index. Unless that index is made well, I need hardly say that the value of that volume is greatly decreased, and one might go as far as to say that the index is so far like a chain, and as a chain is not stronger than its weakest link, so the index is not valuable unless it is altogether complete and accurate and a sure means of reference. It seems to me that Mr. Boyce discharges his duties thoroughly and well, and if he discharges them thoroughly and well the amount suggested by the committee is a small sum for

work so laborious and at the same time requiring so much skill. In regard to the other recommendation I am not so fitted to speak, because I do not know the circumstances; but, so far as I have had them explained to me, I think that the recommendation is one also that the House should be ready to adopt.

Mr. CHARLTON. As a member of the Debates Committee, I rise to heartily endorse what has been said by the chairman of the committee and the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) especially with regard to the services of Mr. Boyce, and to support the motion that an addition be made to his salary. I believe that even then he will be an underpaid servant. He is a most valuable officer, and has served the House in the capacity which he follows at a very low pay indeed. Mr. Boyce most richly deserves the increase of salary proposed to be given to him.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. Minister will allow me, before closing the debate, I simply wish to add a few words to fully endorse all that has been said in regard to the value of this gentleman's services; and my endorsement leads me to the statement that even if this addition is made to the salaries of Mr. Brewer and Mr. Boyce (with whom I am best acquainted), they will still remain rather underpaid than fully paid for the great services they render. They are both competent officers, and discharge their important functions in a manner which has given great satisfaction to the House since they have been appointed—and I have known them both since they were appointed. I have great pleasure in endorsing even this moderate measure of justice to these gentlemen.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry the chairman had this report moved to-day, as we did not expect it to come up. I do not say he is wrong in doing so, but we did not expect it, as it is not mentioned in the Order Paper, and we had no time to consider it. I would ask, therefore, that the hon. gentleman postpone it to another day, so that the Government may have a chance of looking over the matter. Besides that, I must call the attention of my hon. friend the chairman, and the other members who have followed him in supporting the report, to the fact that this mode of increasing the salaries of officers of the House is hardly a proper one, and I do not think it will meet with the approval of the House. The officers of the House are put under the control of the Clerk, with the Speaker over them all; and the Committee on Internal Economy is appointed also, according to law, by the Governor in Council, every year. The Commission consists of members of the House, with the Speaker as chairman, and their duty is to look over appointments and have vacancies filled. Some three years ago that committee made a report to the House and classified the officers, and determined their salaries, which were acknowledged by the House as proper. Now, this committee can enquire if those officers are deserving officers, and if their pay is too small. If, by a report to the House of Commons, a committee can obtain this increase in salaries, will they not by that means do an injustice towards other officers who may be as deserving, but who will not have a chance of having their case brought before the attention of such a vigilant committee as the committee of which my hon. friend is chairman? I see that one of the officers, whose salary is recommended to be increased, is Mr. Hartney. I think Mr. Hartney is one of the clerks of the Railway Committee, and of the Banking and Commerce Committee as well. He was appointed the other day by the Railway Committee examiner of all the Bills that are presented, in order to see that those Bills are exactly in accordance with the Rules adopted by Parliament. This is extra work, and so that officer, finding that he can have an increase here, may come to the other committee and ask for another increase. We may have from the other com-

Mr. DAVIN.

mittee a report in that direction. Those officers would then be increasing their salaries without any reference being paid to the Clerk of the House or to the Speaker. I certainly think that the best mode, in a case of this kind, would be that a recommendation on the part of the committee might be referred to the Commission on the Internal Economy of the House, of which the Speaker is the head. Then the matter would be according to the Rules, and more just to other officers of the House of Commons. If the hon. gentleman does not object, I will move the adjournment of the debate, so that we may have time to consider the matter, unless he wishes to withdraw the motion.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I thought it had been understood that the report would come up for the concurrence of the House as soon as the other discussions had been finished. Last week I moved the adoption of the report, and the hon. the Minister asked me to postpone it until after the debate that was going on would be terminated. The matter has already been called to his attention, and I understood that he would be ready to-day to consider the report. I have no interest whatever to press the adoption of the report before the House of Commons is ready to consider it. In the meantime I might observe this: that the committee is making this recommendation now in the way that they have always made such recommendations, and according to the practice that has been always followed. For my part, I am ready to accept the recommendation made by the Minister of Public Works, that it be referred to the Commission on Internal Economy or to the Speaker, as it can be done in such a manner that no injustice will be done to any other officer of the House. We are just following the practice now which has been followed since the creation of the Official Debates.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no doubt whatever that the principle of the contention of the Minister of Public Works is right, but there is no doubt also that the officers connected with the Debates of this House have always been treated in a different category from other officers. This was contended for some few days ago by this side of the House, and my hon. friend, the chairman of the committee, did not support the views we took then. However, it is better late than never, and I am very glad to see that my hon. friend has resumed his privileges as chairman. For my part, I am ready to support him in the position he takes to-day. I would not support such a report with regard to any other officers than the officers of the Debates; but I come back to the position I laid down a moment ago, and also a few days ago, that the officers connected with the Debates are a special class, and have always been treated as such since the commencement of the Debates, and this report is only one of a long line of similar reports which from time to time have been adopted by this House.

Mr. SCRIVER. As a member of the committee, I desire to repeat substantially what my hon. leader has just been saying, that the committee have always looked on the persons connected with the Debates as in a somewhat different position from the other officers of the House, and what we have done in this instance is only in the line of what we have been doing in the past. Indeed, the present recommendations are of very much less importance than many that we have made before, especially that relating to the permanent reporters, in which we recommended not only that their salaries should be increased, but that they should be employed permanently, and that was accepted by the House as a matter of course.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may also say that some three or four years ago the committee recommended to the House that the salaries of the reporters should be raised, and that report was adopted by the House. In fact, in every instance in which any change has been made in the emoluments received by any person connected with the *Hansard*

staff, that change has been made on the recommendation of the committee; and I do not see how the committee could exercise control over the Debates, or could be made reasonably responsible for the proper conduct of the Debates, unless they had that power of making recommendations to the House. Here is a case where three officials on the *Hansard* staff are acknowledged to be underpaid, and that is especially the case with regard to Mr. Boyce. The increase for Mr. Boyce was recommended by the committee last year, but the report was not acted on, and during a year or more Mr. Boyce has been serving at a rate of pay which the committee last year reported was insufficient. If the matter now goes before the Commission of Internal Economy it will perhaps be laid over for another year, and cause considerable hardship to Mr. Boyce; for even if the recommendation of the committee is adopted, he will still be an underpaid official. Although, as a constitutional question, the Minister of Public Works no doubt takes a correct view of this matter, I think it will be better to continue the practice which has been in vogue hitherto, and allow the committee to exercise that jurisdiction over the officers of the Debates which they have exercised hitherto, and in this case to act on their recommendation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. What I ask is to have the report postponed in order that we may consider it for a couple of days, after which the chairman of the committee may bring up his motion again. My remarks about the Commission of Internal Economy apply specially to Messrs. Hartney and Brewer, who are officers of this House. The other officer, Mr. Boyce, as I understand, is an officer under the committee, and not a regular officer of the House, and that would make the circumstances different. Under these circumstances, we would like a little time to look into the matter, and the House will perhaps agree to my motion to adjourn the debate.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It is understood that I shall be able to bring it up again in the same way.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, in the same way, but the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to let me know when he intends to bring it up.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPRESENTATION OF BEAUHARNOIS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from Mr. Justice Bélanger, one of the Judges selected for the trial of controverted elections, his judgment relating to the election for the Electoral District of Beauharnois, by which judgment the sitting member had been declared to be duly elected.

THE CRIMINAL LAW.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 100) respecting the application to Canada of the Criminal Law of England. He said: In each of the Provinces there is a date at which the criminal law of England ceases to have application, and the result is a want of uniformity in the criminal code of Canada. The object of this Bill is to fix as the date the 1st of July, 1867, and to provide that the law of England, except in so far as it has been amended or repealed by any Provincial Act then in force or an Act of the Parliament of Canada subsequently passed, shall be applicable to Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would not that make a number of decisions on matters of criminal law that have been given by the different courts of the Provinces no longer applicable, and unsettle as well as settle? It would make a very slight difference, if the criminal law of England

should be applicable; but at a subsequent stage, I will bring down a table showing the changes this would make.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FISHERY BOUNTY CHEQUES.

Mr. FLYNN asked, Whether the Fishery Bounty cheques have been distributed to the fishermen yet? If not, when will they?

Mr. FOSTER. In some districts they have been already distributed; in others, they are being distributed. They differ for different districts.

MEGANTIC POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. TURCOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish postal service between the villages of West Broughton and Lemesurier, in the County of Megantic, in view of the fact that while the said villages are but six miles apart, communication sent by mail must traverse a circuit of two hundred and sixty-two miles each way, and that there is a comparatively large business between the two places?

Mr. McLELAN. It is not the intention of the Government to establish such postal service.

UNOCCUPIED LANDS—OLD LEASES.

Mr. DAVIS asked, Whether the lands covered by old leases, which have not been stocked or occupied, are to be kept closed to settlement for an indefinite period?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, these leases are being cancelled as rapidly as possible.

POSTAL SERVICE—VICTORIA COUNTY.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BARRON) asked, Has the Government received petitions from the public in the vicinity of Uphill, in the County of Victoria, asking them to establish a daily postal service between Uphill and the village of Victoria Road? If so, when was the first petition or request in that behalf received? What answer was made to the petitioners, and what does the Government intend to do in the premises?

Mr. McLELAN. The Government has received petitions for a daily mail service over this route. The first petition received was dated 19th, October, 1886 and addressed to Hector Cameron, Esq. The reply given was that the Postmaster General would not accede to the petitioners' request.

INDIAN TREATY, PEACE RIVER AND ATHABASCA.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BARRON) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make treaty with the Indians north of Treaty Six, in the Peace River and Athabasca District. If so, when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention of the Government to make such a treaty now.

EMPLOYMENT OF MR. SNETSINGER.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BARRON) asked, Whether one Snetsinger was at any time employed as carpenter or otherwise in the Government shops at Cornwall? If so, was he dismissed? What was the date of his dismissal, and what was the reason of such dismissal?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Snetsinger was first employed on the Cornwall canal from January, 1885, until the end of that year, and also during the year 1886. He

was also employed in January, February, March and April, 1887, and ten days in May, after which he ceased to be employed. His wages were two dollars per day.

INTERNATIONAL REGULATIONS.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to submit to the proper party the draft of an international regulation, compelling the trading vessels of the Dominion of Canada to take the necessary precautions in the direction of making themselves distinguishable, during the night-time, from vessels of war; these vessels being thereby obliged to proclaim their non-belligerent character by some distinctive mark, most easily seen, by some mode of placing the masts, the yards, or form of hull, about which it would be impossible to make a mistake?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the intention of the Government to submit to any party the draft of such an international regulation as is described in the question.

PROTECTION OF FISH.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint for the Gulf of St. Lawrence and for the Canadian waters of the Pacific, magistrates provided with the necessary powers for the protection of the fish within the limits reserved to us by treaty; and also for the protection of sea-fowl and their eggs; these magistrates being obliged to reside on the coast itself and in the neighborhood of the places where the greater part of the depredations are committed?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government has its fishery officers appointed in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, as well as for the Canadian waters of the Pacific. These officers have magisterial powers, and they will be added to as is necessary for the proper protection of the fisheries. With reference to the sea-fowl and their eggs, that is a matter which is under the jurisdiction of the Local Government.

WHALE FISHERIES.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to prevent the whale fishery from being carried on during a certain period in Hudson Bay and vicinity? In case permission is granted to foreigners to engage in such fishery in Hudson Bay and vicinity, whether it is the intention of the Government to impose a license fee upon each vessel so engaged, and to prescribe the method in which such fishery shall be conducted?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the intention of the Government to take any steps in that direction at present.

COLLISIONS ON THE HIGH SEAS.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, with the view of preventing as much as possible collisions on the high seas, to propose a law which will include the following provisions:—1. Prescribing to passenger-carrying steamships one track for the outward and one other track for the homeward passage, in order to divide what is now one course into two parallel courses; 2. Laying down a maximum speed in narrow channels in foggy weather; 3. Increasing the power of the lights carried, and bringing them more into harmony with the present high rate of speed possessed by these vessels?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a matter which is under the consideration of the Government.

HUDSON BAY SALMON RIVERS.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to lease out the salmon rivers emptying into the Hudson Bay or in its vicinity?

SIR HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. FOSTER. That is under the consideration of the Government.

POSTMASTER, VICTORIA, B. C.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether Robert Wallace, late postmaster at Victoria, B. C., has been superannuated? If so, what is his annual retired allowance under the Superannuation Act? Has time been added to his term of service? If so, for what reason? What was his salary at time of retirement; who has been appointed in his place, and at what salary?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Wallace has been superannuated. The amount of his annual retiring allowance is now under the consideration of the Treasury, upon an appeal. No time has been added to his term of service. Mr. Webster has been appointed. His salary on retirement was \$2,400. Mr. Noah Shakespeare has been appointed in his place at \$2,000.

ALBERT RAILWAY COMPANY LOAN ACCOUNT.

Mr. ELLIS asked, What is the total amount of the Albert Railway Company loan account? To whom was the money paid? What security has the Government for the advances paid? Is the Albert Railroad now in operation?

SIR HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total amount voted as a loan was \$15,000. There has been paid direct to the company on account of the loan, on reports of the chief engineer, and authorized by Order in Council, \$13,778. The Government holds as security a mortgage on the road executed by the president and secretary of the company. I am not aware whether the road is now in operation or not.

SUBMARINE CABLE FROM PELEE ISLAND.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) moved for:

Copies of all petitions, correspondence and reports respecting a submarine cable between Pelee Island and the Mainland.

He said: Although this public improvement for which we ask is in a portion of the country from which I come, still it is a matter of public interest, and one which all those who are interested in our inland marine should heartily support. Most of the wrecks which occur on Lake Erie occur in places which, if they were served by this cable, would not witness so many wrecks, and a great many more lives and property would be saved, and these lives and this property would have been saved if this cable had been laid down a few years ago. I hope the Government will see their way to going on with this work during the present summer. It is a matter of great importance to our vessel owners and to those engaged in our lake trade, and I think that all the details have been in the Department of Public Works for some years. I would be glad to see that the Government would deal with the matter without further delay. Last autumn some work was proposed to be done, and I do not hesitate to say that the construction of a submarine cable would be paid three times over by the cost of the loss of property which takes place. When a wreck takes place, the sending over to Windsor or some other port, and the cost of telegraphing from that place to the port where relief can be found causes a great deal of difficulty before the relief can come to the vessel which requires it, but if we have a submarine cable to the nearest wrecking point, a great quantity of property will be saved by the expedition with which the saving party will arrive at the wreck. I urge this question on the favorable consideration of the Government. It is not a local matter but it is a Dominion matter. It is a matter which should engage the attention of the Government at once, and particularly in view of the fact that the American Government are now

improving at the rate of millions of dollars the navigation of their waters and are building lighthouses. The whole expense for the construction of this cable is a few thousand dollars, and I believe it would be greatly appreciated by our sailors and our fishermen. Just before I came here for the Session, I had to receive a deputation of lake captains, who urged me to bring this matter again before the Government. It has been brought before them from year to year, and the persuasive style of the Minister of Public Works has not been sufficient to catch the ear of his colleagues. It is possible that more experience in this matter may enable him to obtain a favorable result this time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter has gone before my colleagues, and I hope this time that their ears will be opened.

Motion agreed to.

THE NORTHERN LIGHT.

Mr. WELSH moved for:

Return of all correspondence, telegrams and reports upon the *Northern Light* (including hull, machinery and boilers) for the year 1887, and from 1st January to date; also, all correspondence, telegrams and reports relative to the steamer *Alert*, and her fitness as a winter boat in the Straits of St Lawrence; also, all estimates and expenditure proposed to be laid out in the attempt to fit *Alert* for the winter crossing.

He said: I want to offer a suggestion to the hon. Minister of Marine which will save him some trouble. Some time about the 1st March, I moved:

For a return showing the names and salaries of all Captains in charge of Government steamers, together with the salaries and allowances at present payable to and received by them, together with all petitions, correspondence, telegrams, &c., relative to the paying of the Captain of the *Northern Light* since 1st January, 1879. Also for a return showing the names and number of men employed in or about the *Northern Light* during last summer, from the time she ceased running in the spring of 1887, until she again resumed in the autumn of the same year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to inform the Minister of Marine that I hold in my hand the return to this motion, but it does not contain the number of men employed about that steamer since she was laid up last spring until the ensuing fall. What is the meaning of sending in half a return when this House ordered a full return? I intend to have a full return, and if it is not brought down, if the Order of the House is not attended to, I intend to make a motion for a commission of enquiry in this matter. I can assure the Minister of Marine that he will not find an hon. gentleman on the front Government benches that will support him in this act.

Mr. FOSTER. I instructed my officers to comply with the Order of the House, and that report was handed in, and I supposed it thoroughly complied with the Order of the House. From the excited manner in which the hon. member made his remarks to the House, I inferred that his chief grievance was with reference to the number of men employed. It may be that the number of men employed was not given. If there is any omission it can be very easily remedied, and could have been just as easily remedied if my hon. friend had shown less feeling. I can assure him that there is no intention of depriving the House of full information. In fact, if my hon. friend will wait a little while we may make him a present of the *Northern Light*.

Mr. WELSH. I know there was a great number of men employed on the steamer last summer, making repairs, when there was no captain in charge of her, and without any one to superintend their work; and I wanted to know the number of men so employed, and the amount of money paid to them, in order that the House might see the manner in which the business of that department is conducted. That was my motive. There is no feeling in the matter, so far

as I am concerned; although the matter may appear to the hon. gentleman one to cause a little excitement. The truth is, I feel sore about this matter, and if I don't get this return, I will make the hon. gentleman feel sore, if I am not very much mistaken.

Mr. FOSTER. That is undoubtedly the way in which the mistake has arisen. My officers have given the number of the crew and the officers of the ship that were employed, and not the others.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman said that if my hon. friend had a little patience, perhaps in a short time they would make him a present of the *Northern Light*. Is it the intention of the Government to supersede the *Northern Light* with any other vessel?

Mr. FOSTER. It is.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If so, have arrangements been made for the purchase of another vessel, and where and when will they be carried out?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the intention of the Government to supersede the *Northern Light* by a new vessel, and arrangements are now being made with that end in view. I will be able to explain the matter more fully to the House later on.

Motion agreed to.

WORKS FOR THE DESCENT OF TIMBER AND LOGS ON THE OTTAWA RIVER.

Mr. AMYOT (Translation) moved for:

Statement setting forth the total cost of the construction of various works for the descent of timber and saw-logs on the Ottawa River and its tributaries, up to the 30th June last; also statement showing the yearly expenditure for the maintenance of the said works for five years preceding the 30th June last, under the different heads of reconstruction, repairs and cost of management, at each of the stations, with the names of river or tributary where the same was expended; likewise copies of any or all applications, whether from individuals or chartered companies, to acquire by purchase or otherwise all or any portion of said works and improvements on the said Ottawa River and tributaries thereof.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) There are one or two points of information demanded in this motion which it will be difficult, if not impossible, to give. I shall try, nevertheless, to supply them as nearly as possible.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Could the hon. Minister give us an idea of the time that we could get these documents? It would be an advantage to have them before the discussion of a Bill which is now before the Railway Committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In that case I judge that the report should be divided in two, for the reason that I fear a certain portion of the documents asked for by the hon. gentleman cannot be got ready in time. I quite understand what the hon. gentleman means by making this motion, and I shall do my utmost to forward the hurrying down of the papers.

Motion agreed to.

PROHIBITION.

Mr. JAMIESON moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for sacramental, medicinal, scientific and mechanical purposes. That the enforcement of such prohibition, and such manufacture, importation

and sale as may be allowed, shall be by the Dominion Government through specially appointed officers.

He said: Mr. Speaker, a resolution in reference to the prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors has been twice introduced into this House within the past few years, and there has been a full discussion of the whole question on each occasion. Consequently, I do not deem it advisable on the present occasion to make anything like an exhaustive address in support of the resolution. In fact, it is not my intention to say more than a few words, and I shall be perfectly satisfied, so far as I am concerned, if we can reach a vote on this question within the next half hour. I think it will be advisable to dispose of the resolution this afternoon, as I am informed and observe by the Order paper—I was not here on Friday evening—that if it is not disposed of by six o'clock, it will have to pass over in order that the arrangement in reference to resuming the debate on the Fishery question this evening may be carried out. I am not aware of anything new having come up in the country on the question of the prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors since last Session, when I submitted to this House a resolution in similar terms to the one I have just proposed. I am not aware that the evils flowing from the traffic in intoxicating liquors since that time have abated in any way, and I am still as fully convinced as I was on that occasion that it is the duty of this House to provide by legislation, not for the regulation, but for the entire prohibition of that traffic. It may be said that we have a local option law, and that it is the duty of those who are opposed to the traffic in intoxicating liquors to try that law which is already upon the Statute-book. Well, it is quite true that we have a local option law, and it is also true that that law, to a very large extent, has been laid hold of by the people, and adopted in a large number of counties and cities in this Dominion. But I have always contended, and I now contend, that the Canada Temperance Act is not a fair test of the question of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. I am not aware that either in this or any other country has any law yet been passed which can be said to be a fair test of prohibition. In the United States, I believe, several States of the Union have passed a prohibitory liquor law, but their power is limited, and, after all, it is only partial prohibition. Although the sale and the manufacture is prohibited by those States, it is beyond their power, as has recently been held by the Supreme Court of the United States, to prohibit the importation, inasmuch as that would be an interference with trade and commerce. Now, it is well known that the Canada Temperance Act, in the counties in which it is adopted, is only directed to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors. Consequently, it is only partial prohibition. I believe we should go further, and enact a law which will not only prevent the sale, but get at the root of the evil, by prohibiting the importation and manufacture of intoxicating liquors. We have dealt, since this House assembled, with some very important questions bearing upon the trade and commerce of the country, but it is my contention that the question now before the House, however lightly some members may be disposed to treat it, is the most important question which has been before the House since we have met this Session. I am not sure that it is merely the duty of the representatives of the people to deal with questions of trade and commerce alone, or what may be called purely secular questions. I believe it is the duty of the Parliament of this, and every other country, to deal also with questions affecting the morals of the people. I know of no traffic which, to the same extent, affects the moral condition of the people as the liquor traffic. In discussing this question, I am prepared to concede that it has a very important bearing upon some interests in the country which are regarded as of very great importance. I am quite aware that those engaged in the manu-

Mr. JAMIESON.

facture and sale of intoxicating liquors would be most materially affected, were a prohibitory measure passed by this House, but in my judgment it is the duty of Parliament to pass every law which it deems to be right, and to have that law enforced in the interests of the people. I am not now going to discuss the question as to whether it would be right or not to grant compensation to those engaged in the traffic, but will simply give expression to my own opinion on that point, and that is that if the option were given to me at the present moment of securing the prohibition of the liquor traffic and doing away with the great evils which flow from that traffic, I for one would be prepared to put my hands in my pocket, as a ratepayer of this Dominion, and contribute my share in compensating these parties. However, I am not prepared to admit that those engaged in the traffic are entitled to compensation. Notice after notice, intimation after intimation, has been given to those parties, from time to time, that the traffic in intoxicating liquors was considered by the people as inimical to their interests. The passage of the Temperance Act of 1864 by the Parliament of Canada was a notice, the passage of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 was a notice to those parties that the people and Parliament of this country considered that the traffic was inimical to the best interests of the country. Consequently, if parties, since the passage of those Acts, have gone into the manufacture or into the traffic, or have taken up the selling of intoxicating liquors in any way, they have done so with this notice to them upon the Statute-book of this country. Now, I trust that this resolution will receive very careful consideration at the hands of the representatives of the people. I know that those who are endeavoring to rid the country of this great evil are not looked upon with favor in certain quarters. I know they are regarded, and sometimes spoken of, as cranks, and as parties who want to destroy the peace of the country, and we are told that we are endeavoring to entrench upon the liberty of the subject by prescribing what men shall eat and drink. I know that very serious objections are urged in certain quarters to the passage of what are called sumptuary laws. But I believe that those who are advocating the prohibition and abolition of the liquor traffic are acting, not only within their rights as citizens, but in the best interests of the country. It may be true that men have an abstract right to eat and drink what they please and as they please, but when men who drink intoxicating liquors not only injure themselves but injure those who are dependent upon them—and it is not alone those who drink that suffer, but every interest in the community suffers—I believe it to be the duty of Parliament to step in and prohibit this traffic. I believe that the pathway of this traffic is strewn with the ruined lives and wrecked hopes of thousands and tens of thousands of the best citizens of this and every other country. It may be that Parliament is not yet prepared to give its sanction to a prohibitory liquor law, it may be possible that even the people of this country are not yet prepared to carry out such a law, if it were placed on the Statute-book. But I expect to live to see the day, and I believe many other members of the House will live to see the day when we shall have on the Statute-book a law prohibiting the traffic in intoxicating liquors; that the people of this country, in consequence of the great evils flowing from this traffic, will revolt against it and will put the ban of the law upon it. Now, although I have spoken much longer than I intended to in introducing this resolution, I have a few more words to say. It may be said, in reply to the remarks which I have made, and the resolution which I have had the honor of submitting to this House, that it was entirely unnecessary to submit another resolution during the present Parliament; that, in the first Session of this Parliament, when it was fresh from the people, we had a resolution on this

subject submitted and we had the deliverance of the House upon it, and that therefore it was unnecessary again during the continuance of the same Parliament to submit another resolution on the same subject. I may say that, when that resolution was presented last year, there was a very thin attendance of the House, and it was not a fair expression of the views of the House. I may also say that, since last Session there has been a serious change in the *personnel* of the House in consequence of vacancies which have taken place and have been filled by bye-elections. In addition to that, it is the desire and it is the determination of the promoters and friends of temperance in this country to keep this question before the Parliament of Canada and before the country at large. We are resolved that we will keep the question to the front, that we will educate the people and that we will agitate the people in regard to this question, and will agitate in Parliament in reference to it until we secure what we are striving to obtain, the entire prohibition of the liquor traffic. With these few remarks, I submit to the House the resolution which I have proposed, and I trust that it will receive that attention from the House which its merits demand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has brought this motion forward for the second time. Of course, if the hon. gentleman was prepared to propose a Bill to carry out the motion which he has submitted to the House, in case the majority supported him, there would be no objection to his putting a motion of this sort before the House, but it is hardly consistent with parliamentary practice that the hon. gentleman should ask the House to assent to this as an abstract proposition. The hon. gentleman has had for some time a Bill before Parliament to amend the Canada Temperance Act, but that is somewhat different in principle from the motion which he has made now. The principle of the Canada Temperance Act is very different from the principle which is embodied in this resolution, or in any Act which could be founded upon it if a majority of the House was found to favor it. The principle of the Canada Temperance Act is the principle of local option. It recognises that, in regard to any matter dealing with the licensing laws, each locality should decide for itself. When you come to legislate in regard to what may be regarded as a sumptuary law, you find that it is wholly inoperative unless it is sustained by a majority of the people in a particular locality. The measure to which I have referred was put on the Statute-book ten years ago by the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). That Government assumed the responsibility of putting that Act on the Statute-book, and assuming that responsibility they followed the principle which was laid down in a resolution proposed by the leader of the present Government, that it was the duty of the Government to assume the responsibility. They did assume the responsibility. The question whether we should place a prohibitory law on the Statute-book was made the subject of enquiry by the Government. They enquired into the operation of the law in the State of Michigan, and into the operation of the prohibitory law in the State of Maine, and also in regard to the operation of the prohibition law which was put, at one time, on the Statute-book in the Province of New Brunswick, and afterwards repealed, and the Government came to the conclusion that it was in the interest of temperance and in the interest of prohibition to adopt the optional law and not to adopt the law looking to total prohibition. I have myself always been in favor of prohibition, but I have never been in favor of the adoption of a measure that the majority of the people did not sympathise with. That would be inoperative, that would not in any degree suppress the habit of drinking, that would leave that habit as much in force as it was before, and would turn the sympathy of any district away from the cause of temperance and lead it in a direction where it would

try to set the law at defiance. For that reason I did not support the motion which the hon. gentleman proposed before. It seems to me that, before undertaking any legislation of this sort, we should know the opinion of the country on this question, and how are we to know whether the people in a particular locality will support the principle of prohibition or not? The hon. gentleman knows, or at least I know, that in my own constituency the Canada Temperance Act is in operation, and that there is no measure which it is so difficult to efficiently carry out as a prohibitory measure; and I know that, unless the overwhelming majority of a people in the locality favor the measure, it will do as little to suppress the habit of drinking to excess as if there was no such law at all. What we want is that the public sentiment should be in favor of prohibition, and then to follow it up by legislation which can be efficiently carried out. The Canada Temperance Act leaves it to the people in the locality itself to say whether they want prohibition or not. I know that in the rural districts, where it is tried, it works admirably. The farmers know that when their sons go out, they are not gathered in a drinking hole, they are not acquiring habits of dissipation, and that even those who are not total abstainers are not violating the law in any respect. But the towns and cities present a wholly different state of things. I am not at all sure that if you were to-morrow to try a measure of prohibition in any one of our cities, you would have as little drinking as you would have under a strict license law. Now, what the hon. gentleman ought to desire, and what the House ought to desire, is not simply and formally to put upon the Statute-book a law that is never put into operation, or that remains a dead letter, but it should be to put upon the Statute-book such legislation that the people themselves will sustain and will carry into operation, a law that is operative in favor of sobriety and good order, and not a law that excites opposition in a very considerable section of the community, the violation of which the people wink at, that will rather tend to a demoralisation and to a want of respect for law, than to good order and good habits in the community. Sir, holding this view, I would not support the motion of the hon. gentleman, not because I am not in favor of the principle of prohibition wherever the people are willing to carry it out, but because I am not in favor of putting upon the Statute-book a measure that would do away with existing restraints, and that would leave a very considerable section of the country exactly in the position as if there was no legislation at all. Now, when the hon. gentleman proposed to amend the Canadian Temperance Act with a view to making it more efficient, I think he was taking a step in the right direction; he was proposing to amend a law that is based upon wholly different principles from the resolution which he is now proposing. If, Sir, it were found that the people throughout a Province generally favored prohibition, I think the measure ought to be carried in that Province; if it were found to be so in several Provinces, then it would be well it should be carried in those several Provinces; if it should be found that the public sentiment of the entire Dominion were in favor of the measure, then it should be carried throughout the Dominion. But, Sir, it does seem to me that when in some of those localities in which the measure has been optional, it has been carried and afterwards repealed by a majority where it was formerly put into operation by a majority, it is scarcely a fitting time to propose to the House a measure of prohibition. This whole subject is entirely in the hands of the people themselves. Why, Sir, we know that the hon. gentleman proposed here amendments to the Canada Temperance Act, and they were kicked out in the Senate. The hon. gentleman said: "I will vote for an elective Senate." Well, Sir, I proposed in this House a resolution in favor of that view, and the hon. gentleman helped to vote it

down. Then, when the hon. gentleman saw that the Senate was opposed to his measure, and when he saw that a majority of the Senate held those views, and we proposed that the Government, who can control the Senate, that exercises a potent influence over the Senate, should assume the responsibility of those amendments to the Canada Temperance Act, and there was a chance, not only of carrying them through this House, if the hon. gentleman had been in favor of it, but there was also a chance, upon that line, of carrying them in the Senate—did the hon. gentleman support my proposition? No, Sir, he voted it down. And when last year the hon. gentleman had a motion upon the paper, and it was proposed to put it upon the Government Orders so as to give an opportunity for legislation of the sort desired, what did the hon. gentleman do? Why, Sir, he assured hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that he did not want to put it upon the Government Orders, that he was a Government supporter first, and a temperance man afterwards.

Mr. JAMIESON. The hon. gentleman is stating what is not true—if I may so so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did the hon. gentleman appear in his place.

Mr. JAMIESON. Whoever said that in reference to my conduct last year, said what was not true.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I put this question to the hon. gentleman: Did he not know there was a proposal to be made to put his motion upon the Government Orders so that there would be an opportunity of reaching it?

Mr. JAMIESON. I will explain to the hon. gentleman, if he will permit me. There was some conversation in reference to that matter, and the friends of prohibition on both sides of the House were called together and the matter was submitted to them, and they decided not to force the question in the manner indicated by the hon. gentleman, and I submitted to the action of that meeting.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Who were at the meeting?

Mr. JAMIESON. The member for Broome (Mr. Fisher) was one; there were about a dozen at the meeting, representing both parties in this House, all temperance men. I may say that I never saw the hon. member for Bothwell, (Mr. Mills) at any meeting or on any occasion when it was necessary to advocate temperance in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not undertake to prostitute my position as a member of Parliament by doing what the hon. gentleman has done in this House upon that question; I did not profess to support a motion that I took the earliest opportunity of opposing afterwards—that is what the hon. gentleman has done. I do not profess to give an opportunity to the Government to put it out of my power to put a motion that I desire to make, or to decline to allow a motion to be put upon the paper along with Government Orders. That is what the hon. gentleman did on that occasion last year.

Mr. JAMIESON. I deny it again, and I insist that the hon. member for Bothwell is wrong in the statement he is making with reference to my conduct last year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why, Sir, we know the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JAMIESON. The House will remember that the hon. gentleman was opposed to the present constitution of the Senate, and on entering the Government, for five long years, he never did anything towards reforming that body.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says he never saw me at one of those temperance meetings.

Mr. JAMIESON. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, Sir; he did not. But I happened to be a member of a Government that assumed

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

the responsibility of putting the only measure upon the Statute-book on this subject that is to be found since the Union, and Sir, we did not receive the support of the hon. gentleman in that undertaking, we did not receive the support of the hon. gentleman's political allies in that undertaking. I remember, Sir, that there was a prominent temperance man, a member of the Government, that preceded us in office, the late Finance Minister, the Hon. Mr. Tilley; I remember that he was seven years a member of the Government, and never proposed legislation on the subject. I remember that the moment the Hon. Mr. Tilley returned to office, the political associates of the hon. gentleman, and some of those who pose as temperance men with him, met Mr. Tilley here and complimented him upon the progress of the temperance work—not work that had been done by Mr. Tilley, or through his instrumentality, because it was done by the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). Did they thank my hon. friend for East York for what he did, for the sacrifices which he made, the opposition which he incurred? No, Sir, nothing of the sort was done. Why, Sir, it is well known that the hon. member and the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) hunt in couples. The hon. member for South Lanark appears here as an opponent of temperance, and receives the support of the hon. member for North Lanark, (Mr. Jamieson), who is the advocate *par excellence* of temperance; and so the one secures the liquor support for the temperance candidate, and the other secures temperance support for the liquor candidate; and we have the temperance candidate for North Lanark and the anti temperance candidate for South Lanark. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman will find that that policy is pretty nearly played out in this House, and he will find that it is very nearly played out in the country. The hon. gentleman has appeared for two or three Sessions as a legislator in favor of temperance; but he has, instead, been its impeder, he has stood in the way of legislation. The hon. gentleman forced himself to the front in undertaking to amend a measure put upon the Statute-book by a Government that the hon. gentleman has always opposed, while the hon. gentleman never dared to ask the men who sit on the Treasury benches, whom he hourly supports, to take up this question and to amend a measure which a former Government put upon the Statute-book. Sir, that is the position of the hon. gentleman. And the public will thoroughly understand it. What does the hon. gentleman do now? He brings up his measure within one hour of the adjournment when he knows that another subject is to be taken up after recess, and that in all probability his motion will not be reached again this Session. He has taken precious good care not to permit this measure to occupy a foremost place in the notices of motion; he took precious good care last year that his motion should not occupy a foremost place, and the result was that last year his motion was never reached, and a vote was never taken on it, and so seeing how eminently successful he was last year in preventing legislation of a practical character, giving the people an opportunity of acting in accordance with their moral conviction, he comes here now, and leaves the measure proposing to amend the law—it has not yet been reached or dealt with—and he proposes to take up an abstract resolution which may secure him certain temperance support in his constituency by those who do not take the trouble to ascertain exactly how the business of the House is conducted. I think the hon. gentleman has succeeded eminently well in showing exactly where he stands upon the temperance question. He has said that he is ready to support a measure of prohibition. He proposes to ask the House to vote on the subject of prohibition—certainly he does. He says that when the people favor a measure we place it on the Statute-book. So we do. When men are guilty of forgery the public are ready to punish them, and

so it is with regard to theft. Is such the case in regard to the subject of prohibition? Does not the hon. gentleman know that it is not? If he wishes a measure of prohibition to be practical it must have the sympathy and support of at least a majority of the people in the locality where the law is to be operated, and it is therefore unwise and highly inexpedient in the interests of really genuine temperance legislation to propose a measure with which public opinion does not sympathise and which it will not support. We have on the Statute-book a measure of prohibition. There is nothing to prevent the people from making it law throughout the entire Dominion from one end to the other. If there are defects in this measure let them be pointed out, and they can be corrected, and the people can be given an opportunity of saying whether they will have prohibition or not. Does the hon. gentleman propose to force prohibition down the throats of those opposed to it? Does he suppose such a measure would be operative? Does he not know what is done up the Ottawa just beyond his own constituency, where the Act was carried by a narrow majority, and does he believe that in the large lumbering districts where the vast majority of the men are opposed to prohibition such a measure will be operative? He knows it will not. What the hon. gentleman proposes is merely buncombe, and the reign of buncombe is over; it was a reign of usurpation, and we trust this the last opportunity in which any of its friends will exhibit themselves in this House.

Mr. JAMIESON. As I have a right to reply I will now avail myself of the opportunity to do so. I do not like to appear before the House again so soon, but the conduct of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has been such as to call upon me to reply. If the hon. gentleman had discussed the question on its merits I would not at this stage of the debate have asked the privilege of again speaking in regard to the question before the House. It seems to me that the conduct of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is of a most extraordinary character. He, forsooth, is the great champion of the cause of temperance, at least he was a few days ago in this House when he sought to embarrass not only the Government but the friends of the Government. I am now glad, however, to find that he has shown his hand. I think not only the members of this House but the people of the whole Dominion will appreciate at its true worth the conduct of this new apostle of temperance in Parliament. The hon. gentleman has charged me with bringing up this motion at an inopportune hour. Every hon. member knows that this is the first opportunity I have had since the Session opened to bring this question before the House, and the hon. gentleman ought to remember that this debate will close at six o'clock simply for the purpose of giving the hon. member for Bothwell an opportunity to air his eloquence upon a certain important question. If he considered this question so important as he would indicate by his remarks, let him forego the opportunity of addressing the House to-night on the other question, and let us have this question discussed to the very bottom. I think it is most unfair on the part of the hon. gentleman to attack me for the manner in which this resolution has been brought before the House, because it was utterly out of my power to bring it forward at an earlier period of the Session, or on any other occasion than the present; but I apprehend that if I had refused to avail myself of the opportunity of bringing the question before the House at the present time, the hon. member for Bothwell would have been the first member to have risen and charged me with endeavoring to shirk a duty that had been placed in my hands by the Dominion Alliance. The hon. gentleman has referred to the Canada Temperance Act, which was placed upon the Statute-book by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when he was at the head of the Government. I am quite pre-

pared to give the Government of that day due credit for anything they did in connection with the temperance question.

Mr. MILLS. But you voted against them all the same.

Mr. JAMIESON. But the principle was admitted before the Canada Temperance Act became the law of this country. In 1864 a Conservative Parliament placed on the Statute-book of the country another measure, the Temperance Act of 1864, which was the first measure ever introduced and placed upon the Statute-book which conceded the principle of local option. Although I am quite prepared to admit that the Canada Temperance Act was an improvement on the old Temperance Act of 1864, still the principle of the two measures was identical, and I do not know that the Government were entitled to so much credit for that measure after all. I will tell the House why. In 1874 the temperance people of the Dominion, representatives from every Province of the Dominion, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Ontario, and I believe Manitoba, met in convention in the city of Montreal in order to devise the best means of promoting the cause of temperance in the Dominion. They passed a resolution giving a committee authority to approach the Government of that day for the purpose of securing a measure under which a popular vote would be taken upon the question. But when the committee reported at a subsequent meeting that was held for the purpose of receiving that report, it was found that the Premier of the Dominion at that time refused to grant what the temperance people asked, a plebiscite on the question, on the ground that there was no constitutional precedent under the British Crown for such a procedure. So that the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) did not concede to the temperance people of the Dominion at that time what they asked; they did concede a half-way measure, the Canada Temperance Act, and although we were thankful at the time to get it, still it was not what we asked, and I would prefer to-day to have this question submitted to the popular vote of the Dominion rather than have the question tested by a measure of partial prohibition which necessarily is unsatisfactory as a proper test of the question. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has attacked me for the course I pursued two years ago on the motion which he submitted to the House in regard to the reformation in the constitution of the Senate. Allow me for a few minutes to point out the course of the hon. gentleman on that question a few years ago. In 1874, when his friends were in power, he submitted a resolution to the House with the same object in view. Did he pursue the same course as he pursued on the last occasion? Not at all; the circumstances were different, his own friends were in power, and instead of moving his motion as an amendment to go into Committee of Supply, he moved it as a substantive motion. *Hansard* will show that on the last occasion on which that gentleman submitted that motion to this House I rose and said that if the hon. gentleman would place the motion before the House on that occasion in the same manner in which he did on a former occasion, I would support it; but he did not do anything of the kind, because on a former occasion his own friends were in power and he did not want to embarrass them. On this occasion his political opponents were in power and his action was for the purpose of embarrassing them and for nothing else.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman know that the proper time for moving a motion relating to any defect is when going into supply, and it is not regarded as a vote of want of confidence?

Mr. JAMIESON. If it were the proper time to take it up why did not the hon. gentleman, on a former occasion, bring it up in the same way? What is more, Sir, he

charges me with insincerity upon this question. It will be recollected by every public man in this country that notwithstanding the fact that the House gave assent to the proposition which he submitted in 1874, to reform the constitution of the Senate, that he not only did not take for further action on the matter but that he entered the Government of the day and remained a member of that Government for four long years, and we heard no more about the reform of the Senate. Let me ask what did the hon. gentleman ever do with a view to carry out the spirit of the motion which had received the sanction of this House? I do not desire to enter at any great length into this question of his references to me. The hon. gentleman charges me with insincerity because a few days ago I voted against a motion which he submitted to this House. I think it is due to myself and to the temperance Conservatives on this side of the House, that I should enter into a further explanation in reference to this matter and give to the House my reasons for pursuing the course which I did. It is well known that there is a body of temperance men in this country called the Dominion Alliance for the suppression of the liquor traffic. It is organised of non-partisan members, and Reformers and Conservatives meet there on a common ground for the purpose of promoting the cause of temperance. I am and have been for years a member of that Alliance, and it has been a principle acted upon in that Alliance that any temperance legislation to be brought before this House ought first to receive the sanction of the Alliance; that every movement in reference to the amendment of the Canada Temperance Act, or with reference to the prohibition of the liquor traffic, should originate with the Dominion Alliance. On the very day and up to the very hour that the hon. gentleman made the motion to this House, I had been acting in the Dominion Alliance in accord with the temperance Liberal members on the other side of the House. We had been sitting at a committee meeting around a table that very day discussing questions in reference to the action we would take in the House on the question. What was my surprise to find the hon. gentleman who never yet manifested any zeal for the cause of temperance, except on an occasion when it was likely to embarrass those who were opposed to him, and who has never yet appeared at a meeting of the Dominion Alliance, or any other organization for the purpose of promoting the cause of temperance in this country, get up in his place and place a motion before this House under circumstances which he must have known would call for a condemnation of the resolution at the hands of the majority of the members of this House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Why so?

Mr. JAMIESON. Because at the time he knew it would be voted down by the members of this House. I did not vote against it simply because it was a vote of want of confidence in the Government, but I voted against it because it was a breach of the fundamental principles on which the Dominion Alliance was organised.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. JAMIESON. It is of the kind, and not only have the Liberal members of the Dominion Alliance who are not represented in this House endorsed the course which I took but they have said I could not take any other course.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not they. Name.

Mr. JAMIESON. Yes, among others Mr. Spence, the secretary of the Dominion Alliance, who is as good a Liberal as the member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) is. He said the resolution was an untimely one to be submitted to the House. The *Montreal Witness* whose sympathies are altogether with the Liberal party condemned the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) for the circumstances under which he put that resolution to the House and every

Mr. JAMIESON.

fair-minded temperance man in this Dominion has taken the ground which I took on the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. JAMIESON. Yes, they did; and I am prepared to submit my conduct to the people of this Dominion on that question. I believe so far as this question is concerned that the people of this Dominion have more confidence in myself as a representative than the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I am bound to characterise the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell a few moments ago in reference to my conduct last year as a—well—I do not know how to characterise it so that it would be within the rules of Parliament, but I will say it is a wrong statement from beginning to end, and whoever gave that information to him I have no doubt they were “guying” him because they thought he would swallow it in the manner in which he did. There is not one word of truth in it from first to last. When we found we could not get a measure before the House last year—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why?

Mr. JAMIESON. An old parliamentarian asks why? On a former occasion I forced the measure through this House, but it was the cause of defeating several other measures. I am satisfied now that this is not a proper course to pursue and that it is not a course which is recognised by the House as a fair one. I do not know whether we could have succeeded last year in forcing the question through the House or not. We called together the men from both sides of the House; we called them to consult together, and the question was submitted to them, and the decision of that committee was that it was too late in the Session to press temperance legislation, and it would not be fruitful of any good to us if we had pressed it, because we would not be able to get the question disposed of in such a manner as to have it complete.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if he notified all the temperance men of the House to go to that meeting?

Mr. JAMIESON. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Who were selected?

Mr. JAMIESON. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) undertook to notify the members favorable to temperance on his side of the House and I undertook to notify the members favorable to temperance on my side of the House. In that way the meeting was brought about.

Mr. FISHER. What meeting are you referring to?

Mr. JAMIESON. The one that was called last year to bring up this question. You recollect it?

Mr. FISHER. I am not aware of any meeting at which it was decided that we should not push the temperance question as fast as we could.

Mr. JAMIESON. Well, I am, and I think there are gentlemen in this House who were present at that meeting.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask the hon. member how many members he invited from his own side of the House to attend that meeting?

Mr. JAMIESON. I am not prepared to say at the present moment, but possibly about a dozen were invited. There are a certain number of gentlemen who are connected with temperance movements and temperance organisations, and who are favorable to prohibition, and we generally invite them. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has been invited, but I am not sure that he ever attended. Now, I am sorry that this discussion has assumed the character that it has, but I think the hon. members of this House will at least excuse me for the course I have taken.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, we will not.

Mr. JAMIESON. Then, I suppose you will sustain the course pursued by the hon. member for Bothwell, who instead of urging this question on its merits, used it as an opportunity of making a personal attack on myself. But I can say this—my own constituents, and I believe every honest man in this Dominion, will give me credit for being at least sincere on this question, and doing what I can for the purpose of advancing this policy.

Mr. SCRIVER. It is now so near six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, that it is very evident that this question cannot be disposed of before you leave the Chair; and, under the rules of the House if the debate is not adjourned, the order will disappear from the paper. Therefore, with the view of keeping the question before the House, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the House is very thin this afternoon, and as the question has not come to a vote, I think the debate should be adjourned, so that the House may have an opportunity to consider the matter and deal with it as they think proper.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

CLAIM OF WARREN ALLEN.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved for:

Return of all papers and correspondence relating to claim for compensation by Warren Allen for an ice-boat burnt to save the lives of the crews and passengers of the ice-boats, in the month of January, 1885, while crossing from Prince Edward Island to New Brunswick; and also for the use of an ice-boat and a crew, engaged in search of the missing boats.

He said: As the hon. gentleman will see, I am making a motion in relation to the claim preferred by one of the ice-boat men, who, during the year 1885, lost his boat in a storm. It will be remembered that one of the members of this House was among the passengers on that unfortunate occasion, and although this man was not in the employ of the Government in any sense of the word, but was the owner of a volunteer boat which was making crossings at the time, still the circumstances strongly favor his claim. The Government boats carrying Her Majesty's mails and a number of passengers were caught in this awful storm, and Mr. Allan's boat was accompanying them. In order to save the mails and the lives of the passengers, the boat, in the last extremity, was broken up and burnt. No doubt the heat thus obtained was the means of saving the lives of the passengers and of saving the mail. I think altogether the claim is a very good one, and is based on the highest grounds. Mr. Allan's property was burnt for the preservation of Her Majesty's mails, and also for the preservation of the lives of the unfortunate passengers. I do not know whether the hon. member for King's County is in his seat or not, but I know that he was one of the passengers, and he can bear personal testimony to the facts I have stated. My hon. friend's life was in danger, and he was many months recovering from the effects of the trip. I am aware that the Government were not themselves in charge of the boat, and the only ground on which I recommend this claim is that this boat was burnt in order to afford warmth to the passengers and crew, and thus enable them to weather the storm. I think, therefore, the claim, small as it is, should recommend itself to the just consideration of my hon. friend, and I sincerely hope he will see it in his power to satisfy it. I have heard this claim urged by a great many gentlemen irrespective of politics. I do not know what are Mr. Allan's politics. In fact he is not a constituent of mine at all, but is a resident on the other side. Everybody speaks favorably of the claim, and I sincerely hope the hon. gentleman will give it his attention.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will let the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries know what the hon. gentleman has said about the case. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in saying that this is not a question of politics. There cannot be any politics in a matter of this kind, that of saving the lives of the passengers and the mails. I am sure my hon. friend will consider the case if he has not already done so.

Motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

FISHERIES TREATY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper for second reading of Bill (No. 65) respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The subject which the House has under consideration this evening is one of unusual importance. In matters which concern ourselves and ourselves alone, if we make a mistake, it is possible for us to retrace our steps. Our blunders may impede our progress for the time being, but they cannot put ultimately any obstacles in our way. But that observation will not apply to the Bill which is now under consideration. Every step we take is a step in a direction from which there is no returning. Every act that we do is final. And if a blunder is made, if we do something that is detrimental to the interests of the country, it will wholly be beyond our power to correct the errors into which we have fallen or the mistakes we have made. It is therefore of very great importance that we should carefully consider the subject now before us. It is important that we should not hastily come to the conclusion, and I confess that I am wholly unable to understand the extreme haste with which the hon. the Minister of Finance and his chief are disposed to press forward a matter of such vital importance to the country. We know that the concessions we are called upon to make are of very great magnitude. We know that the concessions are wholly upon the one side; we know that we are not in this matter standing as the aggrieved party. The complainant is the United States. It is the country to the south of us that has demanded concessions from us, and we, at all events, before we are called upon to approve of what has been done by those who claim to represent us—we ought to know whether they are prepared to accept the extraordinary concessions which have been made or not. Now, I understand that within twenty-four hours this subject is, in all probability, likely to be dealt with at the capital of the neighboring Republic. In all probability, within the next twenty-four hours, the Senate of the United States will either postpone or reject the treaty that has been negotiated. Why, then, are the Government so anxious? Why is the Government so anxious to press this to a conclusion? Why should we commit ourselves to a proposition, which, if rejected, will simply be made the starting point for further concessions at a future period? If this question were allowed to stand over, if Parliament were not called upon to commit itself on it at this moment, should the Senate of the United States within the next twenty-four hours reject the treaty we would then be as free to start again from the point at which the hon. gentleman started a few months ago as he was at that time. But if this House, representing the entire country, is called upon at this moment to approve and does approve of what has been done, and if what has been done should be rejected by the party to whom the concessions are made, why, when we start again to negotiate with our neighbors to the south of us, we will have to start from where we left off in this

Parliament at this moment. We cannot, once the House has committed itself to the provisions of the treaty, take exception to anything therein conceded. A new embassy would say naturally: You, the representatives of the nation to the north—those for whom you speak have already agreed to concede what you now object to. This we knew you were ready to concede without hesitation, and we expect something more at your hands. And so the hon. gentlemen seem not to be satisfied with the humiliation which they have brought upon themselves and the humiliation they have brought upon the country by the propositions which are now before us for ratification, but, before they are at all sure, or, as I believe, when they are very sure, that these propositions will not be accepted by the Senate of the United States, they seek to commit this House to them. Why this indecent haste to commit this Parliament to the propositions of the Minister of Finance before we know whether the neighboring Republic, or those who represent the neighboring Republic, accept these concessions at our hands? Has Lord Salisbury importuned this Government to hurry the matter in this way? Is he afraid that the headland question may be raised again by the people of Canada? Is he afraid that these questions between the two countries may be again raised in consequence of the exasperating regulations in regard to customs, and in connection with the Department of Marine and Fisheries? Why do hon. gentlemen opposite press us to give an answer or to give an opinion on this subject before we know what opinion will be expressed by the Senate of the United States? We have everything to gain by awaiting the action of the Senate of the United States, and we have a great deal to lose if they should reject this treaty after we have affirmed it. What does the Minister of Finance hope to gain by this House affirming that treaty? Does he propose, or is it his desire, to convince an exasperated nation that those who represented them on this Commission made a bad bargain, and that the arrangement which was made is so satisfactory to the people of Canada that they have not hesitated to accept it immediately and without dispute? That is to call upon us to make an affirmation which we know to be false. We know what our position is. We know that it is one of humiliation, and we ought to be spared the further humiliation of having these extraordinary concessions rejected by those to whom they have been made. The Minister of Finance has told us in his speech that the protection of the fisheries has never been made a party question. I believe that is true. I believe that the protection of the fisheries was earnestly desired by both sides of the House, but the protection of the fisheries and the concession to another country of the sovereignty over our fisheries, or a common right to our fisheries, is a wholly different thing, and when the hon. gentleman speaks of the protection of the fisheries and then refers to the provisions of this treaty, he is referring to two things as far apart as they can be. This treaty does not provide for protection; it is a surrender. The conditions in this treaty which, possibly within the next twenty-four hours, the United States will either have postponed or rejected, are not provisions by which proper protection is to be given to our fisheries, but is a concession of more than half of the area which we claim to be within the jurisdiction of this country. There are many thousands of square miles, which we claim to be under Canadian jurisdiction or under the jurisdiction of Newfoundland, which are proposed to be surrendered to the United States under this treaty. Two years ago we were promised a vigorous police policy to protect our fisheries. That policy, we were told, was supplemental to the so-called National Policy. It was on the same lines, it was for the same purpose, it involved the same principles, it professed to be intended for the interests of the people of this country, but it proved to be anything but that. It was

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

inefficient, it was exasperating. Why, we had before us last year abundant evidence, furnished by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) showing that hundreds of vessels from the United States engaged in fishing within the three mile limit; and that, while harsh customs regulations were in force, and while harsh and unjust police regulations were carried out, so as to irritate the people of the neighboring Republic and to give them an opportunity of exciting the resentment of their fellow countrymen, there was really nothing done to protect our own fishermen. Two years before the Washington Treaty was denounced by the United States, this Government were notified, and they were advised that it would be well, before that provision of the Washington Treaty came to an end, to enter at that time into negotiations with the United States, so that there would be no worrying police regulations, because at that time those fishermen had still the right to engage in fishing in our waters with the fishermen of this country. The same view was taken by Lord Derby, who was then Secretary of State for the Colonies. That nobleman addressed three communications to the Government of this country without receiving any response. It was not until he sent the fourth that they gave him any answer and the concluding words of that fourth despatch were:

"In the face of these circumstances, my Government does not consider that it would be consistent with the respect which it owes to itself to appear as a suitor for concessions at the hands of the United States."

It was not necessary that the Government should appear in the position which they seemed to have considered it necessary for them to appear, as suppliants. It was only necessary for them to invite communication and negotiation; but hon. gentlemen upon the Treasury benches had a high idea of their own dignity, and one would suppose from the observations which I have read, that they had studied the diplomatic negotiations which were carried on two centuries ago, when the treaties of Osnabruck and Westphalia and Madrid were negotiated, when the ambassadors took different sides of the room, and watched each others' legs when anyone moved, because the man who stepped first was supposed to be sacrificing his sovereign's dignity. In one place, there was a special building put up for the ambassadors to assemble in, and in that there were as many doors as there were ambassadors, so that no one could have precedence of another; and there was also a round table provided at which they might sit so that no question of distinction might arise when their negotiations were being carried on. It seems to me that it is in this spirit that the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches have approached a great question affecting the friendly relations between this country and the neighboring Republic, a question of the most vital consequence to this country, whatever it might be to the country to the South of us. We find in the history of hon. gentlemen opposite a continuation of these lofty pretensions and this proud reserve. We find that they have passed these officious customs regulations which could not help us, but must exasperate the feelings of our neighbors to the South. Then, we have the fisheries regulations which in some cases were cruel and unjust as well as unwise and unnecessary. See what were the means employed by these hon. gentlemen to promote the well-being of this country and to secure friendly relations with those of the neighboring Republic? First, Sir, they proposed to be extremely generous; they said to the people of the United States when it was too late to carry on negotiations, when Congress had no longer an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon the subject, or of agreeing to any proposition that might be made: You may have free use of our fisheries for a season, if the President will permit fish to be carried free into the neighboring Republic. Well, Sir, the President informed these

gentlemen of what they ought to have known before, that he had no power to make any such concession, that he had no power to repeal an Act of Congress, that the proposition ought to have been made while Congress was in session, so that they would have had an opportunity of considering it. And so the American fishermen were given the use of our fisheries for a season without any compensation, and without any reserve. Then we were told that they cared nothing for the generosity that we had extended to them, that they were in no mood to make any concession, that the Gloucester fishermen were still opposed to the free admission of Canadian fish to the American market; and so they were to be taught by a policy of retaliation the power which this country possessed. Sir, we were told that Canada was the great maritime state of the new world, that our fleet was almost as large as that of the neighboring republic, and that while we did not want to quarrel with them, while we did not want to adopt a policy of exclusion, while we were ready to trade with them if they were disposed to trade, we were quite able to live without them, and that we were quite able to show them that we were capable of protecting the fisheries that we possessed on our coast, and so the policy of Jingoism was begun.

"We don't want to fight,
But, by Jingo! if we do,
We've got the men, we've got the ships,
We've got the monee, too."

It was in that spirit that the hon. gentlemen entered upon the consideration of this question. Sir, what defence did the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries make the other night? Why, it is that we were standing upon our legal rights, that what we did was within the undoubted rights that Canada possessed under the Treaty of 1818. He told us that he had not strictly enforced the provisions of that treaty; he said there were many cases in which the fishermen of the United States were allowed in our waters, privileges which they had no right to claim under the treaty. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman's policy was vacillating, it was capricious, it was arbitrary. It may have been that in every instance that he mentioned he made the concessions which he speaks of; but, Sir, there were many instances in which he did not make concessions. And what defence does the hon. gentleman make when it is complained that his conduct was occasionally arbitrary, vexatious and unjust? Why, Sir, he says: It is not in the bond; I complied with the law; I kept within our rights; I did not do to you anything that the law did not authorise me to do; and so, because I did not violate the treaty of obligations between the two countries, you have nothing of which to complain. Well, Sir, I deny altogether that position. I say it was the duty of the hon. gentleman to act in accordance with the principle of humanity and of modern civilisation. It was his duty to do no harm, to put no impediment in the way of the fishermen of a friendly power, as long as he was not giving them facilities for violating the law of the land. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, I say, in many instances, did that which was altogether unjustifiable. I hold in my hand a report of some of the complaints of some of those fishermen, and I will read a few with reference to the action of the officers under the charge of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. There was the case of the *Sarah B. Putman*, of Beverly, Mass., which was driven from the harbor of Pubnico, in a storm, 27th March, 1886. That was the complaint. Now, the hon. gentleman will not say that the Treaty of 1818 gave his officers a right to force a vessel to leave the harbor in a storm.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you know?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am pointing out the charges that have been made by the people of the United States against the Government of which he was a member.

Mr. FOSTER. By whom was that charge made?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, I will, by-and-bye; answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. Please answer now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, I will not. I purpose to make my own speech in my own way. We know that those hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are the last parties who will submit to interruption, and I will, in this speech, follow their example. Now, I will say this. It does not matter whether that statement was well or ill founded. It was the kind of statement that was made to the American people, it was published abroad in their newspapers, it was that which formed public opinion in the United States, and it was that which compelled those gentlemen to make the discreditable surrender which we are this evening considering; and what I complain is that these hon. gentlemen, knowing the country with which they had to deal, knowing the jealousy with which they guard the interests of their fishermen, were not sufficiently careful to give them no cause of complaint, and were not sufficiently careful to see that when a complaint was made, it should be redressed, or answered at the time, if untrue. Now, there was another case, the *Rattler*, which was a ship from Gloucester. It is complained that she was warned off at Canso, N. S., in June, 1886; that she was detained in the port of Shelburne, where she entered seeking shelter, and that she was ordered out from that port. Then again there was the case of the *Caroline Vought*. She was from Booth Bay, in the State of Maine, and was warned off at Paspébiac, N.B., and was refused an opportunity of taking water on board. Now, Sir, the right to take water is one of the rights under the treaty, and what I am reading at this moment are complaints of American fishermen, not that the Government had acted in a narrow and inhospitable spirit, but that they had acted illegally and contrary to the provisions of the treaty by which their rights were secured. Then again I will take a few cases of the next year. There was the case of the *Christina Ellsworth*, a schooner of Eastport, in Maine. The complaint of her master was that in every harbour she entered she was refused the privilege of buying anything, that she was compelled to enter at every custom house, that she found that the customs charges at every place, almost, were different from what they were at the preceding place. Then there was the case of the *Stowell Sherman*. She was ordered, in distress of weather, out of Cascumpec Harbor, P.E.I., after having entered it in a storm. Then there was the *Walter L. Rich*, a schooner of Wellsfleet, Mass. She was ordered out of Malpeque Harbor, P.E.I., in unsuitable weather, for fishing, and was compelled to return to her own port without having an opportunity of fishing, in consequence of the refusal of shelter by the Canadian authorities. Then the *Newell B. Hawes*, that made harbor at Shelburne, N.S., she was ordered out at 5 o'clock in the evening, in the face of a storm. Her commander refused to go, and at 7 o'clock the next morning she was ordered out to sea although there was a dense fog which made it quite impossible that she could leave the port safely. Then there was the *Helen F. Frederick*, of Cape Porpoise, Maine. She was ordered out of Port Latour, U.S., where she had gone for shelter and water. Now if those representations are all well founded, then all of those cases mentioned were in violation of the rights secured by the treaty. There are many other cases which show harsh and unnecessary police regulations, but I mention these that were brought under the attention of the Government of the United States and made the subject of diplomatic discussion between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain in consequence of the complaints set forth. Then there was another class. There are four purposes for which fishing

vessels of the United States may enter the harbors of Canada. There are other purposes that have grown up since for which they might fairly be allowed to enter without doing any injury to our fishermen, without in any way affecting them as competitors in the markets of the world. One of those is the occasional taking on board persons as mariners. In some cases where mariners were sick, where parties were disposed to leave the fishing vessels, where arrangements had been made for taking others on board, they were not allowed to ship seamen in ports of Nova Scotia, and the vessels were obliged to return to American ports and those who had engaged as fishermen or mariners on those vessels were compelled to take rail and go to some port in the United States before they could go on board and enter American service. The vessels that made complaint on this score were *William Keene*, *Pleiades* and *Margaret S. Smith*. Then there was a third class, such as the case of the *Neponset*. She was a schooner from Boston. On 27th August, 1886, she was anchored in Port Hawkesbury, Cape Breton, and immediately reported at the custom house. Being short of provisions her master asked the collector for permission to buy more food, but he was twice refused. He then expressed his intention of seeing the United States' consul at Port Hood three miles away. The custom house officer forbade his landing at that port to see the consul; but he did so in spite of the prohibition of the custom house officer. He saw the consul, and was informed that if he attempted to buy provisions in all probability his vessel would be seized. He asked permission, as he was sick, to return to his own country; that was refused, and he travelled through the woods to a station where he boarded a train in order that he might, contrary to the customs and police regulations of Canada in those matters, return to his own country for medical assistance. It is almost impossible to read these statements without feelings of indignation. It is a discredit to any Government to deal with fishermen of a neighboring country in so harsh and so cruel a way as those parties were dealt with under the vexatious regulations made. We know what the consequence has been. It has been, as the Minister of Finance has said, the union of 60,000,000 of people against this country. What is the testimony of the Minister of Finance on this subject? His hon. friends adopted their National Policy nine years ago. It has had nine years' operation on land, and it has been tried two years at sea, and we know the result. We have the testimony of the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. gentleman, in this discussion, said:

"Yesterday we stood face to face with a non-intercourse Bill, sustained by the united action of the Senate and House of Representatives, sustained by almost the whole political parties, Republican and Democratic, of the United States, sustained with few exceptions by a prejudiced, irritated and exasperated people of 60,000,000 lying to the South of us."

How was it those people were so united, irrespective of party, against this country? How was it that the two Houses of Congress, the press of the United States, the people of the United States entertained such feelings of hostility to this country? It was in consequence of the regulations those hon. gentlemen made and which they attempted to enforce. It was intended to force the United States to come to terms, it was attempted to deal otherwise than on principles of common sense with those who controlled the Government of the neighboring Republic. The Minister of Finance has changed his position. He was at one time hostile to the present policy, and that not long ago. The Finance Minister perhaps had as much as any hon. gentleman opposite to do with the framing of the policy that has resulted in these disasters. Since the hon. gentleman visited Washington his opinions have undergone a change, and he has come back entertaining views much more in accord with those of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House
Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

than we have for a long time heard expressed by those occupying the Treasury benches. We remember that a few years ago the Finance Minister declared himself a free trader. He told us he was not a one-sided free trader. He declared that in order to bring about free trade we must do the people of the United States the credit of imitating them, we must adopt their policy. We know that Sir Francis Hincks when he held the position occupied by the hon. gentleman, came down one afternoon with a certain policy set out in his Budget speech, and, at eight o'clock, after being subjected to the pressure of the hon. gentleman, receded from that position and adopted a policy quite different. The hon. gentleman approved it and defended it in this House. It was adopted; it continued twelve months and then met its death at the hands of its friends. The hon. gentleman at that time said: "Why, you see the very moment we propose to put a duty on coal the Congress of the United States removed their duty; you see what an extraordinary effect can be produced by imitating the United States in their fiscal regulations." It happened as was pointed out, that this action of the United States Congress was prior, in point of time, to the action of the Dominion Parliament, and could not, therefore, have been influenced by their actions, but although that was explained at the time it did not prevent the hon. gentleman from pursuing this argument. The hon. gentleman's visit to Washington has had a remarkably sobering effect, it has worked wonders in his political sentiments. He has come back entertaining wholly different views of the situation from those he entertained twelve months ago. The hon. gentleman, twelve months ago, was confident that if the United States adopted a non-intercourse Bill, if they carried out the policy to that effect, it would not, after all, do us great harm. It is true he deprecated the policy, but he told us some extraordinary advantages that we would derive if such a policy were adopted. I will read what the hon. gentleman said, so that it cannot be alleged that I have misrepresented him:

"Deeply as we would deplore so mad, so unjustifiable an act on the part of a great country like this great Republic of the United States, adopting such a barbarous policy as that of non-intercourse with a friendly power, we stand in the proud position of knowing that if that policy were adopted to-morrow, we have perfected our lines of communication, and have the most complete means of communication from the furthest and most remote section of our country down to the sea. As I said before this cloud, this only cloud has a silver lining. I would deeply deplore it; every member of the House, and every intelligent Canadian would deeply deplore any interruption of the commercial relations which exist between this country and the United States, but I cannot forget that, if the policy of non-intercourse were adopted, it would lead to the development of those channels of communication between ourselves, and that the commerce of Canada which to-day is building up New York—I am speaking of the through traffic—which to-day is building up Boston and Portland, would be carried through exclusively Canadian channels to Canadian ports, and would build up Montreal, Quebec, St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax with a rapidity which the people of this country can scarcely understand."

Now, Sir, I do not know whether the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canada Southern Railway would quite agree with the views of the hon. gentleman. I do not know what the traffic of those roads would in a large degree consist of if the policy of non-intercourse had been carried out. I do not know what traffic would have reached those cities of which the hon. gentleman speaks if there were to be no traffic from the United States passing through Canada. But, Sir, I am not going to stop to discuss that question, because it is only remotely connected with the subject in hand. The hon. gentleman went on to say that:

"That policy [referring to this policy of threatened retaliation] has only to be carried a very short step further to lead Her Majesty's Government to the conclusion that they would owe it to Canada and to themselves, as being the power under which Canada is happy to serve to meet that policy of non-intercourse by such a different mode of treating the grain from the United States of America and the grain grown in Canada, as would vivify the industries of this country, especially the farming industries of this country, to an extent which would make the most marvellous change of this Dominion."

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman threatened the Government of the United States and the people of the United States not merely with a retaliatory policy on the part of Canada but with a retaliatory policy on the part of the United Kingdom. Was the hon. gentleman authorised to make that threat? Had he any communication from the Government of Lord Salisbury intimating to him that if the United States adopted a policy of non-intercourse—a policy of discrimination such as they here shadowed out they would adopt—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will read the passage that preceded that which he has read, he will see it does not stand in the light he has placed it at all. I gave my reason.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, he gave his reason but he told the House and the country that if the United States adopted such a policy that the Government of the United Kingdom would retaliate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not, and the hon. gentleman will see I did not when he reads the whole passage.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have read enough to show—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You garbled the passage in such a way as to make it say what I did not say.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has said what is not a fact.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have read what I have here. If the hon. gentleman sends out and gets the *Hansard* I am ready to read it. I say that neither the beginning, the end, nor the middle nor any other part of the speech can alter the statement he has made here and I would like to know whether His Excellency the Governor General received any communication from the other side of the water in reference to this matter. I would like to know on what authority the hon. gentleman threatened the great Republic to the South with the indignation and wrath of the Government of the United Kingdom. The hon. gentleman was fond of using high sounding phrases and he may have thought after his return from the United Kingdom that he had something to do with the Government of that great country as well as with the Government of Canada. I will venture to say that the hon. gentleman had no authority to make that statement. I venture to say he had no authority to hold out such a hope or to make such a threat. We know the views the hon. gentleman has expressed in that passage are views as foreign as any well can be to those held by any political man of standing on either side of politics in the United Kingdom. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman has told us the consequence of the policy that he and his colleagues have pursued. What did he find the state of things at Washington? He said in this debate:

"Yesterday we stood face to face with a Non-intercourse Bill, sustained by the united action of the Senate and House of Representatives, sustained by almost the whole press—Republican and Democratic—of the States, sustained with few exceptions by a prejudiced, irritated and exasperated people numbering 60,000,000 lying to the South of us."

That is the statement of the case as it now stands, and I ask the hon. gentleman to contrast what he said twelve months ago with what he said here last week. I ask the hon. gentleman to contrast the policy he shadowed out twelve months ago with the policy he is supporting to-day. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on his progress. I congratulate him on the progress which he has forced his chief and those associated with him to make in connection with that question. Sir, the Minister of Finance last year professed to stand by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; to-day, Sir, in that paragraph which I have read the hon. gentleman stands by neither of his colleagues, but he stands by Mr. Phelps. Mr. Phelps

said the policy of Canada in reference to her fishery and custom house regulations was barbarous, harsh, inhospitable, contrary to common law, contrary to common justice, and that it produced such a state of irritation on the other side that however anxious the President and his colleagues might be to carry out negotiations with Canada, the state of exasperation was such that it was quite impossible such negotiations could be successfully entered into. That was the exasperation produced twelve months ago by the course pursued by the Government. What does the Finance Minister now say on this question? Let me read the observations which the hon. gentleman made in his speech. He says:

"But what would be thought of Canada if a vessel of the United States loaded with mackerel or fish of any other description were driven by stress of weather and perhaps in a sinking condition compelled to resort to a Canadian port, and if instead of allowing her to tranship her cargo or sell it on paying duty and go to a marine yard for repairs: We said no, you must throw overboard the whole of your cargo because we find you are not allowed to bring your fish into Canada under the Treaty of 1818?"

That, Sir, is the question put by the hon. gentleman. I ask whether any hon. gentleman on this side of the House has pronounced a more severe censure on the colleagues of the Minister of Finance than the hon. gentleman has himself pronounced. This is the very thing that was complained of in the case of the *Eliza A. Thomas*. The Minister of Marine justifies himself by saying: Such are the provisions of the Treaty of 1818, and the Minister of Finance justifies the provisions made in the treaty that is submitted to us for consideration by saying: That those are fair and proper provisions and that to have acted on different principles would have been harsh and ungenerous and would be contrary to the principle of natural justice. Sir, it did not require a treaty to enable the people of this country to act on the principle of natural justice. We did not require to bind ourselves by a formal document that we might act on the principles of humanity and common sense. We did not require to bind ourselves by a treaty to say to the American people that if a vessel is wrecked on our shores, her cargo may be saved, her fish may be put on board another ship or on board a railway car and sent to the neighboring Republic. That was possible without a treaty quite as well as with a treaty, and it was in consequence of the inhuman and the impotent regulations made by the hon. gentlemen opposite that this state of things was brought about. Sir, there is this very extraordinary thing connected with those negotiations. Article 10 of the treaty provides that the fishermen of the United States may enter our harbors, that they may do so under certain conditions to tranship their fish, that they may do so to purchase certain supplies that they may do so without reporting every time if it were half a dozen times a day to the customs. And what did the Minister of Justice say in defence of these strict regulations in the memorandum which he prepared? Why, Sir, he said this:

"It is impossible to enforce the fishery laws for the protection of our fisheries without a strict enforcement of these customs regulations."

That is what the hon. gentleman said last year. The hon. Minister of Finance in this treaty says it is not necessary. He says these concessions may be safely made. He says it is possible to protect our fisheries efficiently, and prevent them being poached upon by the fishermen of the United States without any of those strict regulations which the Minister of Justice said were absolutely necessary for their protection. Well, Sir, who is right; the Minister of Justice in his memorandum, or the Minister of Finance in article 10 of the treaty? Now, Sir, I am inclined to think that the strict regulations were not so necessary as the Minister of Justice supposed. I am inclined to think that the Government had other objects in view than the protection of those regulations. The Government, find-

ing that they were not so very successful by the policy of delay in securing terms with the United States, thought they would see what they could do with a policy of vexation. Well, they succeeded admirably; they succeeded in exasperating 60,000,000 of people, and in being forced to concede what under other circumstances would never have been demanded. Sir, the hon. gentleman told us that he had not met anybody at Washington who did not say that the Treaty of 1854 was mutually advantageous to both countries. He said that everyone he had met and conversed with on this subject entertained the same opinion as to the mutual advantages that were conferred by that treaty; and the treaty was repealed, not because it was not commercially satisfactory, but because of political irritation that existed between the two countries. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman would have led the House to believe that the political irritation to which he referred was due to the depredations committed by the *Alabama*. Sir, that was not the case. The treaty was repealed in consequence of the action of the Tory party in this country. Why, Sir, we know how the defeat of Pope was ridiculed. The hon. gentleman who now leads the Government led the Government at the time of the civil war. We know that when Parliament met at Quebec the hon. gentleman and his colleagues rose and cheered and sang "Dixie" when it was reported that Hooker was defeated at Chancellorsville. No American came to Canada and met the hon. gentleman or any of his supporters, who did not feel that he was in a country that was controlled by those who were hostile to him. So the American people took the first opportunity of putting an end to a treaty that was commercially satisfactory to both countries, in consequence of the avowed sympathies of hon. gentlemen opposite for the south. Why, Sir, we know the sentiments that were expressed at that time. Those hon. gentlemen told us that democracy was a failure, that the people were not capable of governing themselves, that they required an aristocratic or monarchical element as ballast for the political ship in order that it might sail safely for any length of time; and so they rejoiced at what seemed the disruption of the American republic. Not because the people of that republic had done them any wrong, but because they were hostile to a free government, and were anxious that their predictions as to its failure should be, as they apparently were, confirmed. Now, Sir, we have had a second exhibition of hostility, which had its origin in the policy of fetaliation, of which I believe the hon. gentleman claims to have been the author; at all events, so far as I know, he was the first to suggest it. Well, Sir, I am glad the hon. gentleman has made progress; I am rejoiced to see that he now entertains views of a different character. The hon. gentleman is now inclined to believe that freer intercourse with the neighboring republic would be of advantage to this country. But the hon. gentleman told us that the Treaty of Washington was a wise treaty—that everybody now praised it, although we on this side at the time were violently opposed to it. I would like anyone to mention a single clause of that treaty which is now approved of to which we were opposed at that time. There is not one. We were opposed to the free navigation of the St. Lawrence being granted to the Americans without our consent and without our receiving anything in return. There is no river in Europe that is made navigable to those high up the stream through to the sea, that is not also navigable to those at the mouth as far up as the river is used for navigation. The same is true of every river in South America; but that was not the rule secured to us by the Washington Treaty. The people of Chicago have a right to use the St. Lawrence for all time to come for going to the sea and returning to Chicago; but we are not free to navigate Lake Michigan or to go to Chicago. He knows that we did not secure the free navigation of the River Columbia

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

or the rivers of Alaska. He knows that we surrendered the use of our canals without getting anything in return. There is not a provision of the Treaty of 1871 of which we complained then that we do not complain of to-day. The hon. gentleman has told us that we do Mr. Chamberlain an injustice in holding him responsible for the concessions that were made. I believe, Sir, that is true. I believe Mr. Chamberlain was not more anxious to make concessions to the United States than was the hon. gentleman himself or the hon. gentleman who sits beside him. Mr. Chamberlain recently said, in addressing the people of Birmingham:

"The Canadian Government and its representatives were most desirous of terminating a state of irritation dangerous in its possible consequence to Canada."

Mr. Chamberlain says the hon. gentleman was anxious to terminate this state of irritation, but how came there to be a state of irritation? It is a mistake to suppose that in this case concessions were made simply at the demand of the Government of Great Britain. The hon. gentleman knows the state of exasperation in which he found the public sentiment in the United States; and knowing that it was dangerous to this country, knowing that the American Government could do us immensely more mischief than we could do them by a policy of non-intercourse, he was anxious to come to terms at any price; he was just as anxious to make concessions as Mr. Chamberlain. Mr. Chamberlain visited this city; he saw the Prime Minister and no doubt learned the situation. He ascertained the views of the First Minister quite as well as the Minister of Finance, knowing that he and his colleagues were responsible for the condition of things that existed in the United States, I have no doubt was quite as anxious to make concessions as was the British representative who came from Birmingham. The hon. Minister of Finance devoted a great deal of time in praising the commissioners; but there is one thing which he did not explain to us, but which he will perhaps explain before the debate closes, that is, how Mr. Bayard came to name him as the British commissioner. The hon. gentleman knows that in Mr. Bayard's letters, Mr. Bayard expresses, not only his readiness to enter into negotiations with the Government of the United Kingdom, with the view of coming to a better understanding, but also names the hon. gentleman as the British commissioner he was most anxious should carry on the negotiations. At whose suggestion was the hon. gentleman named? It would seem, from his statement, that the Imperial Government was rather inclined to name his colleague, Sir John A. Macdonald, but that hon. gentleman, with that modesty for which he is distinguished, gave up his right to the honor, and allowed it to be conferred, in accordance with Mr. Bayard's suggestion, upon his colleague the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman says that we owe a great deal to the right arm of Great Britain in this controversy. I do not think that the military power or the diplomatic resources of England were of the slightest use to us. On the contrary, I believe they have done us much mischief. I believe that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches would scarcely have ventured to enter upon their policy so impudent, so offensive to the people of the United States, and so mischievous and disastrous in its consequences to the people of this country, if they had not supposed the Government of England would have helped them through the difficult crisis upon which they had entered. What has happened forces us to recognise the fact that the 60,000,000 of people to the south of us are supreme on this continent, that the Munroe doctrine, on the whole, is pretty well established on this continent, and that while the Government of the United Kingdom are ready to aid us by any amount of good advice, they will never be disposed to aid us with anything which can be of more effect. They recognise the fact that the Government of the United States is supreme, that whatever power or

liberty we possess, we enjoy in a large degree by sufferance, and that it is necessary we should act with great care and prudence in order that we may tide over the difficulties by which we are surrounded in consequence of the action of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. They point out the necessity of making a new departure, of establishing new relations, of altering the course upon which we have entered, and adopting one more in consonance with the circumstances and facts with which we are surrounded. The hon. the Minister of Finance has told us that he made a proposition in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, that he proposed to leave the fishery question in abeyance by making other provisions by a collateral arrangement such as that which existed before. I have no reason to question the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's statement. But what puzzles me is this. The hon. gentleman's chief at Washington, Mr. Chamberlain, declared himself against such a policy before he left the United Kingdom. The hon. gentleman's chief who sits beside him (Sir John A. Macdonald) declared himself against such a policy some time ago. Now, how was it that the hon. gentleman, in spite of the avowed declaration of Mr. Chamberlain in England, and in spite of the avowed declarations of the hon. First Minister here, offered unrestricted reciprocity to the United States? Supposing the American Government had taken up that proposition and accepted it. Supposing they had said: You have offered us unrestricted reciprocity, we are ready to accept it and to enter into negotiations on that basis. Was the hon. gentleman prepared to stand by his policy? Was Mr. Chamberlain, notwithstanding his declaration on the other side of the Atlantic, prepared to stand by his policy? I would like to know. There are a great many people in this House and on both sides of the Atlantic who would like to have a solution of this question. The right hon. the First Minister did not seem fully to realize the extraordinary change that had taken place. The hon. gentleman has been saying for a long time "heads up." But the hon. the Minister of Finance came back from Washington and said: "tails up"; and it was a most disagreeable position for the First Minister as well as for those who sit around him. I would like to know how it was the hon. gentleman obtained the consent of the First Minister to the policy that he did not seem altogether to realize, even after the hon. gentleman's return and after he had entered into these negotiations. I am rather inclined to think that the hon. gentleman had the assent of the First Minister to a proposition of the sort, but I am inclined to think the First Minister was disposed to give that assent, knowing the Americans desired that interpretation of the treaty, with a view of checkmating hon. gentlemen on this side. Let him take this side of the House for one moment into his confidence, and tell us whether he does think that the hon. Minister, who sits beside him, in making that proposition with his assent, did not, after all, bungle it a little, and produce an impression different from that which the First Minister intended to produce. I am sure if the hon. gentleman would make a clean breast of it, I am sure if he would freely avow the sentiments he entertained, I am sure if he would tell us what he instructed his Minister to do, and how far afield he was in following strictly those instructions, we would have a considerable amount of light thrown upon this proposition of unrestricted reciprocity by the hon. the Minister of Finance—the more especially that the hon. the Minister of Finance said it would be just as foolish to propose unrestricted reciprocity to the United States as it would be to undertake to construct a railway to the moon. Yet, notwithstanding the folly of the proposition, the hon. gentleman made it. Now, I shall ask the attention of the House for a few minutes to some of the provisions of this treaty.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, I think that the time I have occupied, I have applied to the discussion of some of the features of this question, which were brought under the attention of the House by the hon. gentleman's colleague.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The most important provision of this treaty is that relating to the surrender of our sovereignty over a large area of water, an area which must embrace in the neighborhood of 20,000 square miles. The hon. gentleman has but to look at the map to see what an extraordinary area of what we supposed to be a part of our Dominion, and in that I include Newfoundland as well, we have given up. I wish to call the attention of the House to the position taken by the United States on this headland question. The United States have never maintained that the contention we have put forward with regard to the bays and headlands is peculiar to the Convention of 1818. On the contrary, they admit that the Convention of 1818, in laying down the shore line, simply followed the rules of international law,—that, in fact, if there had been no treaty at all, and we had exclusive dominion over our waters, the same question would have been raised as has been raised in this treaty. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I say that would be so. That contention, again and again, has been put forward by the United States. The United States insisted upon the maintenance of these rules, that is the rules relating to the headland question, believing them to conform to the well established principles of international law. They believed them to conform to the law of nations which treats of the maritime boundary of States as being three miles from any shore, bay, creek, river, &c., precisely as does the Treaty of 1818. The Convention of 1818 did nothing more than lay down the rule of international law in this particular. If that is so, and they themselves state that in the case and argue it before the Halifax Commission, what is our position? It is exactly the position of the United States. Whatever right they have over the bays on their coasts, we have over the bays on our coasts. The maximum size of a bay in any other country cannot be greater than that in our own country. What have the Supreme Court of the United States and their Attorney General and the district courts decided in regard to the bays on their coasts? They have decided that the bays belong to the States in which they are situated, or are in common to the States which they may divide. Justice Story, in a very important case, held that the Bay of Delaware was not a part of the high seas because, as he said, it was between the jaws of the land and was therefore a part of the land. That same rule has been recognised in the opinion of their Attorney General, and does anyone suppose that, if the Minister of Finance had said to the American representatives, if you dispute our pretensions in regard to our bays upon our coasts we must refer this to an international commission, and the rule on our coasts is precisely the same as the rule in regard to bays on your coasts, in regard for instance, to the Bay of Delaware, which is 15 miles wide, to Chesapeake Bay, which is 12 miles wide, to Massachusetts Bay, which is 40 miles wide, and we claim the same right to go into those bays as you claim to come into our bays, and if there is a dispute, it must be submitted to arbitration, and it will apply to your bays as well as to ours—does any one suppose that the American Government would, in face of the decision of their own courts, and the opinion of their own law officers, have insisted against us that our contention was erroneous? I believe it was in the power of the British commissioners to dictate their own terms on that matter, and that the Americans, anxious as they are to enter into our waters for fishing purposes, would never surrender their rights over their own bays in order to secure that; and it was impos-

sible, after the line which they had taken before the Halifax Commission, for them to have successfully contended against us if we chose to stand out against their contention. Then I call attention to the decision which was given by the Queen's Bench in England. There was a case of murder which took place in the Bristol Channel, which is more like one of our bays than any other arm of the sea in the United Kingdom. I think it is 20 miles wide at the mouth, but it was decided by the Court of Queen's Bench that it was not part of the high seas, but was a part of the counties between which it ran. Then there is a decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as to the dispute which took place between two cable companies as to Conception Bay on the east coast of Newfoundland, which is 20 miles wide. It was held that that was part of the island and not part of the high seas. In view of the decision of the Privy Council, in view of the decision of the Queen's Bench in England, in view of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, the district courts and law officers of the United States, in favor of the contention which we have always put forward, I say that it was only necessary to say to the people of the United States or to the negotiators on their behalf: If you dispute our contention, the whole question of the bays on your coast as well as the bays on ours must be referred to some impartial tribunal, and we are ready to abide by that; and I have no doubt whatever as to what would have been the result. It is utterly impossible that the American commissioners could have contended for a different rule being applied to Canada if our case had been fairly put on the impregnable grounds which were open to those Canadian commissioners, if they had seen proper to insist upon those grounds. We have heard a reference made to the North Sea Treaty, for the purpose of defending the concessions which have been made in this treaty in regard to bays and headlands. There is no analogy between the North Sea Treaty and the treaty which is now spread before us. In the North Sea Treaty there were half a dozen parties concerned. There were Norway, Denmark, Germany, Holland, Belgium, France and the United Kingdom. They were all interested. There were bays extending into the territories of each of these powers, and there was a provision agreed to that any bay which was more than ten miles wide at its mouth should be common property for fishing purposes. That provision was made because it was a matter of common convenience, because each party to the agreement had something to concede, and each had something to gain. The rule which was adopted was one which is not applicable to our case. It was not a treaty made under any rule of international law, but for the convenience of each, and for the benefit of the fishermen of each of the different countries which were interested. Is that our position? What bays on the other side have been thrown open to us? What bays more than ten miles wide on the American coast have we obtained any right to enter? From the first to the last this has been a concession on our part. There was no analogy between this case, this treaty which we have now before us for consideration, and the treaty which has been referred to in regard to the North Sea. I would like to ask the House for a moment to look at Articles 3, 4 and 5. Article 3 declares that all bays less than ten miles wide are to remain the exclusive property of Canada, that bays more than ten miles wide are common fishing property until you reach a point where the bay is less than ten miles wide, and then the line is drawn. Article 4 specifies certain bays which are more than ten miles wide, which are to remain the exclusive property of Canada, but there are many bays which are omitted, such as Placentia Bay, Hare Bay, Bonaventure Bay, Conception Bay, St. George Bay, and other bays on the shores of Newfoundland which were formerly regarded as the exclusive property of

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

the Crown and are now made the common property of all nations. I asked the hon. gentleman to give an explanation of Article 5. He did not give an explanation of the article but he gave an example of a bay which would come within the provisions of that article. That is only one case. I think Article 5 will come within a construction which will limit the provisions contained in Article 3. It is negative in its provisions. It simply says:

"Nothing in this treaty shall be construed to include within the common waters such any interior portions of any bays, creeks or harbors as cannot be reached from the sea without passing within three marine miles mentioned in Article 1 of the Convention of October 20, 1818."

Now, the hon. the Minister gave us an instance where there were two or three islands scattered in the mouth of a bay, and he said that, where that was more than six miles wide, that would be common fishing ground. But that does not appear in this clause, which says that "nothing in this treaty shall be construed to include within the common waters any such interior portions of any bay, &c., as cannot be reached from the sea without passing within the three marine miles mentioned in Article 1." Take the Bay of Mines, that is twenty miles across, that has an entrance eight miles wide—does the hon. gentleman say that you could exclude American fishermen from that bay? I say that it is as clear as noon day that they are admitted under the provisions of that article. If a bay is more than six miles between headlands, and it widens out into a basin more than ten miles wide, then it becomes common fishing ground as long as the parties keep more than three miles from the coast. It is clear that under that article, the American contention of the Treaty of 1818, is allowed to operate in the case of a large number of bays upon the coast of Nova Scotia, and upon the coasts of Newfoundland. Now, that being the case, the hon. gentleman will see that, in the first place, he has restricted our contention by the surrender of a large number of bays, by far the greater number, that are over ten miles wide, and then he has further restricted it by surrendering all those that are more than six miles between the headlands, if they widen out into basins more than ten miles wide. I say it is as clear as anything can be that that is the construction which will be put upon that article, and it seems to me that must have been the construction that was intended. With no negative provisions such as are contained in that article, it is quite impossible that the hon. gentleman and those who advised him, could have failed to understand the scope of its provisions. I have sometimes seen it stated in the press which supports the hon. gentlemen, that it would be no use to raise the question as to the rights of the Americans to bays upon their coasts, because there are no fish in them. Well, Sir, this is not a peddler's question, it is a question of sovereignty; and there are other considerations besides merely the right of fishing, or the use of those bays for fishing purposes, to be borne in mind. We cannot expect always to be at peace, we cannot expect always to be just in the circumstances in which we are placed now, and it is of the utmost consequence to us that those large bodies of water upon our coasts which we have hitherto claimed to be a portion of our territory, should have remained such that our sovereignty over them should be maintained. Why, Sir, if the United States, in bays and harbors in which there are no fish, which have no value for fishing purposes, so tenaciously uphold their pretensions, of how much greater consequence is it to us to uphold and maintain our rights in the bays upon our coasts, when they are valuable for other than maritime purposes, and those of defence. Yet, the hon. gentleman has not in a single instance, so far as we know, raised the question of the pretensions of the United States. Sir, we know what the Americans are at this moment maintaining with regard to

Behring's Sea. Here is a sea nearly 2,000 miles in length and more than 2,000 miles in width, of which they claim dominion to one-half; and at the very time when they are claiming dominion over a sea which, from point to point, is more than 2,000 miles across, they are denying to us our sovereignty and dominion over bays that are more than ten miles across, and that concession the hon. gentleman, by this treaty, has made. I do not pretend to say that the hon. gentleman, in conceding some of the pretensions with regard to commercial intercourse, has made provisions that are detrimental to the interests of this country. I think that these might well have been conceded, I think they ought to have been conceded without a treaty at all. I think it was unfortunate for this country that these questions were raised. It was the meddling oversight of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Customs that raised these questions. I do not say that the responsibility wholly rests with them, for I have no doubt whatever that in this matter they had the support and approval of their colleagues; but I say that the exasperation which the hon. gentleman says he has done so much to allay, the irritation which he says, and which we saw from the negotiations, stood in the way of all negotiations for a time, the exasperation and irritation which the hon. gentleman makes the justification of the unnecessary concession he has made, are due to the action of those hon. gentlemen with reference to their commercial policy upon our coasts. If the hon. gentleman had not adopted his fishing regulations, if he had not undertaken vexatiously to worry and annoy American fishermen, if the hon. gentleman had not made vexatious customs regulations, which the Minister of Justice said were absolutely necessary for the protection of our fisheries, but which the Minister of Finance, with his new experience, declares were wholly unnecessary, and may be safely conceded, and are conceded by this treaty. I say it is unfortunate they were raised at all, because by raising them, they had not only conceded what ought never to have been denied, but they have also conceded that which was absolutely necessary to the due protection of this country in case of difficulty and of danger. Sir, the hon. gentlemen, while professing to feel great interest in the fisheries, have done little or nothing to furnish adequate harbor accommodation and protection to the fishing vessels which are engaged in the deep sea fishery. We know that is where the real difficulty exists, and from this treaty we know, if we did not know before, that it is the deep-sea fisheries which the Americans regard as of the utmost consequence to them. The hon. gentleman has proposed negotiations for our inshore fisheries. Have the Americans accepted the offer of the hon. gentleman? They tell us that they are very valuable, they are growing more and more valuable from day to day. But that is not the opinion of the American fishermen, because they have refused to negotiate for them, they consider them of no consequence; what they regard of consequence are facilities for engaging in the deep sea fisheries, and the hon. gentleman has adopted a policy which has provoked retaliation and brought about concessions that will go a long way to put American fishermen in a better position for engaging in the deep-sea fisheries than they ever were before. What now does he propose to do? To equalise the condition of things and to improve the position of the deep sea fisheries of the Maritime Provinces? The hon. gentleman has proposed nothing, he has suggested nothing, he has left those fishermen to take care of themselves. He first exasperated, then he conceded to the American fishermen what was necessary to allay their exasperation. And so we are in the humiliating position of being called upon here to-night to ratify what these hon. gentlemen have done in sacrificing a large portion of the territories of this country, of our sovereignty over that territory, without at all being aware that those sacrifices and

concessions will satisfy the people of the United States. Why, Sir, it would at least have been dignified if the hon. gentleman had waited a short time to see whether the American people would approve of what has been done. The hon. gentleman knows that to-morrow his treaty will be postponed or rejected, and before it is postponed or rejected he wants to commit this House to this proposition so that it must be made the starting point in all future negotiations. The hon. gentleman feels that the position of the Government is one of humiliation and that the Parliament of this country ought to be made sharers in the discredit of the work that has been done.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at the close of the debate on the fisheries treaty on Friday night or Saturday morning when discussing with the Finance Minister the reasons why there had been a miscarriage of some arrangement for the closing of the debate during that sitting of the House, took occasion to administer a rebuke to those members of the House who were not sworn of the Privy Council or who had not special acquaintance with the fisheries question, because they had ventured, among the number being my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kinney), the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhower) and the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) to take part in this debate. There are eighty odd young members of this House, and I think it did not well become a Liberal leader to express this illiberal sentiment. Those of us who represent maritime constituencies, however young we are in Parliament and how ever unable we may be to debate those questions with older and stronger men, yet feel it to be our duty and our right to speak on these questions as well as we may. I must to-night in coming to the fishery question compliment the Minister of Marine who has for two and a-half years now held that portfolio on the happy termination of the long and arduous struggle in which he has been engaged. Last summer in the city of St. John, the right hon. the First Minister took occasion to pay a splendid compliment to his young colleague, in view of the courage and patience and the courtesy which he had shown in his most difficult duties during those two years, which more than, or certainly as much as, any two previous years since Confederation, called for the exercise of the very highest qualities in the administration of the department; and that compliment found an echo all through New Brunswick. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) opened his speech to-night by asking why it was that the Administration was in so great a hurry, why they were bound to close this debate, why they must come to a conclusion before we know what action had been taken by the American Senate. But here is a bargain, and if it is to be ultimately ratified by the Imperial Parliament, by the Dominion Parliament, by the Newfoundland Legislature and by the American Senate it will never be carried out if each one is waiting for the other, for some one must begin. We have had the present Bill on our Order Paper and we have commenced; and what could be more business-like and proper than that having begun we should conclude the matter? The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says the treaty will be rejected, or he thinks the treaty will be rejected. He seems to share that feeling. Why will the Americans reject the treaty if it is on the part of Canada such a base and abject surrender, as the hon. gentleman says it is? There is scarcely an offensive adjective in the English language that the hon. gentleman has not applied to this treaty. The old ground has been travelled again. The hon. gentleman has repeated the old charges that we were harsh, exasperating, impolitic, irritating, in the administration of our laws for the last two years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Marine says so.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I will not say, as the right hon. gentleman who leads this House said with respect to another Opposition member, that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is a perfect Bourbon, forgets nothing and learns nothing. The hon. gentleman is an imperfect Bourbon, he learns nothing, but he forgets everything. He forgets, if he was present in the House, the adequate answer which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave to those charges. He has not in substance made a new charge, but he has given the appearance of novelty to old statements by giving the names of five or six new vessels, and he has taken the responsibility, as a member of the Canadian Parliament, speaking to five millions of people and beyond, to say what the responsible Ministers of the United States never said and never dared to say, namely, that in the case of the vessels *Rattler*, *Caroline Vought*, *Sarah B. Putnam*, *Newell B. Hawes*, *Stowell*, and *Sherman* we were guilty of cruelty and inhumanity. Let us go into this matter a little more fully. The facts are that specific charges of inhumanity against the Canadian Government in regard to those fishing vessels were actually distributed through the American press. What was the origin of the distribution of that news, what did it begin with, whence did it all come? It came from this. The American Senate appointed a committee to take evidence as to the extent of those alleged inhumanities on the part of the Canadian Government. Their commissioner, the late Spencer F. Baird, sent out a circular letter, which I will read to substantiate what I said:

"UNITED STATES COMMISSION OF FISH AND FISHERIES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., 5th February, 1887.

"SIR: I forward herewith for your information a copy of a communication from Mr. R. Edward Earle, in charge of the division of fisheries of this commission, accompanied by a list of New England fishing vessels which have been inconvenienced in their fishing operations by the Canadian authorities during the past season; these being in addition to the vessels mentioned in the revised list of vessels involved in the controversy with the Canadian authorities furnished to your committee on the 28th January by the Secretary of State.

"The papers containing the statements were received from the owners, masters, or agents of the vessels concerned, and though not accompanied by affidavits are believed to be correct.

"SPENCER F. BAIRD,
"Commissioner.

"HON. GEORGE F. EDMUNDS,"
"Chairman Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate."

I have here the letter of Mr. Earle, to whom Mr. Baird's letter was written. After stating:

"Some time since, at your request, I mailed circulars to owners or agents of all New England vessels employed in the food-fish fisheries"

He says, as follows, in the concluding sentence:—

"I enclose for your consideration a list of these vessels, together with a brief abstract of the statements of the owners or masters regarding the treatment received. The statements were not accompanied by affidavits but are believed to be entirely reliable."

Evidence was not taken, witnesses were not examined or cross-examined, and there were none of the guarantees which the British law throws around evidence to prevent imposition, but, on the contrary, those unsupported, unsworn statements were sent throughout the United States, but I am proud to say the Secretary of State would not take on himself the responsibility which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), has taken to-day of distributing those infamous falsehoods broadcast throughout the whole country. To come to the question proper: It was to all of us a feeling of relief when we learned that the Finance Minister and his confrères had returned from Washington with a treaty. The one disturbing element in the relations of the two great powers, Great Britain and the United States, for a hundred years has been this fishery question. That was the devil, so to say, which the diplomatists would lay for a time but never exorcise. We adopted a measure

Mr. WELDON (Albert).

in 1818, we obtained a temporary adjustment in 1854, we had a temporary adjustment in 1871, but we have before us in the schedule of the Bill the draft of a treaty which, if ratified, will put an end forever to those quarrels of a century's standing. Let us very briefly clear our minds of all matters of detail and once more very rapidly turn our attention to the main substantial outlines of this matter. In all our fishery negotiations with the United States we have held in our hands three properties, and it is desirable that in considering this question we should keep them distinct. First we have exclusive fishing in the three-mile limit, and our legal right in this matter has never been contested. We have, secondly, our exclusive fishery in the territorial bays or in the words of the old treaty, "British bays," and, thirdly, we have the advantages of neighborhood to the fishing grounds. How are we to deal with these, one after the other, in this treaty? The policy of 1854 was to sell our rights in that matter for a market and we sold the rights of our fishermen in the inshore fisheries for a market, a market for our fishermen it is true, a market for the farmers, a market for the miners and a market for the lumbermen. You may say that was "robbing Peter to pay Paul" and the friends of the fishermen 30 years ago felt that way about it, but there is the fact. I will not dwell as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) did on the cause of the termination of that treaty. No doubt he was in part right when he attributed the abrogation of the Elgin Treaty to the ill will between the northern States and ourselves. But that is not a fair statement of the entire cause in my judgment. I think the material reason why the Elgin Treaty of 1854 was abrogated in 1866, was that there was a profound jealousy in the city of New York, and among the carrying companies west of New York, of the St. Lawrence route and the St. Lawrence cities. That had something to do with the abrogation of the Treaty of 1866. Under the Elgin Treaty we sold our inshore fisheries for a market. In 1871, we sold them for gold. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that every view he had in respect to the Washington Treaty of 1871 he held to-night. I say again he is not correct and that he has a bad memory. If he will look back on a speech he made in 1871 he will find some predictions of his that certainly have not been verified. The hon. gentleman is much more successful in his historical than his prophetic utterances. The role of a prophet is dangerous to all men, and they who prophecy least have least to take back. At the time of the Halifax Commission the hon. gentleman made a speech in which he said it was utterly impossible for a commission to decide on the relative value of Canadian and American fisheries, leading us to suppose we could get nothing out of that commission. Well, we did get something out of the commission. We got a round five and a half million dollars. It may have been a small sum altogether, but it was quite a respectable sum and enough to falsify this prophecy so confidentially made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). What is our policy in this treaty with respect to the inshore fisheries? One statement was made the other night by the hon. the Minister of Justice, in his encounter with the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and a statement which got a quicker response from this House than any other statement made, and than which, in my judgment, there was no more statesmanlike remark made in the course of this debate—I refer to the statement that it was a wise policy for the Canadian people, looking to their future, to hold those inshore fisheries and to preserve the fisheries within this three mile limit, and that we have pursued a wiser course here than we did in 1854 or 1870. Those marginal seas, as we call them, are, so to speak, the fisherman's farm. Our fishermen leave the shore at early morning before daylight, take their boats, lines and nets and go to their farms on the

sea and return with the fruits of their labor at night. Our farmers in the same way go out in the early morning to their fields and bring in their harvest in the harvest time at night. If we preserve this policy which is embodied in the Treaty of 1888, the result will be, Mr. Speaker, that we will keep our fishermen at home, that we will make our fisheries a productive and a permanent industry in the country, and when by-and-bye the day will come when we will have, as all growing people must have, to raise a navy and support a navy for her own defence we have there the nucleus of a fine body of men out of which a navy can be made. It is a statesmanlike principle to guard our fisheries for our own people, and just as necessary as to guard our forests, our mining area or our marsh lands and not sell them *en bloc* to a stranger. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that the headland question was the great question, and I quite agree with him. It has been the material cause of the quarrel between the two peoples. It has been in controversy since 1818, and I agree with him that the difficulty, however, is largely a difficulty as to a principle of law, for the words of the treaty are reasonably clear. Hon. members all know very well the several contentions on this question. The rule, of course, is that the high seas are free from the dominion of any one and that the property in the fish there is free to all. Everyone understands that some small bays are part and parcel of the State that has its headlands and strand lying between them, but the controversy lies as to how large a bay must be before it may properly be called part of the high sea. When the plenipotentiaries met last November in Washington, they had before them the old Treaty of 1818, which simply says:

"Whereby American fishermen renounce forever their right to come into British seas."

The word "British" is not defined and the whole question has been how are we to come to the meaning of "British" or to its equivalent word "territorial?" The hon. gentleman said that in our negotiating this treaty we had gone to the American Government in a spirit of 200 years ago and that our diplomacy was a mediæval one. I tell the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that his law is mediæval law, and that he has quoted to this House on this subject exploded authorities of the last century. He has quoted here the opinions of Judge Story, which are opinions given many years ago. I wonder why he did not quote Chancellor Kent, who was an authority on this subject many years ago. With his permission I will quote from Woolsey who has reviewed the opinions of those men who held that bays stretching from quite distant headlands, such as from Cape Ann to Cape Cod, and from Nantucket to Montank Point, and from that point to the Capes of the Delaware, and from the South Cape of Florida to the Mississippi, were within the limit. Woolsey holds that those are not territorial waters and he says:

"But such broad claims have not it is believed been much urged and they are out of character for a nation that has ever asserted the freedom of doubtful waters as well as contrary to the spirit of more recent times."

The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) quoted the Attorney General of the United States, but he did not do us the favor to say what Attorney General. He did not tell us, and the opinion may be as old and obsolete as the opinion of Judge Story. The hon. gentleman proposed to deal with the opinions of the English courts on this matter. He said the common law courts in England dealt with this matter and he spoke of a case where the English court claimed to have jurisdiction over a vessel in the Bristol Channel. That particular point of the Bristol Channel is in the county of Glamorganshire in Wales and the channel is properly speaking but the mouth of the river and bears no analogy whatever to any of the waters in controversy in this country, for example the Bay des Chaleurs. He dealt

more fairly and stated more appositely the case when he dealt with a decision of the Privy Council in the Conception Bay case, in which the question was raised as to the authority of the Newfoundland Legislature over a point of land four miles from the inner part of Conception Bay, where a cable company had placed a buoy. The hon. gentleman misled this House. I do not say that he deliberately and intentionally misled the House but he led us to understand that the English court in that case proceeded upon a rule of law, that a point four miles from the shore of Conception Bay was a part of the high seas. I say that is not the ruling of the court in this case and the ruling of the court is quite the contrary. They said that the British Parliament had declared that Conception Bay was part of the British waters and a British court is bound by the words of an Imperial statute whatever their opinion of the law may be. I will read what Lord Blackburn said in giving judgment on this Conception Bay case. Lord Blackburn had not made up his mind on this point, but the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) seems to have made up his mind on it if Lord Blackburn did not:

"It does not appear to their lordships that jurists and text-writers are agreed what were the rules as to dimensions and configuration, which, apart from other considerations, would lead to the conclusion that a bay is or is not a part of the territory of the State possessing the adjoining coasts, and it has never, that they can find, been made the ground of judicial determination."

The hon. gentleman said that there had been judgment in different courts on this rule of law. Lord Blackburn says there has been no judgment with which he is acquainted.

"If it were necessary in this case to lay down a rule, the difficulty of the task would not deter their Lordships from attempting to fulfil it. But in their opinion it is not necessary to do so. It seems to them that, in point of fact, the British Government has for a long period exercised dominion over this bay, and that their claim has been acquiesced in by other nations, so as to show that the bay has been for a long time occupied exclusively by Great Britain, a circumstance which, in the tribunals of any country, would be very important. And, moreover (which in a British tribunal is conclusive), the British Legislature has by Acts of Parliament declared it to be part of the British territory, and part of the country made subject to the Legislature of Newfoundland."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this effectually disposes of that aspect of the case. By the law of nations, what are our rights in land-locked bays, like the Bay of Chaleurs? We can only find the law of nations from two sources—the opinions of the great text-writers and the courts, and the history and practice of nations. I do not know any subject in international law about which there is so much controversy, disagreement and confusion, as the subject of the jurisdiction of nations in land-locked bays. I have obtained in the library the opinions of all the authorities on this subject that I could find, leaving out English and American authorities, and I will venture to give them to the House. Azuni, Vol. I, p. 46, after asking the question: How wide at the mouth a bay must be before the State which owns the two defining headlands and the intervening strand loses exclusive dominion over such bay, answers: "Nevertheless, there is no consensus of opinion, and no accord in national practice, respecting the extent of this sovereignty." Bluntschli, at section 309 of his book on International Law, says, "Where the width is but small." Reyneval, in his law of Nature and Nations, Vol. I, p. 299, says that there is great uncertainty, "but the extent of this property is not determined by a uniform rule." Prof. De Martens states that there are conflicting theories, and seems to favor the range of a double-cannon shot, so that the bay could be defended from both sides. Fiore, Vol. I, p. 374, says: "We speak of bays of small extent, not those a great width." De Hautefeuille, Vol. I, page 93, says: "The authors, unanimous upon the principle of sovereignty, over the territorial sea, are far from agreed as to its extent." Some say "100 miles, some say 60, some 3" miles, and some the horizon." Vattel, a standard author of not so many years ago, expresses himself in

similar terms. In the light of these opinions, who can say that the great writers on the law of nations are agreed. The hon. gentleman says there is a definite rule, but they say there is not a definite rule, and that in the absence of public law, you are utterly at sea as to what your rights are in these land-locked bays. Passing away from the writers, we have but one other means of determining what are our rights, that is the practice of nations. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to deal with these matters, but I may be pardoned if I remind him that the practice of nations is reasonably definite and clear. We are not alone in our fishery troubles. The fisheries on the North Atlantic coast are not the only fisheries in which England has been interested. There are extensive fisheries on the eastern side of the British Islands, and there are fisheries in the North Sea, with reference to which England has a treaty with France, made in 1839. In determining with France what should be regarded as the maximum limit of jurisdictional bays, England in that treaty had agreed to the ten mile rule. In 1868 in a treaty with Germany with reference to the fisheries in the North German Ocean, she has also agreed to the ten mile rule. Then there is the Treaty of 1862, to which the hon. Minister of Finance alluded, in which the same rule was followed. I call the attention of the House to these facts, in order to show that while there is no consensus of opinion in the writers on international law, there is a uniformity in the practice of the great nations of Europe; and I do not see how our negotiators could have expected to obtain more than the ten mile rule; yet Article 3 closes all the small bays by the ten mile rule, and Article 4 closes all the large ones by individual delimitation. Hon. gentlemen claim that Canadian fishermen have under this treaty been deprived of their lawful fishing grounds, but the only possible ones are the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy. The hon. member for Northumberland stated the case fairly the other night when he stated that all parties are agreed that the Bay of Fundy is regarded as part of the high seas, partly because of the great width of the bay, and partly because the northern headland is in the United States. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) delivered a very interesting speech, a speech very highly prized by this House, not altogether because of its own inherent merits, but also because of the very spirited rejoinder which it provoked from the hon. Minister of Justice. I think, if the hon. member for Queen's would speak frankly to-night as to his feelings when the Minister of Justice had done with him, he would say, with Sir Andrew Aguecheek, "Plague on it! had I known him valiant and so cunning in fence, I would have seen him damned before I challenged him." The hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) took a high patriotic ground that was delightful to see. We know the hon. gentleman and respect him highly, but the patriotic role is not his normal role; and when he said that, as a Canadian, he was prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of the Empire, I was astonished. He takes the ground that this treaty and the interests of Canada have been sacrificed by the exercise of Imperial pressure and the same position was taken, and more strongly taken, by the hon. member for Northumberland. But, I desire to impress this point on hon. members: that Great Britain, in negotiating this treaty for her Canadian people, has preserved to them the ten mile rule, and has held for them bays much wider than ten miles, while in negotiating with reference to the rights of her own English people in the German Ocean she has not gone so far or secured such great rights. She has held out more strongly and stubbornly to protect us than she has done to protect her people at home. Mr. Speaker, I must apologise for occupying the time of the House so long. I shall sit down by saying that I share in all sincerity the feelings of the hon. member for Halifax, when he said he was glad to see a cause of quarrel between

Mr. WELDON (Albert).

the two nations removed. I think we all express the hope that this treaty will be ratified, we cherish the belief that this treaty will be ratified by the Canadian Parliament, and I cherish the hope that this treaty, in which undoubtedly we have made concessions, will be ratified by the Americans. It is a treaty that undoubtedly comes long below what we argued for; it is undoubtedly a treaty of concession. We hope the Americans will ratify it, and thus remove the cause of ill-will which has been standing for many years. But if they should not ratify it, our labor would not be in vain. Here is a treaty endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the Canadian Parliament and people, and the responsibility of putting it through their Senate has been accepted by the American executive. It commands the support of one powerful party in the United States, and with that enormous weight of opinion at its back, whether it be rejected or accepted, it will establish the rule that will hereafter control the conduct of both nations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hardly think the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat was quite justified in insinuating that I was desirous of stopping the discussion the other night. On the contrary, we were anxious to prolong it, and to give himself and other hon. gentlemen on that side, as well as ourselves, an opportunity of expressing their views. It was his own leaders who were most desirous of shutting off that discussion on that occasion, and depriving us of the pleasure of listening to the hon. gentleman. It appears to me there is really some little inconvenience in this present doctrine of dual sovereignty which appears to be exemplified on the other side of the House. No doubt there have been occasions in our own history, in the old relations between the two Canadas, when it was found convenient to have two heads to the Government; and, in older times, there were two consuls in Rome, but really on the present occasion it must be admitted this arrangement comes rather hard, particularly on what I may call, I hope without offence, the inferior members of the Ministry. These hon. gentlemen are, I am sure, desirous, as they ought to be, of keeping in accord with the powers that be; but, Sir, it is very hard indeed for even political Vicars of Bray to render proper obedience to the powers that be, when the powers that be do not know their own minds from week to week, and do not appear to agree with each other as they ought to do. Sir, I think that the First Minister in particular, ought to consider the feelings of his colleagues. He has been accused on various occasions of looking on most of his colleagues as his clerks rather than his colleagues. It is not for us to say how far that suspicion is correct, but I am bound to say that some of his proceedings of late do appear to give it a good deal of color. In the present instance, take the case of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, who, I am sorry not to see in his place. How hard a case was his. He was called upon to reply to myself on a recent occasion; and after he replied, we find the Minister of Finance coming down and riding ruthlessly over all his arguments. Well, perhaps the hon. the Minister of Finance may plead there was not much argument to ride over. Indeed, I virtually agree with him there; but that made it none the easier for the hon. the Minister of the Interior. Then there is the case of the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice was called upon to back up his leader in response to the attack made on the Government by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and he rose equal to the occasion. He not only expounded the law on the occasion, but he declared, with his hand on his heart, that he would be a traitor to the best interests of his country if he advised, or the Government advised, that we should bend to the caprice and suit our policy to the dictation of any petty demagogue in the United States Congress. I submit that after those patriotic sentiments, it

was cruel to the Minister of Justice, who depends on his character to a great extent, that within a week he should be compelled to draft a proclamation (and draft it very badly) granting reciprocity in these identical articles which, but a week before, he declared could not be let in without treason to the constitution. I do not know how this constant diet of humble pie may agree with hon. gentlemen opposite. I am bound to say, as regards the hon. Minister of Justice, that it does seem to agree with him; but it must be a hard thing to have to swallow it all the time, and all I can say with respect to these hon. gentlemen, is that it ought to be considered in their wages.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He is the master of Dotheboys Hall.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am certain of this: I have known men occupying that position who would not have consented to play such a part for seven times \$7,000 a year—aye, or for seventy-seven times \$7,000. Now, we have again the case of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He was obliged, like his colleagues, to devote great labor and great toil to compiling despatches, in which he set out at great length, and with very considerable force, how imperative it was for us to do all these things which he did, for the purpose of maintaining our fisheries. He showed us that our fisheries were perfectly worthless unless those customs regulations were enforced; and how completely their value would be destroyed if these identical privileges which we are now asked to concede were conceded to the American fishermen. The disavowal of all this by the Minister of Finance was very hard on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I think the hon. gentleman really ought not to call upon his colleagues, at any rate at such very short notice, to swallow their own words in this perfectly reckless fashion. I listened with some attention to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries the other evening, and I must say that his arguments savored strongly of his department. They were of the fish—fishy. There is no doubt, however, that the hon. gentleman, however well he may have succeeded in pleasing his friends on the other side, failed entirely to account for the language which he and the hon. the Minister of Justice had seen fit to use on a previous occasion with respect to these identical privileges which they now agreed to concede. I think there is no man here who has taken the trouble to examine those minutes and despatches which those hon. gentlemen laid on the Table, and to compare them, line by line, with the treaty which we are now called upon to adopt, who will not agree with me in saying that it is practically impossible for us, or for any men, to declare that this is a treaty we can be proud of. It may be a necessary dose to be swallowed, we will discuss that presently, but most assuredly, after the stand which was taken by the hon. gentleman a year ago and two years ago, no human being can say that any Canadian can be proud of the attitude in which this country finds itself to-day. Now, my main reason for desiring to speak to-night is that on the occasion of a recent debate, to which I may be pardoned for alluding, I called the attention of hon. gentlemen and their colleagues, and this House, to the fact that there was practically no argument which they could bring forward to induce us to adopt this fishery treaty, which would not also most fully justify me in the arguments that I then brought forward in defence of the right of Canada to make her own treaties and her own terms with the people of the United States. Let me for one moment recall to the attention of the House the argument which I then addressed to them. I pointed out, in the first place, that the position of Canada, in regard to the United States, was entirely exceptional. I pointed out that strict right, strict legal right, must yield to the good of the Empire at large, and I pointed out that the Em-

pire itself had adopted a totally different rule as regarded the United States from that which it had adopted with regard to any other country under the sun, and therefore I drew the conclusion that unrestricted reciprocity, though an unprecedented, was an exceptional thing, and was not contrary to the general good. What has been the argument advanced by the Minister of Fisheries? Why, point by point, step by step, that hon. gentleman has explained to this House that the position of Canada, as regards the United States, is wholly exceptional, he has explained to us that our strict legal rights must yield to the general good of the whole Empire, that the English Government have, and have for good reasons I doubt not, adopted a totally different rule in dealing with the United States from that which they have adopted in dealing with any other country, and, therefore, he drew the deduction that these unexampled concessions, as he rightly called them, might be expedient in this case. It followed, as I had warned the hon. gentleman and his followers that it would have to follow, that he has established, by his own precedent, that unusual and unexampled concessions might be made in the case of the United States. It is rather remarkable—I do not mean to say for a moment that it is to his discredit—to observe the isolation in which the hon. gentleman appears to stand in the present Cabinet. The hon. gentleman's arguments are not the arguments of his colleagues, the hon. gentleman's language is not the language of his colleagues, the hon. gentleman's ways are not the ways of his colleagues, and the resolution which he arrives at differs very widely from theirs. I observe that the hon. gentleman declare, and declared correctly in this particular instance, that the Canadians pay the duty, which is rather different from the doctrine which has been avowed by his colleagues, and not only by his colleagues but by nearly everyone who supports him on that side. He dwelt—and there I am in accord with him—upon the immense importance of the friendship of the people of the United States to the people Canada and the people of England. There again he was right, and it would be well if some of his colleagues had shown a greater appreciation of that great fact. The hon. gentleman told us, and he told us truly, that a non-intercourse Bill, or a Retaliatory Bill, whatever it might be called, would be a great injury to the people of Canada, though I do not hear that he took his colleagues to task, when they proclaimed the opposite. The hon. gentleman told us that he undertook to attempt to obtain unrestricted reciprocity, but that the Americans would not accept it. The hon. gentleman may or may not deserve well of his countrymen. There may be a difference of opinion in regard to that. But I will say that he has deserved exceedingly well of the party with which he is connected. There can be no doubt that he, and he alone, saved them in 1887, and I believe that he has saved them again in this negotiation from the consequence of their own ill-judged folly in very nearly dragging us into a collision with the people of the United States. My hon. friend who last spoke was quite right in saying that it was a very dubious question whether or not it was wise for us to proceed now to the ratification of this treaty. There are many reasons why we should not. There may be also something to be said in favor of our doing so; but in any case the Government must bear the responsibility. I have doubts whether we are doing a wise thing in ratifying this treaty at this moment, but I am aware of the differences which exist in the political constitutions of ourselves and the people of the United States; and it may be, as we are constituted, that we are nearly as much committed to the action of our Government now as the United States would be by the action of their Senate, so I am disposed to place the whole responsibility on the Government. They may be acting under pressure from the Imperial Government, or they may be acting under pressure from the Gov-

ernment of the United States, with whom they came to this arrangement. I am not going to press them for an answer in regard to that. The matter is one of grave doubt, and I am going to leave the responsibility resting upon them. But there are other matters of grave moment which are involved. First, it is better, on the whole, for us to make these concessions, and, in the next place, how far has the action of the present Government deserved the approbation or the censure of the House? As to the first point, no one can dispute the fact which the Minister himself has admitted, almost in so many words, in his speech, that, by some misfortune or some blundering, call it what you will, this negotiation was entered into at a time which was as inopportune in the interests of Canada as it could be. I said, and I notice the hon. gentleman has echoed what I said, that you could not have entered into a negotiation for the settlement of our fishery disputes at a more unpropitious time than just before a presidential election in the United States, and I think the Government were to blame for allowing the matter to drift so long instead of entering into the negotiation at a more opportune time. Then, in the second place, I believe, whatever quibbles may be used, that all the concessions are on the side of Canada. I have been unable to see from any statement which has been made by hon. gentlemen, that they have gained one single thing for which they have contended. Still further, I notice that all matters favoring Canada were carefully eliminated from the second Treaty of Washington as they were from the first. There were other matters affecting our fisheries which should have been dealt with on the north-west coasts of this Dominion as well as on the north-east, and, in dealing with any other power than the United States, the British Government would have insisted that the negotiations should have included all the fishery matters in dispute, including the fisheries action of the United States officers in the Behring's Sea, of which we have as much reason to complain, at least, as the United States have to complain of the action of our officers in regard to their fishermen in the north-eastern corner of the Dominion. Why was not that allowed to be made a part of the discussion by the commissioners? I am afraid that it was eliminated for the same reasons for which the undoubted wrongs of Canada were passed over and were unnoticed in 1871, because it was not convenient for the American Government to be called upon to enter into that question at that time, because every argument which they could use in favor of the action of their officers in the Behring's Sea would have been in antagonism with their contentions in regard to the St. Lawrence and the Atlantic fisheries. I fail to see where we have obtained any support from the British authorities on this subject. Undoubtedly, dealing with any other power, the British authorities would have insisted that the negotiations should cover these points, but in our case these points were eliminated from the discussion, and even Mr. Chamberlain himself stated that our legal rights in Canada were surrendered in this matter, and he justified that action on the ground of the vast importance of the friendship of the American people to the people of England. Sir, under these circumstances, it is utterly impossible for us to pretend that we had any substantial assistance whatever from the presence of the English plenipotentiaries; and I heartily endorse the statement of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that the interests of Canada would have been much more likely to have been attended to successfully if we had, in a matter which concerned us chiefly, been allowed to name our own negotiators and conduct our own negotiations, and until we have the power to do that, I do not believe, for my part, that we have any very great chance of carrying such negotiations to a successful termination. Then my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) called attention to the fact—I have as yet heard no answer

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

whatever to his argument—that there would be very great practical difficulty in enforcing this agreement. He called attention to this fact: Now that you have admitted the Americans to traverse the three mile belt, practically at their own pleasure, unless you maintain an enormous fleet of cruisers at almost every point frequented by these fishermen, you will find it entirely impossible to prevent them, whenever they get an opportunity, from exercising their craft. The Minister of Finance himself admitted in so many words that the fishermen were an uncontrollable and intractable class of men, in other words, that if they get an opportunity of catching a few hundred barrels of mackerel within the three mile limit, they were perfectly certain to use it unless a cruiser were alongside. That, Sir, I take it, you will find to be the actual state of the case. You will find that, under one pretence or another, American fishermen will traverse this belt at their own pleasure and will, as it was contended a year ago, under those circumstances, and fully enjoy all the rights and privileges of the inshore fisheries which the last speaker declared he was so anxious to preserve. Lastly, Sir, I point out that this is wholly and entirely at variance, be it right or be it wrong, with the pretensions which the Government advanced but a year ago. This treaty may be an honorable treaty or it may be a dishonorable one, but one thing is sure, that if it be right to make it now, the conduct of hon. gentlemen a year ago was the maddest folly, inasmuch as rather than yield concessions which they say now they can honorably yield, they persisted, as the Minister of Finance has told us, in exasperating a people whose friendship he rightly declared to be of the vastest importance, not only to us, but to the people of England as well. Well, Sir, what was the answer of the Minister of Finance to all this? Practically he admitted it all. He admitted, as I have said, that the treaty was negotiated at a very unfavorable time, but he went on to tell us that we must bow to the logic of facts, we must look at the situation, the hon. gentleman said, all round. It was a great mistake, the Minister of Finance thought, that we should have exasperated the Americans. He dwelt upon that repeatedly. He called attention again and again to the fact that our policy had been such as to exasperate the Americans. He declared that it could not be too often emphasised, that in the minds of the English people the friendship of the United States was of immense importance to us and to the Empire, and he practically told us that on mature reflection—and I dare say he was quite right—he had come to the conclusion we could not long resist a non-intercourse Bill. Last year he did not think so, but this year, after a visit to Washington, he has grown considerably wiser. I think that hon. gentleman, when he was brought face to face with the difficulties of the situation, showed himself superior in judgment to his colleagues, and recognised that they had made a tremendous mistake, and he prepared to execute his strategic movement to the rear at the earliest possible moment. Sir, he recognised, and we have got to recognise, that in matters of this kind, to a very great extent, owing, no doubt, to their position as an European and Indian power, the English people are, to a great degree, powerless to assist us, and that being so, for peace's sake, as the hon. gentleman truly said, we of Canada must be prepared to give up our rights. Now, Sir, I am not disposed to contravene the position of the hon. Minister of Finance altogether, but what I desire to point out here, and what I shall point out elsewhere, is that from the whole tone and tenor of his apology for this fishery treaty we are now discussing, you must draw of necessity these two inferences: first of all, that the position of Canada toward the United States is taken wholly and entirely out of all ordinary categories. Sir, we have got the right to deal with the United States as we have the right to deal with no other nation. The plain truth of the

matter is this, and it is time, and it is right, that that truth should be known, the suzerain state cannot protect us as against the United States, and, therefore, that suzerain state has no right, as far as the United States are concerned, to claim from us that obedience which she would have a right to claim if she was able and willing to protect us, as Mr. Chamberlain put it, in our admitted legal rights. Sir, we knew this before. Those of us who were not blind and deaf to the whole situation, saw that this was the case the moment the first Treaty of Washington was concluded, and the moment Great Britain informed us that she was unable to obtain compensation for Canada for the wrong which had been admittedly perpetrated on our territory by American citizens, although it was as clear as daylight that the Americans could advance no argument which would justify them, or justify any arbitrators in admitting their claims for damages in the case of the *Alabama* and her consorts, which did not go with tenfold more force to justify the people of Canada in demanding that their claims should be considered for wrongs done them in time of peace by Fenian marauders on our shores. Sir, I say that was clear from 1871, I say that is now beyond all possibility of dispute. I say that it follows, therefore, that the hon. gentleman is quite right, and that I am quite right, in saying that we must make, from this time forth, the best bargain we can with the United States, and that we must do it alone. Mr. Speaker, it is worth while, in this connection, to call attention to a very remarkable document which was laid upon the Table of the House, that is, the personal and unofficial letter written by Mr. Bayard to Sir Charles Tupper, under date, Washington, 31st May, 1887. I think, Sir, that this House will do well to ponder on what Mr. Bayard has there said:

"WASHINGTON, D.C., 31st May, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR CHARLES,—The delay in writing you has been unavoidable. In the very short interview afforded by your visit I referred to the embarrassment arising out of the gradual practical emancipation of Canada from the control of the mother country and the consequent assumption by that community of attributes of autonomous and separate sovereignty, not, however, distinct from the Empire of Great Britain. The awkwardness of this imperfectly developed sovereignty is felt most strongly by the United States, which cannot have formal relations with Canada, except directly and as a colonial dependency of the British Crown, and nothing could better illustrate the embarrassment arising from this amorphous condition of things than by the volumes of correspondence published severally this year relating to the fisheries by the United States, Great Britain, and the Government of the Dominion. The time lost in this circumlocution, although often most regrettable, was the least part of the difficulty, and the indirectness of appeal and reply was the most serious feature, ending, as it did, very unsatisfactorily.

"It is evident that the commercial intercourse between the inhabitants of Canada and those of the United States has grown into too vast proportions to be exposed much longer to this wordy triangular duel, and more direct and responsible methods should be resorted to."

I say that is plain common sense on the part of Mr. Bayard, who thoroughly well understood the position of Canada toward the United States and towards England; and I regretted to find that the Minister of Finance, whom I thought would have been disposed, as he appeared to be in his reply to Mr. Bayard, to have accepted and endorsed Mr. Bayard's statement, should, on the other hand, have declared that he thought it was infinitely more desirable for us to deal with the United States under the aegis and protection of Great Britain. I, for one, wholly and entirely repudiate that part of the contention of the Minister of Finance. I say that Canada has grown to that stature that in dealing with the United States she ought to be allowed to deal directly; and I say it will be tenfold more to the interests of the people of Canada that we should deal directly with the United States, without reference to Downing-street or the British ambassador at Washington either. There is another inference that must be drawn from the very striking language that the Minister of Finance has used, and that is this: It appears to me to be only too clear that Canada lost, and the Government lost, a very great opportunity in

this matter. It appears to me the Government, besides losing a great opportunity, placed us in a most humiliating position, and they ran a very great risk. When I come to examine this correspondence which passed between Mr. Bayard and the hon. gentleman opposite, I cannot but feel that in all human probability, if we could pierce through the diplomatic secrecy which inevitably enshrouds these negotiations, the House would find that when the hon. Minister met Mr. Bayard, as I think he did in Easter, 1887—I think I am correct in that—several weeks before these letters were written, when the hon. gentleman was brought face to face with Mr. Bayard, when he realised where we were and whither we were drifting, he and Mr. Bayard must then have come to the conclusion, which Mr. Bayard announces in his letter, that the real and true means for the extrication of Canada from all these difficulties was a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity almost identically on the lines that I myself have proposed. Why, this is what Mr. Bayard indicates. Does any one suppose that Mr. Bayard on 31st May, 1887, five or six weeks after he had conferred with the hon. gentleman, would have made that proposition unless he had some good reason to suppose that it would be acceptable to the Minister of Finance at all events? Sir, I believe that the Minister of Finance in that respect was decidedly in advance of his colleagues, and that if they had given him a free hand, if they had allowed him in 1887, in April or May, when he met Mr. Bayard, to reply to the invitation which Mr. Bayard gave in that paper, we might have had unrestricted reciprocity to-day, and I believe that would have suited the hon. gentleman, who had, at all events, inclination enough, and who had intelligence enough to understand how vastly superior such a mode of settling the difficulty would have been to the one to which we have had recourse. But that opportunity passed, that opportunity was lost; and when later on, just on the eve of the presidential election, the hon. gentleman did then make a sort of proposition in that direction, then, of course, we could not be surprised that the American authorities should tell him under those circumstances they were not at liberty to undertake negotiations which they might have undertaken and might have successfully carried out some eighteen months ago. I have said this country is humbled. I do not mean to say that this country is necessarily humbled from concluding this treaty, but this country is humbled in this: That its recognised Government has advanced pretensions, has made declarations, has done acts which are wholly and utterly inconsistent with the line that they now call upon Parliament to take. Why, in the outset of the papers submitted we are told:

"The fisheries could not be preserved to our people if every one of the United States fishing vessels that were accustomed to swarm along our coasts could claim the right to enter our harbors, to post a letter or send a telegram or buy a newspaper, to obtain a physician in case of illness or a surgeon in case of accident, to land or bring off a passenger, or even to lend assistance to the inhabitants in fire, flood or pestilence or to buy medicine or to purchase a new rope."

In other words, if American vessels were allowed to enter the three-mile limit the Minister of Justice declared that our fisheries could not be preserved and our inshore fisheries would be worthless. And then the hon. gentleman goes on to state on another occasion:

"Such a surrender on the part of Canada would involve the abandonment of a valuable portion of the national inheritance of the Canadian people, who would certainly visit with just reprobation those who were guilty of so serious a neglect of the trusts committed to their charge."

I might go on and multiply these quotations *ad nauseam*, but these are enough to show clearly and distinctly that the hon. gentleman took, during the negotiations, an entirely different position from that which the Government occupied twelve months ago. They have done the very things which they declared they could not do without surrendering the national inheritance of Canada. According to their own

statements they have done those very things which they said would destroy the whole value of our inshore fisheries and, more than that, they have, as the Minister of Finance told us in so many words, performed this surrender and humiliation after first of all exasperating a very powerful neighbor, whom the Finance Minister tells us it is in the highest degree in our interest to conciliate and to keep on good terms. Sir, among other things the hon. gentleman gave us a very curious bit of secret history. It appears—and it was a very remarkable admission, although it was only fair on the part of the Minister of Finance to make it—that this famous visit of Easter, 1887, made to Mr. Bayard, did not originate from the Minister's own seeking. It appears there was a go-between, there was a third ambassador concerned; it appears that the Government of Canada and the Minister of Finance were indebted to the friendly intervention of Mr. Erastus Wiman for bringing the Secretary of State and the Minister of Finance together. Now, I am bound to say that I believe in so doing Mr. Wiman rendered this country a very valuable service. I have no doubt whatever from what has transpired that had not Mr. Wiman proposed and arranged that interview, had not the Finance Minister gone down to Washington or New York whichever it might be and interviewed Mr. Bayard, I have no doubt from the dangers which menaced Canada, from the dangerous complications that were ahead, a very perilous state of things might have ensued. I think it is only due to a man who has been much abused and much vilified by the hon. gentleman's colleagues, by his supporters and the press supporting those hon. gentlemen, that attention should be drawn here, and in the most public manner, to the service that Mr. Wiman rendered to his native country on that occasion, and I trust both the hon. gentleman and his colleagues and supporters and the press, now that the Minister of Finance has practically recognised this great service on the part of Mr. Wiman, will speak of that gentleman in future with the respect due to one who has rendered a very important service to his country. I believe myself the hon. Minister of Finance likewise rendered a valuable service in this, that although like his colleagues he had been misled into a very vicious policy, when he was brought face to face with the situation he then understood how critical it had become, and from that time he applied himself seriously and in earnest to extricate us from the dilemma in which we had been placed. I cannot but believe that the hon. gentleman in his heart of hearts had desired—and as I said I think there is no use in disguising the fact after what Mr. Bayard has said—that he at any rate informally acquiesced in the proposal which Mr. Bayard made to us, to close this difficulty on lines closely akin to unrestricted reciprocity. Sir, the hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech, made a very remarkable allusion indeed, and one to which I wish to call the special attention of this House, to the subject of commercial union. The hon. gentleman told us that he did not meet a man of any party among American statesmen who would not hold up both hands for commercial union with Canada, but he also told us that “the proposition of unrestricted reciprocity”—and mark those words—“of free trade with the United States, with the privilege to make our own tariff with the rest of the world,” he says, “I did not meet a man with an intelligent head on his shoulders who would talk about such a thing for a moment. Sir, they treated that proposition with scorn.” What was the proposition that those gentlemen treated with scorn, and what was it that the hon. gentleman had suggested to them as unrestricted reciprocity? The hon. gentleman continues: “They said: Do you suppose that we intend to make a free trade arrangement with Canada, to adopt free trade with England and to destroy the position, that we occupy in relation to all the vast industries of the country.” Sir, does the hon. gentleman suppose that

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

any man on this side of the House, or any sane individual, would be idiotic enough to suppose that the Americans would consent at the present moment to enter into an arrangement with Canada which involved free trade with England and all the world. Does not the hon. gentleman know perfectly well that if that was the construction he placed on unrestricted reciprocity, if, as appears from the very words he has quoted, he gave those American statesmen to understand that unrestricted reciprocity with Canada meant free trade with England and practically therefore with all the rest of the world of course they would refuse it. Sir, that is not unrestricted reciprocity. We know very well, and I was at pains to make it manifest, that if we get unrestricted reciprocity with the United States we must discriminate in a great number of articles against the mother country. Sir, I say that the hon. gentleman has shown conclusively by this very passage that no American statesman, not one of all those he met on the other side, had said the least thing in opposition to such a scheme of unrestricted reciprocity as was proposed from this side of the House, or as any man here has supposed possible. What they declared, as appears from the hon. gentleman's own language in the clearest terms was, that they were not prepared for free trade with England, and consequently, as I have said, with the rest of the world. I am a little at a loss to understand how the hon. gentleman could have so misrepresented the case as it is apparent from his own words he did misrepresent it. He must have done this I think for the express purpose of getting a refusal, and of being able to tell the House that he offered unrestricted reciprocity and that all American statesmen had refused it. He must have desired to obtain that reply, or otherwise those men would never have replied to him as he states they have done. They did not reply: We cannot make a free trade arrangement with Canada; but they did say: We cannot make a free trade arrangement with Canada if that means that we must adopt free trade with England, for we cannot destroy the position we occupy in relation to the vast industries of this country. I have further to say that the speech of the Minister of Finance shows in the clearest possible manner the insincerity, to say the least of it, of the attacks that were made from that side of the House on the gentlemen on this side with respect to this question of unrestricted reciprocity. If it was so disloyal, if it was so unreasonable, and if it was so treasonable, how was it in the name of wonder that the hon. gentleman could have come to enter into these negotiations with Mr. Bayard, or to make a proposition which he himself says amounted to unrestricted reciprocity. Sir, the practical fact of the matter is that the Government has been at sea on this question, as it has been at sea on almost every other question connected with our relations with the United States. Apparently the Government of Canada have adopted this one guiding rule, and this one only, to brag and bluster and bully, and then when you are confronted with a determined foe haul down your flag. That appears to be the policy of the Government and nothing else. That was the policy pursued with the Province of Manitoba. Have we forgotten, Sir, how a year ago this House echoed with denunciations of the gentlemen on this side because they propose a course in accordance with right and justice to Manitoba. Sir, the concession was not made in answer to remonstrances, the concession was made in answer to threats, and not until those threats had assumed the most formidable proportions did hon. gentlemen relax their tyrannical interference with the rights of our sister Province. So, Sir, has it been in the case with those fisheries. There was bully, and bluster, and brag, and various vexatious customs relations, which irritated and exasperated the Americans, as my hon. friend told us, and then, Sir, when they are brought face to face with the results of their own conduct, and when they found there was serious peril, they

hailed down their flag and we are compelled to make this capitulation, for it is nothing else, and this surrender of our admitted legal rights. So it was, Sir, a week ago with respect to that statutory proposal which the Minister of Justice and the First Minister declared could not be granted without treason to the rights of the people of this country. A week after when a retaliatory Bill was put on the Table of Congress we found those gentlemen issuing a proclamation granting the very concessions which they declared could not be made without treason to the country. Sir, I venture to say that perhaps within twelve months, at all events within no very distant period, it will be found—if those hon. gentlemen remain where they are—that they will also deal with the proposal I had the duty to submit the other night. I have this one thing to say to them: I fear it will be found in that case, as it has been found in many others, and as is apt to be found in all such cases, that the longer they wait the worse the bargain will be. This is a simple repetition of the case of the Sybil's books. The longer you delay coming to a fair understanding the higher the price you will have to pay, and the worse your bargain will be. I am not going to detain the House any longer; I thank the hon. members for the patience with which they have listened to me, and I have only to say in conclusion that if any future difficulties of a similar character should again occur, I trust that the hon. gentlemen who have found themselves in such a position as this will in future bear in mind the humiliation they are now inflicting upon the people of Canada, and will conduct the controversy in such a manner that if they are finally obliged to recede, they may not be confronted with their own declarations that to recede as they now propose to do is treasonable and contrary to the best interests of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat with his usual style has varied the discussion by forgetting the subject before him and attacking those who sit opposite him. He describes the policy of the present Government as a policy of brag and bluster. Has he not described exactly his own attitude at the time he made that speech? Was his speech anything from beginning to end but an exhibition of brag and bluster? He says the Government have also been at sea with their policy—they have had no guiding line. Mr. Speaker, we have been at sea three times, and we came safely to land each time. The hon. gentleman was at sea too, but he suffered shipwreck; that is the difference between the policy of the Government and the policy of the Opposition. There is no pleasing hon. gentlemen opposite. We cannot know what their line of opposition is, because there are so many lines. The hon. gentleman who spoke last says that he does not think there was much humiliation in making the treaty, but the humiliation was in the pretences of the Government—in their various despatches of a year ago. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says it was one vast surrender, one vast humiliation. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) says that it was no humiliation—that those concessions ought to have been made two years ago. How are we to find out where we are wrong? We can justify ourselves by the views of any one member of the Opposition by quoting the speech of some other member of the Opposition. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) commenced his attack by repeating his statement, that he made a little while ago, that among the greatest blunder we had ever committed was having taken this inauspicious moment for attempting to make this treaty. But, Sir, the treaty is the consequence of the communication that passed a year ago between my hon. friend and Mr. Bayard. The hon. gentleman, after stating that it was the most inauspicious blunder that was ever committed by a government, com-

mends Mr. Wiman, and says he conferred a great benefit on Canada by asking my hon. friend to go down and commence the negotiations which ended in this treaty. After the negotiations commenced a year ago, were we to stop them? We were either right or wrong. In following up the lead or the hint which had been given by Mr. Wiman, which resulted first in this semi-official communication between those two gentlemen, which was followed up in England, and which after long correspondence and long diplomatic delays culminated in this treaty—after the negotiations were once commenced, we should have been guilty of a great rudeness in the first place, and a great diplomatic blunder in the second place, if we had taken any step either by laches or by positive refusal, to break off the negotiations which we had to a certain degree created under the wise instigation and advice of Mr. Wiman. But it is very singular, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman thinks it was a great blunder and stupidity for us to attempt to make a treaty in the immediate proximity of a presidential election; and yet, if you look at the hon. gentleman's own resolution, which we voted down the other day, you will find that he, in the immediate proximity of a presidential election, says:

"It is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted trade therewith."

The hon. gentleman actually lays it down as our duty to open negotiations at this moment, the most inauspicious time, just before the presidential election, when party strife and party rivalries would prevent any successful negotiations. It was all wrong in us to make any proposition a year ago and attempt to carry it out; it is all very right in the hon. gentleman to suggest that now we should commence *de novo* negotiations for a treaty. How does the hon. gentleman reconcile the position? I am sure he cannot.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I can.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He might try, but his success would be just as dubious as was the success of the whole resolution the moment before the vote was taken upon it. The hon. gentleman, wandering away from the subject, takes up the old cry that we should make our own treaties, and he says that England dare not back us—that England would support her colonies against any other nation, but would not venture to do so against the United States. The hon. gentleman has read very carefully the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and he knows everything that is contained in it. My hon. friend took the opportunity of stating that he had received full support from the representatives especially chosen by England—to use a phrase fashionable now-a-days, unrestricted support from Mr. Chamberlain, the British ambassador—aye, and from the British Government that stood behind all three; and if there is anything wrong in that treaty, if there is any humiliation concerned in it, that humiliation has not been forced upon Canada by the British Government, or the British plenipotentiaries associated with my hon. friend. My hon. friend takes the whole responsibility, or shares the responsibility, of having made that treaty. After my hon. friend made that statement, there was no appropriateness in the hon. gentleman bringing in the old cry that Canada should make her own treaties. In effect, Canada has made her own treaties of late years, and will in future make her own treaties—

Mr. MITCHELL. Not much.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And she will have this advantage, that when those treaties require to be enforced, she will have not only the moral, but the material support of the mother country at her back. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was exceedingly severe in his attack,

first upon the conduct of the Government in the last two or three years, and then equally severe upon their abandonment of that course. The hon. gentleman quoted, with approbation apparently, the statement made by fishermen who are caught in the act of poaching, in the act of breaking the law, and who of course at once complain to their Government. Why, Mr. Speaker, the smuggler who is caught in the act and whose goods are seized, always complains against the officer who seizes the goods. So the trespasser on our waters, who is caught preparing to fish or with a cargo of fish which he has just taken, always complains to his Government; and it is a mistake, and a mistake and a misfortune, in the practice of the American Government, that they do not do as England does and as Canada has always done—before they communicate the unauthenticated charge of the poacher, or trespasser, or smuggler,—enquire into the facts; but they assume it to be true with or without proof, they make it a matter of diplomatic correspondence, and send a complaint to the British ambassadors. England will not take that course, Canada will not take that course. Whenever a Canadian makes a charge of being ill used by the American Government or officials, before we formulate the complaint, before we forward it to Her Majesty's Government or representatives, we take care to collect the evidence. We make sure that we have proof of the case before annoying the American Government by transmitting the complaint and claim for damages under it. We ascertain by a reasonable amount of evidence that there is a *prima facie* case before we formulate the charge or claim any damages. The American Government takes the other and the more unfortunate and more unwise course, and hence all this irritation. Every man, every rascal, who has wilfully broken the law, who has been breaking the law with the knowledge and the desire to break it, makes, when he is caught in the act, his complaint; that complaint is published in the next newspaper, and the American Government without enquiry sends it on to the British ambassador. Thus these complaints are sent to Canada and we have looked into them, and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has shown how utterly devoid of all semblance of truth these complaints are, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has, as I have already said, stated he does not see there is so much humiliation in the treaty itself; that it is a concession we ought not to be proud of, perhaps, but which we were compelled to accept. It was said of the Treaty of Amiens, between England and the first Napoleon, that it was a treaty everybody was glad of but nobody was proud of. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, considers this treaty as being in the same category. The Treaty of Amiens was, however, a treaty of peace, it was a treaty that gave England an opportunity to rest, and it was a treaty that enabled England to prepare and carry out successfully the more fierce contest that afterwards arose. However, this treaty is one that we may fairly congratulate ourselves upon. It is a treaty of mutual concessions. It is a treaty of peace; it is a harbinger, to be hoped, of years and years of peace, of friendly intercourse, of increasing trade, of developing commerce, and of friendly and social as well as commercial increase. It is emphatically a treaty of peace made between two peoples speaking the same language, and having the same principles of government, and the same principles of civilisation and of social intercourse and social position. If, at any rate, it be considered only as a treaty of peace, it is of the highest value, and we would have the right to be proud of such a treaty if it bring in all those results, unless there were any unworthy concessions in the arrangement which brought about those results. Is there anything unworthy in this treaty? It is one of mutual consent. Hon. gentlemen opposite say it is one of unconditional surrender, and that there is no concession on the part of the United States.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

In the first place, with respect to the question of the headland, that has been disposed of by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). When you find that the ten miles span between the headlands has been adopted by so many nations, there can be no humiliation in our adopting the same measure. The hon. gentleman says we ought not to have yielded, that we ought to have left it to arbitration, and that we should have succeeded in our extreme pretensions. Sir, the system of arbitration is preferable to war; but I do not think Canada or England has found great advantage by those arbitrations, that the hon. gentleman advocates for the first time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend said certainly that it ought to be left to a tribunal, and that a tribunal could not find otherwise than that our pretensions were well founded. We have had several arbitrations, and the complaint of Canada has been that they were unsuccessful. We would have to leave this question to be settled by some friendly power. What chance would we have to get justice against the United States and against this provision in a treaty among any of the nations, most of whom have already adopted the ten miles distance as the measure of the bays which belong to a country? Leave it to France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, which have already agreed that that is a reasonable provision and sufficiently indicates those bays that ought to be considered as belonging exclusively to the nation of whose country they form indent, and we would not have the slightest chance of getting a favorable ruling against a provision and contention of that kind. The hon. gentleman says we have received no concessions. If the hon. gentleman will read those despatches that he speaks of carefully, he will find that the United States contended that, notwithstanding the Treaty of 1818, notwithstanding the restrictions of that convention, subsequent commercial treaties with England had so widened the principles of trade intercourse that those restrictions, held originally with respect to the convention of 1818, were swept away. You will find Mr. Bayard contends that under the various commercial arrangements and treaties between England and the United States, the United States had a right to buy bait. You will find that contention in every one of his despatches. That contention was opposed in the correspondence of Canada, and in the various minutes prepared by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. They also concluded that, under a fair reading of the Washington Treaty of 1871, under the binding clause, they had acquired the right of transshipment of their fish. That was resisted and properly resisted by Canada. They had no such rights as they contended they had; the treaty arrangements between England and the United States had in no degree affected the construction of the convention of 1818 and the restrictions in that convention. Those were the contentions of my hon. friend, and those two points have been conceded by the United States. No concession, the hon. gentleman has said, has been made by the United States, but everything has been surrendered by Canada. The United States have had everything asked for. They contended that they had a right to buy bait, and that the refusal of the Canadian authorities to allow the fishing vessels to buy bait was an infringement of the treaties between England and the United States for which they claimed redress. You find in this treaty that they give up that whole point, that they agree that no vessel can buy bait except by a license from Canada, and, if the vessel does not get that license it is liable to all penalties of a breach of the law. Is that not a concession? Then, they cannot get the right to buy it unless they give our fishermen the right to sell their fish in the United States. There was no concession in regard to the transshipment either. If you

read the letter and the despatches of Mr. Bayard, you will find that the Americans claimed that they had a right to transship under the treaty between the two nations, and they claimed that this was not only a hardship but an irregularity, that we should refuse them the right to transship their fish, having adopted the bonding system. Now, under the treaty, they give up that system, and they ask us, and we give them the right to transship their fish so soon as we have the right to sell our fish to them. In fact, this is a treaty of mutual concession. It is a fair treaty and a just treaty, a treaty which is honorable to both parties. The hon. gentleman says, why did you make such extreme pretensions if you were not going to carry them out? Are there any of these pretensions that the hon. gentlemen do not say now are legal? Do hon. gentlemen opposite say we were not justified in making these pretensions? Is not the charge now made that we have given away our just pretensions? Then, if that be so, we cannot be charged with acting with brag and bluster in making those pretensions which the hon. gentlemen opposite are obliged to admit were justifiable by the law of nations and by the treaties themselves. You will remember that there was a special reason why the pretensions or these claims of right, because they are not only pretensions but they are claims of right, were made. They were made at the initiation of this correspondence, at the initiation of these attempts to bring on negotiations and carry them to a successful result. At the time those negotiations were commenced, it was supposed by Canada, and it was in fact supposed by the United States as well, that the question of the fisheries would arise, and certainly when Canada was asserting all her rights, she asserted these extreme pretensions that the hon. gentleman speaks of, because it was supposed that the Americans would ask for the right to the inshore fisheries. We supposed, when negotiations were commenced, that, as in 1854, and as in 1871, the right to fish within the three mile limit would be asked for by the Americans. How we were to be compensated, whether by an extension of trade or by a money payment, was in the future of uncertainty, but we supposed that would be one of the demands which the Americans would make. In that case, it was necessary for us to hold out the utmost of our claims against the possibility of their desiring to get the three mile inshore fisheries, and to insist that these inshore fisheries should be protected under the strict terms of the convention of 1818. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) spoke about the humiliation of our giving away the territorial rights of Canada for money in 1871. I remember very well when that treaty was discussed in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I said nothing about giving away territorial rights in 1871. I simply spoke in reference to the territorial rights under the treaty which is now under consideration. I spoke of certain sacrifices which were made by the Treaty of 1871, but I said nothing whatever about the territorial rights.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman spoke about his objections to giving away the inshore fisheries for money.

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

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then I am much mistaken. Perhaps this is caused by the recollection of the fierce attacks which were made upon me in 1872 by the hon. gentleman and those who surround him, when I was called Judas Iscariot, when I was told that I had sold the territorial rights of Canada for thirty pieces of silver. I do not know whether some hon. gentlemen did not say that I was Benedict Arnold. At any rate I remember that the hon. gentleman's leader, who, I regret to see, is not now in his place, Mr. Mackenzie, declared that he looked with

loathing upon that portion of the treaty which provided for an arbitration under which the Americans were to pay a money consideration for the difference between the value of our fisheries and theirs. That idea was rung all through the country, and I had some fear for my personal safety when I returned from Washington, because of the sacrifice which I had made of the honor of Canada, according to the statements of these gentlemen; but, after we went out of power, and those hon. gentlemen came in, their views changed, they carried to successful completion that arrangement, and the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is now no more (Sir Albert Smith) got his title for carrying to successful completion the sacrifice which they said I had been guilty of. That hon. gentleman got that honor for the work which was done, in fact, by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). The whole treaty at present is, as I have stated, honorable to both sides. There are mutual concessions on both sides. In the first place, in reference to the headlands, there is a reasonable arrangement, because all civilized nations have accepted the same limitation. Then, as respects bait, we have agreed to give bait to the American fishermen, if they allow our fish in. Of course, we give them all other supplies. We have allowed them to come into our ports and purchase supplies, also for their homeward voyage. That is a kindly and a humane thing to do, that, if a fishing vessel has exhausted its supplies, it should be allowed to come into our ports and purchase its supplies; and, on the other hand, we gain for our traders and merchants the sale of those supplies. It is the same thing in regard to transshipment. It is of great advantage to the fishermen to be able to transship their catch by our railways, instead of being compelled to go far away from their fishing ground. On the other hand, our railways get the advantage of that transshipment, and a very considerable item it was in the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway before it was stopped. So, Sir, you can go on with every one of the items of this treaty, and you will find that it is governed by a spirit of mutual concession, by a spirit of give and take. It is honorable to both nations, it is honorable to all parties, and above all things, it is beneficial to all parties, as it puts an end to all this irritation, it puts an end to all these quarrels and it makes us good neighbors instead of bad neighbors; and my hon. friend and the plenipotentiaries who acted with him, and the majority of this House, I am sure, will see, and justly see, the blessings that will be given to peacemakers.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not rise with the intention of adding to this already lengthy discussion. I frankly admit that upon this question I have not made such a study as would enable me to discuss it adequately. I rise simply for the purpose of stating for the fourth or fifth time, since it is not yet understood on the other side, what is the policy of the Opposition upon this question. Sir, in the course of a long parliamentary career the hon. leader of the Government has had to meet many different accusations. He has just told us that he has been compared to Judas Iscariot, he has just told us that he has been accused of being another Benedict Arnold. There is one thing, however, which the right hon. gentleman has never been charged with—he has never been charged with dulness of intellect; and I am surprised, knowing his qualities as we see them exemplified in this House, that, after having heard the speeches which have been delivered on this side of the House on this question, he does not yet understand the policy of the Opposition in regard to it. Sir, it has already been explained by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones), by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and lastly, by my hon. friend from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I tell him

for the fourth or fifth time now that the policy of the Opposition upon this question is simply this: That, while asserting that the treaty is a surrender of most valuable rights that belong to Canada, still, it is the duty of Canadians to adopt this treaty, because it will put an end to a most dangerous state of things. That is the only reason we have to advance for the course which we propose to take on this occasion. The treaty is a concession of rights that belong to us, that should have been retained to us; but still, Sir, in face of the dangerous aspect which events have taken, it is better to adopt the treaty and have this vexed question settled forever. We agree altogether on this side of the House with the statements which were made the other day by the Minister of Finance when introducing this question, that the greatest calamity which could befall the civilised world would be an armed collision between the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race. When we consider that England and the United States to-day are the two foremost among civilised nations, that their trade exceeds the trade of all other nations, we are appalled at the results that would follow an armed collision between those two nations. I say further, it would not only be a fratricidal war, but it would be almost as criminal and as guilty as a civil war. There is no reason whatever why the two branches of the English-speaking race, the United States and Canada and England, should ever come to war, and if such an event were ever to take place I would look upon it, and everybody would look upon it, as the greatest catastrophe which could befall the civilised world. The position of things in reference to this question was such that an actual war between England and the United States was neither a remote nor an impossible contingency. Much more, Mr. Speaker, we were already threatened with imminent commercial war. A Bill had been passed by the American Congress which empowered the President at any moment to close all commercial relations between the United States and Canada. We all agree with the language of the Minister of Finance upon this question when, speaking upon the probable result of such a commercial war, he said:

"I need not tell you that that Bill meant commercial war, that it meant not only the ordinary suspension of friendly feeling and intercourse between two countries, but that it announced much more than that. If that Bill had been brought into operation by the proclamation of the President of the United States, I have no hesitation in saying that we stood in a relation to that great country of commercial war, and the line is very narrow which separates a commercial war between two countries from an actual war."

That was the position with which we were face to face and that is the position which this treaty would put an end to. Now, Sir, what was the cause of that unfortunate condition of things, that prospect of war between the two nations? The cause was no other than the harassing policy which had been followed by the present Government with regard to American fishermen. There was no other cause. It is to be noted that the American Government did not contend for an extension of their powers under the treaty. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that the American Government had advanced contentions from which they have receded under the present treaty, that they had contended under the treaty for the right to purchase bait. Nothing of the kind. I take direct issue with the right hon. gentleman, and I say unhesitatingly that the American Government never contended that under the treaty they had a right to purchase bait, and that point cannot be made clearer than by the language of the President himself when transmitting the treaty to the Senate. This is what he said:

"The right of our fishermen under the Treaty of 1818 did not extend to the procurement of distinctive fishery supplies in Canadian ports and harbors; and one item supposed to be essential, to wit, bait, was plainly denied them by the explicit and definite words of the Treaty of 1818, emphasized by the course of the negotiations and expressed decisions which preceded the conclusion of that treaty."

Mr. LAURIE.

So, Mr. Speaker, the statement of the right hon. gentleman that the Americans, under the treaty, yield any of their former pretensions, falls to the ground. They get everything, we receive nothing in exchange. As I said, the cause which produced this unfriendly feeling between the two countries, the cause which threatened us with retaliation was the policy followed by the present Government with regard to American fishermen. We have been told to-day that the American fishermen were not subjected to any harassing process, that it was only the smuggler, only the poacher who complained and who was ever complaining under such circumstances. But that is not the view taken by the American Government. The American Government did not take the view that it was only the poacher and the smuggler that were harassed by the regulations of the Government; on the contrary they took the ground that the policy of the Canadian Government had been harassing in every instance. Again I cite from the Message of the President:

"The history of events in the last two years show that no feature of Canadian administration was more harassing and injurious than the compulsion upon our fishing vessels to make formal entry and clearance on every occasion of temporarily seeking shelter in Canadian ports and harbors."

It was these customs regulations touching American fishing vessels, compelling them to make entries and clearances on every occasion, which harassed the American fishermen and created intense indignation, that resulted at length in the retaliation Bill. Take the Bill itself. What is the ground of the Bill? The ground is that American fishermen are harassed and oppressed by Canadian authorities, and the ground upon which the President was authorised to close commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada was simply this fact, that American fishermen were harassed and oppressed by Canadian authorities. The language of the Bill makes this very clear. It states:

"That whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that American fishermen are visiting or being in the waters or at any ports or places of the British dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied or abridged in the enjoyment of any rights secured to them by treaty or law, or are or they lately have been unjustly vexed or harassed in the enjoyment of such rights, or subjected to unreasonable restrictions, regulations or requirements in respect to such rights; or otherwise unjustly vexed or harassed in said waters, ports or places, or whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that any such fishing vessels or fishermen having a permit under the laws of the United States to touch and trade at any port or ports, place or places, in the British dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied the privilege of entering such port or ports, place or places, in the same manner and under the same regulations as may exist therein applicable to trading vessels of the most favored nations, or shall be unjustly vexed or harassed in respect thereof, or otherwise be unjustly vexed or harassed therein, or shall be prevented from purchasing such supplies as may there be lawfully sold to trading vessels of the most favored nation; or whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that any other vessels of the United States, their masters or crews so arriving at or being in such British waters or ports or places in the British dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied any of the privileges therein accorded to the vessels, their masters or crews of the most favored nation or unjustly vexed or harassed in respect of the same, or unjustly vexed or harassed therein by the authorities thereof, then, and in either or all of such cases it shall be lawful and it shall be the duty of the President of the United States in his discretion."

This is the whole tenor of the Bill; there is no other ground for authorising the President to come to that unfortunate conclusion except this one fact, that American fishermen had been lately harassed by Canadian authorities. The retaliation Bill was passed, and then we had to face that most deplorable condition that perhaps at any moment the President would issue a proclamation which at once would close our ports to all trade between the two nations. The prospects were simply alarming when we consider the amount of trade done day after day between the two nations, a trade involving millions and millions of dollars for exports and imports, and we can well conceive that if that proclamation had been put in force by the President its effect would have reached every Canadian family and per-

son in the country. The Government at last were alarmed, and as my hon. friend to my left (Sir Richard Cartwright) has said, upon this occasion the Government did what they ever do—they always refuse to listen to representations, arguments and remonstrances, but they always yield to threats of violence. In the case of Manitoba not more than a week or two ago they yielded to threats of violence; and we had a very celebrated case three years ago when the half-breeds, who for seven years petitioned for redress and for seven years never received an answer. At last, when they not only threatened but resorted to violence, they obtained from the Government what the Government refused to grant them during seven long years. In this instance, I venture to say, that if the United States Congress had not adopted this retaliation Bill, we would not have to-day a treaty, but the question would still be in the same position it occupied in 1885-86; but when Congress adopted a retaliation Bill at once, the Government saw they had gone far enough and the time to yield had come. As the Finance Minister has said, they were glad to avail themselves of the services of the gentleman who has been attacked during the last six or eight months as a traitor to his native land. Mr. Wiman has received an ample answer to all the charges made against him by the Conservative press. During the whole summer he was assailed and now he has his answer, and that from the Finance Minister himself; and the Finance Minister has shown that Mr. Wiman has always remembered the interests of this his native country, and though he resides in a foreign country, his heart is always with Canada. After the mediation of Mr. Wiman, there was an interview between the Finance Minister and the Secretary of State of the United States. That interview was followed by correspondence, a correspondence of a most striking character. It was hoped that after the correspondence the question would be settled in a manner most honorable to this country and most satisfactory to the two nations, that is to say, by an extension of the trade relations between the two countries. The correspondence which has taken place between Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Bayard has often been quoted, but it can bear to be quoted again in the present discussion, in view of the position that the Opposition have taken, and still intend to take, on this question. Mr. Bayard, writing to Sir Charles Tupper, said:

"The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain, which has been *questio vexata* ever since it was concluded, and to-day is suffered to interfere with and seriously embarrass the good understanding of both countries in the important commercial relations and interests which have come into being since its ratification, and for the adjustment of which it is wholly inadequate, as has been unhappily proved by the events of the past two years. I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

Sir Charles Tupper replied in a similar strain, saying:

"I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

The plenipotentiaries met, and no doubt the Canadian plenipotentiary had his correspondence in mind. He made a proposition upon this question, and the hon. gentleman has stated to the House that the offer he made to the American plenipotentiaries was an offer of unrestricted reciprocity. The language used by the hon. gentleman the other day was as follows:

"The hon. gentleman says the offer is unrestricted, and I intended it should be so. I intended to give the Government of the United States the fullest opportunity of stating just how far they were prepared to go in reciprocal trade to Canada."

I am sure every one was delighted to hear that the Finance Minister, when acting as a British plenipotentiary, had

offered to settle this question in the direction of unrestricted reciprocity; that he wanted to enter into negotiations with the American plenipotentiaries to ascertain how far they would go in the direction of reciprocity. He had a right to expect, in view of the correspondence which had taken place with Mr. Bayard, an answer of the same nature. The American plenipotentiaries made an answer. We do not know what it was, and I will not discuss it; but we have it in the language of the Minister the other day that the American plenipotentiaries receded altogether from the position which had been assumed by Mr. Bayard in the correspondence. Mr. Bayard had expressed his willingness and his desire to settle this question upon a broad basis and discuss the whole commercial relations between the two nations. The hon. gentleman has said that the Americans receded altogether from the position then assumed by Mr. Bayard. They receded, however, only from the position and not from the principle. As I understood the Minister, he simply said that the American plenipotentiaries considered—and this is what we would infer from the protocol laid before the House—that the time was not opportune or the occasion fitting to discuss that question, that the fishery dispute had to be settled by itself and that the question of commercial relations had to be settled by itself, and that the present occasion was not fitting to discuss the latter, leaving it open, therefore for other negotiations to follow regarding the commercial relations of the two countries as a question by itself. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the very proposal which my hon. friend the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has made, what he wishes the Canadian Government to do. The language of my hon. friend in substance is this: Since you have not been able to settle the question in regard to more extended commercial relations between the two countries in connection with the negotiation respecting the fishery dispute, I ask you to send a commissioner to Washington in order to open up these very negotiations. And this, Mr. Speaker, is the policy which we intend to pursue. We want to sanction the treaty and we give it our support, not because we approve of the treaty and think it is a good one, but because it puts an end to a vexed question between the two countries and that it will pave the way for entering into further negotiations to obtain reciprocal trade relations as we all desire. Now we are in the face of a presidential election, but we have the fact that the most influential statesman in the democratic party; a man who no doubt speaks not only for himself but for the President and a large section of the party, is already committed to that proposition and in favor of it. Therefore, I think that the occasion is most fitting to do the very thing which was moved the other day by my hon. friend; that is to say, the Canadian Government should at an early day send a commissioner to Washington to meet Mr. Bayard on the terms as laid down in his letter to Sir Charles Tupper and discuss the question of more extended trade relations between the two countries and ascertain how far they are disposed to go in that direction. The occasion is most fitting and I invite the serious attention of the Government to this. I know it will not carry. The hon. gentleman has said that my friend made his motion in view of the presidential election. It is true, but my friend knew the Government would not agree to that motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Or he would not have made it.

Mr. LAURIER. He would have made it, and he will make it next year and the year after. We are entering into that war now. The hon. gentleman did well know, from his experience in the past, that his motion would not carry the first time. Sir, it is not in the nature of things and according to our experience that reform should carry a first

time. The battle has to be waged more than once before the principles we contend for are carried. This time we made that motion knowing that defeat was staring us in the face, at least so far as this House was concerned, but we are determined to proceed, determined to proceed even if it were defeated next year, and even if it were defeated year after year until this motion is carried, as it is sure to be carried some day. To make a *resumé* of the policy of the Opposition it is this: We will adopt this treaty because it is the best thing which can be obtained under the circumstances, because it puts an end to the state of things which had been created by the policy of gentlemen on the other side, and because it paves the way to obtain those trade relations which the whole people of Canada desire, although the Canadian Parliament may have voted it down for the present time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman denied the statements that the Americans had set up any claim to bait, and he quoted me as having said that the President sent a Message after the treaty was made. I did not say anything about the President. I said Mr. Bayard claimed it. If he refers to the papers he will see that Mr. Bayard claimed it in the strongest manner, and so did Mr. Phelps in his representation to the Government in England.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, after the masterly speeches delivered on the subject before us; after the eloquent pleas which we have heard from both sides of the House, in favor of the treaty which we are asked to ratify, or against the treaty, it were perhaps presumption in me to rise in the House and take part in the debate. But, Mr. Speaker, I represent, if not the only maritime county in the Province of Quebec, at least that which is most deeply interested in the satisfactory settlement of this fisheries question, and I should judge myself wanting in duty if I did not impart to this honorable House my views on the subject. I shall be brief, as the arguments in favor of the treaty have been already exhausted by those who have gone before me. Still, one thing struck me in the debate which I have listened to: that the hon. members on this side of the House, who engaged in the debate, took pains, as it were, not to touch the question itself which forms the very subject of discussion. They spoke of everything else except the Treaty. They went even so far as to touch on the war of secession, the Irish question, Home Rule, and even the Manitoba monopoly. But the point to which they seemed best pleased to revert was that of reciprocity and free trade. I shall not undertake to refer to these arguments—which, according to me, are not arguments at all—but I shall treat the subject from a practical and business point of view, leaving to more authoritative voices than mine the task of elucidating the legal and international standpoints, as has, indeed, been already done, with much ability, by the hon. the Minister of Justice and my hon. friend, the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). Before going further, I wish to reply to a question just put by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). He asked the ground of the misunderstanding between the United States and Canada, and what it was that rendered necessary the appointment of a commission at Washington, which drafted the treaty that we are, at present, called upon to ratify. The hon. member for Quebec East seemed to say that the conduct of the Canadian Government was the cause of the difficulty. I dispute that point, Mr. Speaker, and say that if the hon. gentleman will recall the facts correctly, he will agree with me that the cause of the trouble was with the Americans who gave the Canadian Government notice of their intention not to renew the Treaty of Washington. And, Sir, the Government of this country afforded a striking proof of their goodwill and spirit of conciliation when, on the 30th June, 1885, they allowed American fishermen

Mr. LAURIER.

to go on with their fishing in Canadian waters for six months, in order that both nations might find time, either to appoint a commission or to adopt some means of reaching a satisfactory settlement of this question. But the Government of this country is charged with having been too severe in the application of the first clause of the Treaty of 1818. And while some of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House inveigh against the severity displayed by the Government of Canada in applying that clause of the treaty, we witness at the same time the curious spectacle of other members of the House finding fault with the Government for not yielding sufficiently, and insisting that they should have made further concessions. I have just said that I would treat this topic from a business and practical standpoint. I hold that in view of the interests of Canada, the treaty, which we are called upon to ratify, is a success for Canada; the solution of a difficulty which might have resulted in serious contention, and was a standing peril for our national institutions, and the development and improvement of our commerce. I state that, despite all the political considerations which party spirit may inspire, there is not a genuine Canadian who is not disposed and prejudiced beforehand against everything that the Government can do, who will not co-operate with the Government in arriving at a final and satisfactory solution of this question. On so important a question, I maintain that the interests of a party must make way for views that are broader, more national, and especially more patriotic. If we would safely, and with knowledge, judge if the treaty which we are being asked to ratify is hurtful or helpful to the interests of Canada, we must go to the very root of the misunderstanding which existed between the United States and Canada, and which brought about the present treaty. That cause rested wholly on the different interpretation put on that article of the Treaty of 1818 by the Canadian and American Governments:

"Whereas difficulties have arisen on the rights claimed by the United States for their inhabitants to take, dry and dress fish on certain coasts, bays, harbors and inlets of Her British Majesty's possessions in North America, it is agreed between the high contracting parties that the inhabitants of the said United States shall possess forever, in common with Her Majesty's subjects, the right of taking fish of all sorts on the portion of the southern coast of Newfoundland, extending from Cape Ray to the Palm Islands, on the western and northern coasts of Newfoundland from Cape Ray aforesaid to the Quiperon Islands, on the shores of the Magdalen Islands, as well as on the coasts, bays, harbors and inlets of Mount Joly on the southern coast of Labrador to the Straits of Belle Isle inclusive, and thence following the north shore indefinitely, without injury, however, to the exclusive rights of the Hudson's Bay Company. American fishermen will also enjoy forever the liberty of drying and dressing the fish in each of the inhabited harbors, bays and inlets of the said southern coast of Newfoundland and the coast of Labrador. But so soon as these tracts shall be more or less settled, the said fishermen will no longer have that privilege, unless they received beforehand the authority of the inhabitants, owners or possessors of the soil. The United States renounce forever the right hitherto claimed or held by their inhabitants of taking, drying, and dressing fish, a three naval miles or less than three miles from any coasts, bays, inlets or harbors of Her British Majesty's American possessions, not comprised in the limits herein designated; provided, however, that the American fishermen be admitted into the interior of the bays or harbors to seek shelter, to repair damages, to buy wood, and to fetch water and for any object whatever. The whole under such restrictions as shall be deemed necessary to prevent them from taking and dressing fish with in those limits, or abusing in any way the privilege reserved to them by these presents."

Still, Mr. Speaker, despite the tenor of this article, which could give rise to no doubt, Americans pretended that, in virtue of certain commercial treaties concluded between the United States and England, after 1818, they had the right to enter our harbors to revictual, discharge their cargoes, and even to purchase bait. If we strip this question of all the technical, political, legal and international cobwebs in which it is shrouded, we reach this conclusion: That, while Americans hold that they have a right, as I just said, in virtue of certain treaties of commerce concluded, after 1818, to revictual in our ports and there purchase bait, we put before them the first article of the Treaty of

1818 and told them that they must renounce these claims of theirs. We have been told, *ad nauseam*, that Canada had yielded everything and that we had received nothing from the Americans in return. Well, there is only need to peruse the correspondence exchanged between the American and Canadian authorities to be convinced that Secretary Bayard insisted on this fact—the most important of all to Americans—that his countrymen had the right to come in and buy bait from us. I shall say nothing about the question of headlands, which has been treated better than I could do it by several members on this side. I shall only reply to those who hold that the Canadian commissioners at Washington have sacrificed and abandoned all our rights. As I have just said, it is easily seen, from the correspondence between the American and Canadian authorities, that the United States Secretary of State always held and insisted on the fact that American fishing vessels had the same rights in our ports as merchant vessels, and that, more especially, they had the right of purchasing bait. The bait question is a vital one for the Americans, for certain fisheries, and particularly the cod fishery, which takes place on the Grand Banks, cannot be profitable unless the fishermen can procure fresh bait. Now, how does the present treaty settle this question? We shall have a reply in Article 15:

“When the United States shall abolish the duties on fish oils, whale and seal oils, and oils of all fishes, except those preserved in oil, coming from the catches of Canadian, Newfoundland and Labrador fishermen, as well as in ordinary and necessary casks, barrels, kegs and cans, and other ordinary and necessary packages containing the aforesaid products, the same products coming from the catches made by United States fishermen, and the ordinary and necessary packages containing them, as above described, shall be entered free of duty in Canada and Newfoundland.

“And on the abolition of this duty, and so long as the aforesaid articles may be brought from the United States by British subjects, without being subject to new duties, the privilege of entering the ports, bays and harbors of the aforesaid coasts of Canada and Newfoundland shall be granted to fishing vessels of the United States, by annual permits, issued *gratis*, for the following ends, to wit:—

“1. The purchase of provisions, bait, ice, seines, lines and all other supplies and equipments

“2. The transshipment of the fishery products, to be shipped forward by all means of transportation.

“3. The equipment of crews.

“Provisions shall not be obtained by barter or exchange, but bait may. The same privileges shall be continued or granted to the fishing vessels of Canada and Newfoundland, on the Atlantic coast belonging to the United States.”

We say, therefore, to the Americans: You insist on a point which for you is important and vital for your fishermen. We shall allow to purchase bait in our harbors when you allow the free entry of Canadian fish into American markets. This 15th clause of the treaty which we are called upon to ratify does not strike me as a concession. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) I think, in his brilliant speech on this subject, alluded to the bait question in these words:

“The question with regard to bait is one of the greatest possible importance. It is one which lies at the root of the fishery question, and the Americans justly understood and appreciated its value when they secured the privilege of obtaining bait under this treaty.”

The hon. gentleman makes a mistake here. The Americans did not secure the right of purchasing bait with us, in virtue of the treaty. It is true that, by the *modus vivendi* attached to the treaty, the Americans will enjoy this privilege for two years, but to exercise this privilege they will be held to pay \$.50 in the ton of each of their fishing vessels. I repeat that is not right ceded to American fishermen, but only a privilege which they are allowed to exercise. The hon. member for Halifax adds:

“The result of the operation of this will be that the bankers going to the Western Banks commonly use clam bait, but those going to the Grand Banks, where they get the fish which are suitable for the larger markets, cannot expect to catch those fish without the use of fresh bait. They are a long way away from their own home, and their fresh bait will only last a short time, and if they are compelled to return to their own ports to get fresh bait, if they can, and the supply is doubtful, and

if they cannot always get it, they would, practically, be almost compelled to give up the business altogether.”

This means, Mr. Speaker, that if the Americans cannot come into our ports to purchase the necessary bait, they cannot carry on their fishing with profit, and I believe that the hon. the Finance Minister (Sir Charles Tupper) and the British plenipotentiaries at Washington acted wisely in insisting on our right to prevent Americans from coming to buy bait among us. The hon. member for Halifax further says that this disposition will tend to the disadvantage of Canadian fishermen, because it will raise the price of bait and force Canadian fishermen to pay a higher price therefor. The hon. gentleman has overlooked two points—first that the number of Canadian fishermen plying their trade on the Grand Banks, and who thus are in need of periodically renewing their bait, is much smaller than he thinks, for in fact not more than one-quarter of the whole fishing population, while the greatest part, that is three-fourths, have no need to buy bait, as they can get it within a few steps of their own homes. He has also forgotten a second point—that Canadian fishermen can freely fish for bait in Canadian waters within the three-mile limit, where it is generally to be had, while the American fishermen have only the privilege of purchasing it. I have insisted on this head, because it is really the point in dispute, and the real cause of the misunderstanding between the two countries. It were an easy thing in reply to the arguments adduced by hon. members on the other side against the ratification of the treaty to quote articles from American papers showing that Canada had not conceded everything to the United States, and that on the contrary Americans fancied that they had been taken in, but I will confine myself to one article from the *New York Tribune* of 22nd February, 1838, which reads as follows:—

“The diplomatic triumph of the State Department is a lame and impotent conclusion. From the full text of the Fishery Treaty we understand how the Secretary of State looks on the stupid trick by means of which he mounted a decisive triumph. He never approached the subject from the standpoint of American interests. He treated it as a matter of international wrangling over the ambiguous ending of a former treaty, and a clashing of fisheries rights. He fancied that this affair was a mere controversy which could be settled by a new and more intelligent definition of these rights, and by a clearer wording of the controverted clauses of the Treaty of 1818. He negotiated an agreement on that ground, defining the three-mile limit, settling the question of headlands, and setting forth certain commercial privileges over and above the right conferred on American fishermen, seventy years ago, for obtaining ‘shelter, repairs, fuel and water in Canadian ports.’ In his mind, he succeeded fairly well in arranging these technicalities, but, were it so, he has not succeeded in shielding the national honor by a refusal of the right of any citizens involved in this legal controversy. He failed there, for the reason that he never understood that the credit of the country was compromised by these outrages in Canadian waters. There is nothing in the treaty to prevent a repetition of these insults in Canadian waters. The result will be as unpopular in Canada as in Britain. It affords no ground for the settlement of the fisheries question. The treaty should be rejected by a Senate that respects itself and patriotic enough to prepare a more efficacious plan for the protection of American rights.”

So you see, Mr. Speaker, that, while on this side there are cries that Canada has been fleeced, beyond the frontier Mr. Bayard and his colleagues are upbraided for having sacrificed the interests of the United States. The following is from the American correspondent of the *Toronto Mail* on the same subject:

“The commercial privileges in Canadian ports granted to American fishermen should not be regarded as a concession. They are rights pertaining to American fishermen which should not be bought by concessions, whether important or otherwise. The frontier line set down in the treaty will certainly exclude American fishermen from the right of fishing within the limit of three miles on the south coast of Newfoundland, and indefinitely to the north, on the coasts toward Labrador. American fishermen hold that they have a right to the inside fisheries of those countries and that this right should not have been surrendered as of little worth. The refusal of Great Britain to allow Americans the right of purchasing bait is the abandonment of a right which the United States have always claimed for their people, not only in virtue of the treaty, but also agreeably to admitted principles of international equity and the law of nations. The right of purchasing bait was—when all is said and done—the chief claim of American fishermen, after the right of entering the ports for the purpose of victualling and transshipping their fish.

Without the right of buying bait, the Americans have gained very little by the treaty. No invention has been made enabling Americans to carry bait enough in their refrigerators for a whole fishing cruise, and the refusal to allow Canadians to sell bait will be as harmful to them as the refusal of the right to buy the same is to the Americans."

The name of Mr. Wiman, the champion of free trade and reciprocity, has been uttered during this debate. Now, we know what this gentleman's views are on the subject, as we see in an answer of his, of last February, in reply to a despatch from the *Mail*, asking his opinion on the treaty. From Washington he replied by wire as follows:—

"That the treaty, in so far as its clauses are known, is the best settlement of an ugly quarrel that could be made under the circumstances. Although, at first sight, it might appear as if the interests of Canada were sacrificed, it will turn out that the Dominion has gained more thereby than it has lost. The provisions of the new treaty will have the effect of broadening the relations between the two countries, and will eliminate an element of grievous discord and danger which has hitherto kept them asunder and threatened their peace."

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, with saying, as Mr. Wiman has done, that the present treaty is the best possible settlement and the happiest solution of a vexed question that threatened real trouble. And the hon. the Minister of Finance will allow me to congratulate him heartily, in the name of the fishermen of Canada, whom I represent, for having taken up their cause with firmness of grasp, for having shielded them from the encroachments of the Americans, and for having furnished us with this treaty which, if it does not check strife for ever, will at least put us in the way of a final settlement.

Mr. ELLIS I feel it my duty to speak on this subject but I would not have addressed the House at all were it not that probably I differ from gentlemen on that side of the House as well as from my friends on this side on certain points. Several constructions have been put upon Mr. Bayard's letter, but the conclusion I come to with regard to that proposition to the Minister of Finance, was that, in Mr. Bayard's view, this country should become an independent country:

"It is evident that the commercial intercourse between the inhabitants of Canada and those of the United States has grown into too vast proportions to be exposed much longer to this wordy triangular duel, and more direct and responsible methods should be resorted to. * * *

"On the other hand, I believe I am animated by an equal desire to serve my own country; and trust to do it worthily. The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain, which has been *questio vexata* ever since it was concluded, and to-day is suffered to interfere with and seriously embarrass the good understanding of both countries in the important commercial relations and interests which have come into being since its ratification, and for the adjustment of which it is wholly inadequate, as has been unhappily proved by the events of the past two years."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is possible that the idea of commercial intercourse and commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity was in that, but it does appear to me looking at events which are transpiring now and with regard to which the House has not been taken into the confidence of the government, that it is the policy that this country should be independent and that Newfoundland should unite in that independence, a process which is now going on at the present moment. He then said:

"Great Britain being the only treaty-making party to deal with the United States, the envoys of that Government alone are authorised to speak in her behalf and create her obligations. I presume you will be personally constituted a plenipotentiary of Great Britain to arrange here with whomsoever may be selected to represent the United States terms of agreement for a *modus vivendi* to meet present emergencies and also a permanent plan to avoid all future disputes. It appears to me that as matters now stand the colony of Newfoundland ought to be represented and included, for a single arrangement should suffice to regulate all the joint and several interests involved. I should, therefore, be informed speedily through the proper channel as to the authorisation and appointment by the Imperial Government of such representatives."

But, Sir, I listened with great attention to the speech of the Minister of Finance, and I have read it over very carefully since, with regard to his remarks as to what Mr. Bayard meant by commercial union. Taking into account the

Mr. JONAS.

statement made by the hon. the Minister of Finance that he himself was disappointed when he got to Washington in regard to Mr. Bayard's views, it is impossible to get from the reference he made to that question any clear idea of what Mr. Bayard meant. It is true reference was made to the desire of Mr. Bayard that we should follow in some way the commercial arrangement of the United States, or that there should be some reciprocity. But it is impossible to get any idea of what the Minister meant by what he did say. He did say, however:

"I did not meet an American statesman who would not hold up both hands for commercial union with Canada. Why, Sir? Because he knows that it would give Canada to the United States; he knows that you would occupy the degrading position of having a neighboring country make your tariff and impose the taxes upon you."

Mr. Bayard most distinctly declared that he had no desire to affect in any way the political independence of Canada. He says:

"I say commercial because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, not to affect the legislative independence of either country."

It is impossible that Mr. Bayard has made that statement in the letter, and that he could reconcile it with the statement which the hon. gentleman has made. However, that is a matter for Mr. Bayard and himself to settle. Mr. Bayard made a memorable statement in reference to the general subject, and I think I might quote his words:

"I feel we stand at 'the parting of the ways.' In one direction I can see a well assured, steady, healthful relationship, devoid of petty jealousies, and filled with the fruits of a prosperity arising out of a friendship cemented by mutual interests, and enduring because based upon justice; on the other a career of embittered rivalry, staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility, in which victory means the destruction of an adjacent prosperity without gain to the prevalent party—a mutual, physical and moral deterioration which ought to be abhorrent to patriots on both sides, and which I am sure, no two men will exert themselves more to prevent than the parties to this unofficial correspondence."

And at the close of the negotiations, Mr. Bayard said:

"As he had expressed himself before, he felt that as a result of the controversies of the two preceding years, the two countries stood at the parting of the ways, and it became necessary to determine whether their future should be in the direction of friendship and mutual convenience, or of unfriendliness and alienation. He hoped the work that had been done by the Conference would decide that question, and that the bonds of amity between the two countries would be strengthened by the ties of friendly and mutually beneficial intercourse."

There is no doubt whatever that the troubles which arose were troubles almost entirely of our own creation. The hon. Minister himself could not get beyond the treaty. He says:

"We offered to remove all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, by an arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse."

To this the American commissioners replied that they declined to take up that matter:

"Because the greater freedom of commercial intercourse so proposed would necessitate an adjustment of the present tariff of the United States by congressional action, which adjustment the American plenipotentiaries consider to be manifestly impracticable of accomplishment through the medium of a treaty under the circumstances now existing."

These circumstances were unquestionably the hostility excited by our acts, which compelled them in their own self-interest to insist on an arrangement on the lines of the treaty alone. So they declared that the proposed trade arrangement could not be accepted as constituting a suitable basis of negotiation concerning the rights and privileges claimed for American fishing vessels. They, therefore, insisted that the adjustment of differences must be had by agreeing to an interpretation or modification of the Treaty of 1818. Now, Sir, at the very outset of the proceedings we were hindered and hampered by the difficulties which we ourselves had created, and which excited such a feeling in the American mind against us that Congress itself had declared in so many words that we were seeking, by the restrictions which we were putting on American fishermen, to drive them into freer trade relations with us, and they

felt it their duty to declare distinctly and positively that we could not do that by the course we were taking. Take the hon. Minister's own statement :

"Yesterday we stood face to face with a non-intercourse Bill, sustained by the united action of the Senate and House of Representatives, sustained by almost the whole press, Republican and Democratic, of the United States, sustained with few exceptions by a prejudiced, irritated and exasperated people of 66,000,000 lying to the south of us."

And again :

"They [the American negotiators] said that such was the expression of public men in regard to Canada, and the treatment by Canada of their fishermen that if to-morrow any relaxation of the commerce of the United States was made by an Act of Congress, it would contain a clause exempting Canada from its operations so as to deny us its advantages."

And continues the hon. gentleman :

"We turned our attention to the only means by which we could avert what everybody would feel would be the greatest disaster that could befall this country.

Now, Sir, the position in which we were placed, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, was, that among a people of sixty millions we scarcely had a friend. Yet, there are something like a million Canadians in the United States, but the hon. gentleman tells us that our position was such that there was not one of them to raise a voice for us. In the House of Representatives at Washington there are men of Canadian birth or origin, men who had lived in this country for a time, and who must have turned occasionally with some feeling of respect and affection to the land in which they had lived ; yet there was not one in the national legislature to raise his voice for us. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that the press, republican and democratic, were united against us. On that press there are many of our young men, too many, south and east and west, who are filling responsible positions on the press, and there was not one of those to say a word with voice or pen in the interest of Canada. The situation is so humiliating that it must have caused the hon. Minister of Finance quite a pang to make the statement to the House. Now, Sir, with regard to the concessions we have made, it will be well to remember that in 1818, when the treaty was made, there were very few custom houses, and very few ports of entry, and the American fishermen no doubt acquired by time and long usage privileges which they came in time to regard as rights. The whole situation was full of difficulty but immediately after the expiration of the Treaty of 1871 we commenced to enforce with greater strictness and rigor than ever before our regulations—so much so that the Americans spoke of our action as unfair, ungenerous, and inhospitable, and what some would call inconsistent ; members of Congress spoke of our passion and spite, and a prominent member of Congress described our enforcement of the treaty as inhuman. The treaty was one intended to give American fishermen shelter, and it was intended that when they came into our ports or along our coasts, and when seeking that shelter, they should be just as much in the exercise of their rights as our own people. But we made it so difficult that many of them preferred to seek the open sea to entering our ports at all. The hon. Minister of Marine the other night, in an endeavor to satisfy the House that his treatment of these fishermen had been very humane, made this statement to show how lenient he had been :

"The schooner *Hereward* was detained for shipping a man, and was released immediately with a warning. The *Boynton* was allowed to land an injured man from her vessel for medical attention. The *Fanny Starling* was allowed to purchase provisions for her homeward voyage. The *French* was allowed to ship a crew to take the vessel home when he discharged her own crew, and was detained for repairs quite a long time. The *French* and *Argonaut* were seized within the three-mile limit and their crews allowed to be shipped home in United States fishing vessels. Technically we could have insisted that they should not have this privilege, but we gave the privilege and gave it heartily. The schooner *Perkins* had shipped a man illegally and was detained, but she was released after discharging the man. The schooner *Gracey* was allowed to ship men to take the vessel home. The schooner *Perkins*

was extended the same courtesy. The schooner *Pendragon*, whose crew had sickness on board, was, under medical advice, allowed to purchase fresh provisions and meats of all kinds, just as long as the doctor gave a certificate that it was necessary for the health of the crew."

And so on through a long list. Well, I think it is discreditable to the country that the hon. Minister of Marine should take credit for such things as these. Why, they are the ordinary things a man would give to his enemy under the circumstances. Along our coasts, where their vessels are continually coming, as our vessels are continually going along their coasts, there is a constant interchange of courtesies and civilities. The customs and coast-guard vessels of the United States have frequently towed our vessels through ice and other dangers and difficulties, have taken them into port and out, making no difference between the vessels of the two countries ; and yet the hon. gentleman claims credit for himself and his department that they did these things. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman can have no soul—no official soul, at any rate. A case of a particular kind was mentioned last year by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), where a vessel came into port where a man lived who had been lost overboard. The captain desired to land his effects and went ashore. During his absence, as was the common custom, the men went ashore, yet that man's vessel was seized and a fine of \$200 imposed upon him. He was in a strange place, had no money and had to go around and raise it as best he could. When the matter was represented to Ottawa, the Minister of Customs undoubtedly remitted the fine and allowed the vessel to go free, but the very fact that this imposition was put on the captain, shows how easy it is, by means of such imposition, to create the feeling which the hon. Minister of Finance described as existing in the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend name the vessel ?

Mr. ELLIS. I do not know the name.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentlemen vouch for the accuracy of the statement ?

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) made the statement last year in his place in the House, and the hon. gentleman did not contradict it then.

Mr. EDGAR. The vessel was the *Pearl Nelson*, and the fine was \$200.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you vouch for that ?

Mr. EDGAR. I have the blue-books which will prove it.

Mr. ELLIS. It is just possible that the Opposition itself in this House was rather too lenient with reference to the conduct and policy of the Government. I do not wish to refer strongly to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries because, in this matter, I am enjoying my little triumph over him, in a quiet way ; but he went down to the constituency of St. John, in 1887, and made there an eloquent speech. One of his positions was that he had introduced in the House of Commons a Bill which made it forfeiture for a vessel to be found within the three-mile limit, except for the purposes of shelter and repair and obtaining wood and water. I do not know how to characterise such a boast in language fitted to characterise it, which would not meet, Sir, with your censure, but the boast is one that reflects no credit on the country, and which would naturally be taken hold of by the American people to show how ungenerous we were. It has been constantly announced by the Government up to the present year that there was to be no change in their policy. It was only last year that the Premier said :

"We stood simply on our rights, we stood simply on the Convention of 1818. We stated, and we hold to it, that the change of years and the commercial treaties that have been made between England and the United States did not and could not in any way, in the most remote degree, affect the terms of the Convention of 1818 ; that convention was

made with due deliberations as a matter of mutual concession, and in which a good deal was given to the United States, as well as something given up by England. It was a bargain with consideration on both sides. We hold to that, and we hold further, that the contention that it has been in any way altered or given up, or that it could be altered, or could be in any way denounced, to use the diplomatic phrase, is out of the question. It could not be, and I have no doubt it will not be."

The treaty before the House which we are now discussing is pretty good evidence of the change that has come over the Ministry on that point. Take up the treaty itself: the first eight articles relating to the headland question, and compare them with what the First Minister said last year on that point. He said:

"There are only two questions in which there can be any contention. The first is the headland question, which we are all acquainted with. We all know what that means. We adhere to the position taken by the British Government from the time of Lord Bathurst until now, that the three miles are to be taken from the headlands and not from the sinuosities of the bay."

With regard to the headlands question, I observe that the treaty itself follows the proposition of Mr. Adams in 1866, as modified by Mr. Bayard. That proposition has been accepted by the Government. I do not propose to find any particular fault with the arrangement made. Some compromise was absolutely necessary, and this is perhaps not worse than any other that might be made. Mr. Bayard, in supplementing Mr. Adams' proposal, proposed that bays and harbours from which American vessels are in future to be excluded are:

"Agreed to be taken to be such bays and harbours as are ten or less than ten miles in width, and the distance of three marine miles from such bays and harbours shall be measured from a straight line drawn across the bay or harbor in the part nearest the entrance at the first point where the width does not exceed ten miles."

The Privy Council thus replied to that proposition:

"This provision would involve a surrender of fishing rights which have always been regarded as the exclusive property of Canada, and would make common fishing grounds of territorial waters which by the law of nations have been invariably regarded both in Great Britain and the United States as belonging to the adjacent country."

By the 10th and 11th articles we have receded very far from the ground originally taken by the public authorities and have undoubtedly placed the American fishermen in a better position to enjoy the rights and privileges they were to enjoy under the Treaty of 1818. I have gone carefully over the treaty, and the contentions made by our own state department, and I have made a summary, which I trust the House will permit me to read, of the concessions made:

"We have, by the very act of making this treaty, receded from the position maintained so long in practice, that Canada and Great Britain could impose their own interpretations upon the meaning of the Treaty of 1818, thus enlarging the limitations of that treaty. By doing this we have given the United States a precedent upon which to base new demands for the amelioration of the regulations applied to their fishing vessels should the need arise.

"We have almost wholly abandoned the contention that fishing vessels are a class by themselves and, therefore, not entitled to any commercial privileges.

"We entirely and forever abandon the three mile headland theory.

"We forever admit the right of United States fishermen to navigate the Straits of Canso.

"We no longer compel American fishing vessels to depart from our shores in twenty-four hours after arrival.

"We relieve them from the obnoxious operations of the customs regulations enforced against them as fishing vessels, and which were specially severe, as the true intent of these laws was to regulate commercial trading only.

"We free them from harbor, pilotage and other dues which were sometimes inhospitably, and often capriciously imposed upon them, even in cases when they sought shelter, dealing with them in these matters as commercial vessels, though denying them the rights of commercial vessels.

"We have practically abandoned the course of ordering them to depart if supposed to be hovering within our waters; and also the plan of putting an officer on board of them as a matter of course.

"We permit them under certain circumstances to purchase bait, to replenish outfits, to ship men, and to transfer cargoes.

"We issue to them, free of charge, permits which enable them to purchase supplies in ports of entry, on all occasions, just as trading vessels, except that they may not do it for barter, and this applies both to the homeward voyage and outer voyages.

Mr. ELLIS.

The second section of Article 11 does not name bait, but there will be no difficulty whatever of purchasing bait under it.

"By the 14th article we abandon our previous contention that preparing within Canadian waters to fish is evidence of intention to actually fish within Canadian waters, and we therefore recede from the position taken by the Act of 1886.

"We have limited, and defined, and reduced the severe penalties imposed by that Act for violation of our exclusive rights of fishing. Forfeiture of the vessel is no longer a penalty except for fishing within Canadian waters, or preparing within these waters to fish therein. In all other cases \$3 a ton is the highest fine which can be imposed.

"We have provided a summary process of law for dealing with arrested or captured vessels, instead of the old and slow process of the Admiralty Court.

"And, lest the punishment of an infraction of the new treaty, or that of 1818, should seem to be unjust, and to prevent the danger of giving offence to the United States, the Government of Canada can reverse the judgment of the court."

The United States negotiators, on the other side, recognise that we are not required by the Treaty of 1818 to sell their fishermen bait, ice or general outfits, to tranship cargoes, or to ship men, in ordinary cases, but by the protocol we give them the privilege of doing these things, although the Minister of Justice said:

"If the Provinces are to be the judges it is most prejudicial to their interests that United States fishermen should be permitted to come into their harbors on any pretext, and it is fatal to their fishery interests that those fishermen, with whom they have to compete at such a disadvantage in the markets of the United States, should be allowed to enter for supplies and bait even for the pursuit of the deep sea fisheries."

Certainly the Minister has abandoned that position. And so going through the whole correspondence, through all the warnings, through all the rigorous custom house regulations, through the utterances of the press, through the declarations of the Ministers, and you will find a thorough and complete change of attitude on almost every point in this controversy. What we have lost by what we have surrendered I do not know. If we consider what we have lost by the efforts which have been made to prevent our coming to any arrangement, we must have lost a great deal. As to the jeopardy in which we are placed, it has been described by the Minister of Finance. I think we have made very many concessions indeed. But I regret that we have been compelled, in an ungracious way, to do a gracious act. I do not find any fault with anything which has been done in that particular. On the contrary, I rather approve of the treaty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ELLIS. Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear," but I think they might review their own conduct and see where they stand to-day and see where they stood one or two years ago. No doubt we have learned a good lesson. We have learned that, in dealing with an international matter, we cannot afford to set up these small restrictions, and treat the Government of the United States as some in this House appear to be inclined to do. The Minister of Finance made a reference to the power which was behind us when we made a treaty. There may be a great power behind us, but it did not stand by us in regard to this treaty, and, when the Premier said that we would have the British forces behind us, it is well to ask where these were in regard to the carrying out of the Treaty of 1818. The British Government have not backed us up, but have left us behind in that matter, and the same inference may be drawn in reference to the new treaty should it become necessary to defend it. While on this point, I might make a remark in regard to what was said by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) on Friday last. The facts which the hon. gentleman stated may be correct, but I do not think we should find fault with England because she chooses to pursue her own way. I do not see that we should make complaint in regard to the mother country. I think that men of fair mind and large judgment in that country, must have been astonished at the position we took; I do not think that men with humane and

generous minds could have defended the positions we took in regard to the vessels of a friendly power. It is in the nature of things that we should pursue different ways, we should remember that England is and has been a model to the world, and should say nothing harsh about her. If this treaty stands in any jeopardy in the Senate of the United States, it is entirely due to ourselves. No doubt the Government is very anxious to carry the treaty. But you may understand the feeling in the United States as to the treaty, or as to any treaty, under the circumstances. I think the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us that in the past two years 2,200 American vessels had been boarded by our cruisers in our waters. If anything could be calculated to excite the antagonism of a people, it must be that sort of conduct. You may have a right to do it, but to exercise that right must necessarily excite the greatest hostility. You had all these complaints made. I think there were fifty vessels involved in one set of complaints, and seventy in another which were made to the Government of this country by the people of the United States as to the way in which we treated those vessels, and claims to the number of 150 or 200 were sent in. All this must have the effect of putting the people of the United States and the Senate of that country in a very unpleasant condition with regard to us. The Minister of Finance, in bringing down his statement, gave us no information as to the position of the claims for damages against us, but I understand, from a published letter of Mr. Bayard, that he is allowing them to stand over as against claims made for damages in the Behring Sea. With regard to the detention of vessels, I do not know how many there are, but I assume that these vessels are to be released. Now, Sir, if these vessels are to be released, it seems to me a very strong acknowledgment that, at any rate, our case was a doubtful one. With reference to the general question of the purchase of bait, referred to by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) the other night, with regard to the purchase of ice and supplies, and wood and coal, and the transshipment of cargoes and crews, I think it would be better for the Government to make an open arrangement with the United States with respect to all these things. It is an utter absurdity in these times to say that we shall not sell bait. There are two sides to the question. Men who are engaged in collecting bait along the coast, whose business it is to sell bait, want to sell it. An hon. member said the other night that the effect of allowing bait to be sold would be to make it dear. Well, people who have bait to sell would like to have it made dear. Then, with regard to ice. When the Treaty of 1818 was made no such thing as ice was used. Why should not men along the coast be allowed to sell ice to any fisherman that comes along? Why should they not be allowed to ship their crews? The hon. gentleman told us, as if it was something wonderful, that we were not to allow transshipment of crews, as if it was some great gain. It is absurd to make men who live in the towns along the coast in Nova Scotia travel by railway to the United States ports for the purpose of entering on board a fishing vessel. So with regard to the transshipment of cargo. Why should not cargoes be transhipped when there are on our coast railways to do the business? Now, I noticed in a paper the other day that there are 8,000 men in the New England deep-sea fisheries, and 60 to 75 per cent. of them are natives of the Lower Provinces. Is it not an absurdity to compel these men to go by railway to New England ports to join a fishing vessel, and then not allow them to be discharged at the port where the voyage ends? What will be the effect of this? The United States, a year or two ago, passed a Bill called the Labor Contract Act. Our men, instead of paying railway fares, now ship as passengers on board passenger vessels, and sail to the United States port at which they are about to engage on fishing vessels, and

where they are to stop on their voyage. The United States authorities have stopped them, have arrested these men. The other day in Boston a large number of natives of Yarmouth and Shelburne were arrested for violation of the Labor Contract Act, and they are subject to fine and imprisonment, because they go into that country under a contract to go fishing. The policy, therefore, in this respect, is one that bears harder upon ourselves than upon American fishermen. The whole object of the Treaty of 1818, and all its restrictions, have passed away. There were two objects in that treaty. One was the determination on the part of the British people of that day, backed by the leaders of the colonial people, to suppress democracy. It was supposed that we would be able to grow a power in the colonies which would check the power of the United States. Another idea was that the fisheries would become the nursery of seamen for the English navy, with which to check the power of the United States and of France. Well, Sir, England herself has become more democratic than the colony, and as to our fishermen, they never have shipped on board a British man-of-war. I do not know whether they have higher or lower aspirations, but at any rate the whole object of that treaty has failed. Therefore, it is better for the Government to take up this whole matter with a strong hand and open out the whole question. It is better not to make any restrictions at all, but to open them as a matter of trade, and say to the United States: We are willing to make the best trade we can with you, under the circumstances. We recognise fully that it is better to have freedom of trade, better to enter into a liberal arrangement with regard to the people of the United States as being beneficial to our own people and to ourselves. Now, Sir, with regard to the contention that the treaty gives us anything, it is perfectly absurd. No one has shown where we get any advantage. The hon. member for Queen's, P.R.I., the other night went over the ground thoroughly, and from his point of view he showed exactly what the position is. The hon. Minister of Justice tuned up his fiddle and played us a very pretty little jig, at which all of us could laugh, whether we were on the Government side or not; but he really did not meet the arguments of the hon. member for Queen's as to what the treaty takes away from us. The main ground upon which this treaty can be defended, the ground upon which I support it, is that it is friendly to the United States. It is a treaty of peace. What we surrender may not be very great. It is absolutely necessary for us to live on the most friendly terms with the United States; it is a most desirable thing that all the arrangements between the two countries, and all the relations between them, shall be of the most harmonious character, so as to prevent trouble and discord among the two peoples. We are constantly, in winter and summer, the recipients of favors from the people along the coast. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support this treaty because of its friendliness to the United States, because it sweeps away restrictions which are unnecessary, which are of no benefit to ourselves, and when removed may be of great benefit to that people and to ourselves in the way of peace, both for this country and the Empire at large. Now, Sir, I must cordially congratulate the Minister of Finance upon his treaty. I do not want to express in as strong terms as I would like to, the appreciation I feel of the work he has done. Words of mine, which would seem to me to be only words of just praise for the work he has done, might seem to the House, perhaps—to this side at any rate—words of extravagant eulogy; therefore I will not use them. But I do say that he has done a great work for Canada, he has done a great work for England, and he has done considerable good work for the United States in this House, and I trust that, in whatever way his reward may come, it will be satisfactory to him. But, Sir, it is well to note that in what he has done, he has bowled over the most important members of the Cabinet. He has swept

away, as with a sponge on a blackboard, the declarations of the Premier himself; he has wiped out the arbitrary regulations of the Minister of Customs, or at any rate, their application to the fishing vessels; he has swept away the pleadings of the Minister of Justice; and, with the breath of his nostrils he has extinguished the false lights put up along the shore by the Minister of Marine, which were luring the Ship of State to destruction. Therefore he is to be congratulated. I do not know whether he likes this kind of congratulations, but they are such as I give, and I give them most heartily. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the treaty will be ratified here. I venture to hope that, as in this Parliament, so in the Senate of the United States, the able men composing that great deliberative body, will accept this treaty, not alone for its practical benefits, but as an acknowledgment of our determination to do justice, too long delayed, as an olive branch of peace, as an evidence of our desire to continue, and to expand, and to make perpetual, the friendly relations between England and her oldest child in America, and to cement more closely and more firmly the friendly relationship of Canada to the United States.

Mr. LANDRY. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. Upon his rising to address the House I made up my mind that coming from New Brunswick and knowing him to be possessed of the intelligence that he does possess, knowing that he is as well informed on public questions as he is, the arguments he would use to this House might possibly require some answer to constituencies of New Brunswick, if not to any other constituency, and I listened with the object of replying to the arguments he might offer. But, to my great astonishment, when he finished he himself had answered his own speech. During remarks occupying fifteen or twenty minutes he condemned the treaty in every possible way, and he pointed out to this House all the concessions made, he pointed out their nature, in what respects they had been made and I expected him to find fault with the surrender of all those rights and privileges which we enjoyed and which had by this treaty been surrendered to the United States; but upon concluding he congratulated the Minister of Finance upon having made such an excellent treaty, upon having rendered such great service to the country and the people of Canada, but he did not forget to say also that he had rendered equally great service to the people of the United States. I cannot say that the hon. gentleman spoke very differently from other hon. members who have spoken on the other side of the House. It is true they have made some semblance of finding fault with the treaty; but upon the whole not one hon. gentleman has said he would oppose it by his vote. They have found fault more particularly in regard to what brought about the treaty; and yet what would they have done? they admitted by their argument that the treaty was brought about because of the regulations enforced by the Government since the abrogation of the last treaty. They say, or in effect they say, that the reason this treaty was brought about was because of the position taken in regard to those regulations, and most of them admit that we had a right to put them in force, that they were strictly within our right to pass, although they think the Government did not act discretely in enforcing them. I would answer them in this way; had the Government acted as hon. gentlemen opposite desired them to have acted for the last two or three years, we would not have had to-day this treaty of which they speak so highly. If we had allowed the United States vessels to have free use of our fisheries, if we had never opened our mouths to find fault with those who came within our waters and poach on our fisheries for years, obliging the Government to protest against those acts, as they did, no treaty would have been negotiated.

Mr. ELLIS.

and we would not have had this great blessing regarding which gentlemen opposite have congratulated the Government so frankly and so honestly. I, therefore, believe if we have a treaty to-night it is simply because when the other treaty came to an end the Government, understanding the interests of the Canadian people, endeavored to put in force that which it is not disputed we had a right to put in force. The only question respecting which I can to some extent agree with hon. gentlemen opposite when they spoke of having made a surrender, and I cannot help giving expression to my opinion in this House, was that so far as I interpret what is given by us under this treaty, although the matters may not be very valuable in view of the interests of peace, good government and relationship which we hope will always exist between this country and the United States, and I say those matters were not a great deal to surrender to secure those objects—yet if there was anything surrendered I believe it was surrendered by us and not by the United States. It is true the United States have given up a great deal of their contention, that they contended for a great deal which they did not get; but according to my interpretation, they were imaginary rights whereas ours were real rights under the treaty, rights which under the interpretation of a proper tribunal would have been found to exist under the treaty. But not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite has pointed out what we have lost by the surrender made. The hon. gentleman who last spoke pointed out thirteen or fourteen different things we had surrendered, but he did not point out that this country had lost anything by it, he did not show that we had made a surrender that injured our interests and in proportion benefited the people of the United States. On the contrary, he told us that he was not prepared to say it would be any loss to us. The only ground upon which he calculates the treaty might be an injury, was simply in view of the contentions made by us previous to the negotiations; but if we take the hon. gentleman's own contentions made before he spoke to-night in this House, we will see that his contentions were somewhat hostile to the contentions made by the Government. What did he say in the paper over which he has control. He said:

"There is a doubt whether an American fishing vessel has the right under the Treaty of 1818 to enter our harbors and buy bait. But an arrangement made 70 years ago will not work now. The Government of Canada in reviving a treaty 70 years old have done a thing which they will not be able to stand by, and which will make this country ridiculous in the eyes of the world."

That was his opinion in 1886.

Mr. ELLIS. That is my opinion now.

Mr. LANDRY. Then what does the hon. gentleman find fault with? He was only grieved because it did not occur sooner. If it had occurred sooner, there would have been no occasion for the treaty. He told us that the circumstances that brought about the Treaty of 1818 disappeared, and therefore, it was necessary to have another treaty. There was an absolute necessity, according to the hon. gentleman, for having a new treaty, because the reasons that led to the Treaty of 1818 had disappeared. If there were such reasons, was the Government wrong in negotiating a treaty? Certainly not. The next question is whether the treaty is one that we can approve. Not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite has endeavored to point out that it is not one that we should approve. They all say we should approve it, and no vote will be taken respecting it. I admit that at the beginning of the debate if hon. gentlemen opposite had taken the stand that the treaty should not be accepted, as it was a base surrender of rights which it was our duty to guard and maintain and not surrender—and I take it that the Parliament of Canada still has it in its own hands, notwithstanding the negotiation that has taken place, the duty of determining whether the treaty shall be passed, and that

we can still stay our hand and cry halt, and say we will wait for something better—if they had taken that ground I could have sympathised with them to some extent, because they would have believed we were surrendering valuable rights. They do not, however, take that position. On the contrary, they take this position: While they blame the Government and use very strong language, the late Finance Minister using very strong language indeed, stating that the Government had in a cowardly manner surrendered, that according to their own admission they would have surrendered long before they came face to face with the American Government; they would have surrendered when the American fishermen came to poach upon our fisheries, and they would have hauled down the flag at that time, to use the words of the hon. gentleman opposite. They found fault with that surrender, and at a time when it was, in my opinion, proper and right and fair to make surrenders, if the surrenders were called for, because when a treaty is being made surrenders have to be made on both sides. If surrenders have been made on both sides, it is in order to ensure the friendly relations which we say ought to exist between the two peoples. When the time comes for discussing those matters in a friendly manner face to face, it is the time to see what one can concede on one side, and what one can concede on the other, for the benefit of both countries. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite in what are our rights surrendered, or on what false position are we placed by those negotiations? I cannot see it, and I have therefore much pleasure in joining with the hon. gentleman from the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis) and with the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in giving my vote for the ratification of this treaty.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, it was towards the close of last Session before the Government laid on the Table of the House the blue books which furnished the information upon which we have to judge very largely of this treaty. During the short time we had before the Session closed, after the correspondence was brought down, I did not do more than take a cursory glance at it, and very little opportunity was afforded to discuss it before the House closed. I must admit that I did feel in reading it very much pained and surprised at parts of the correspondence which was laid before us. I however felt that as the matter was opened up for negotiation between Canada and the United States that even if the opportunity had presented itself it would not have been right for us to wash our dirty linen in public, as it were, and to take the ground which might be construed to be in favor of the American contention. I was not surprised, however, at the arguments of the Government contained in the correspondence. I dare say they were all correct, and they were very able arguments indeed, but what I was pained and grieved at, as a Canadian, was to see the hard and inhumane way and the most imprudent manner in which our Government had enforced the technical rights which they claimed under the old Treaty of 1818. The hon. the Minister of Finance has had to educate his party a good deal recently, and there was a remark which he made in his speech the other day, which I think will apply admirably to the conduct of his colleagues in 1886, in reference to American fishing vessels. This is what he said:

"It is one thing to hold a technical construction and it is another thing to enforce it."

I do not find fault for the holding of a technical construction by the Government, but I do find fault with the manner in which they enforced it. I do not like to see this treaty carried by the House unless I for one protest against the many acts of the Government which have produced those many cases of complaint, and which I have no doubt the British commissioners in private, during the course of the negotiations, have had to admit and must have apologised for. I will give three or four instances which will illustrate

the others. There was the case of the *Shiloh* in which the contention was made that Canadian fishermen who happened to be on this American fishing vessel in a port should not be allowed to step on shore to see their friends. They were prevented from doing so. Now I say if that can be justified according to the strict interpretation of the laws of the Medes and Persians it was the most unwise and improper and inhumane thing to enforce it against our Canadian fishermen. It has been alleged against us on this side that we take the contentions of the American law breakers. I shall go to the reports of the officers of our own Government and prove from their own officials the injustice in the case. Capt. Thos. Quigley of the Government cruiser *Terror* reports:

"In the case of the *Shiloh* she came into the harbor about six p m, on the ninth of August, at Liverpool, and a signal was fired in her case the same as the others."

Just as if she was a pirate,—

"When she anchored I boarded her, and the captain reported he was in for water. I told him it was then too late to report at the custom house till morning, and that he must not allow his crew on shore, also that I would leave two men on board to see that he did not otherwise break the law and that my instructions were carried out."

"In the morning I called for the captain when taking the *Julia and Ellen* captain ashore. From there I told him as I did the other that his men could go on taking water while he was reporting, so that he could sail when he returned and not be delayed. This they did not do."

"I have reason to know that it was not water this vessel came in for, as several of the crew lived there and it was for the purpose of letting his men ashore and not for taking water that he put in. He afterwards emptied six barrels of water, stating they were sour, and fooled all day filling them, delaying the time that he might get his crew on shore. I refused to allow his crew on shore for any other purpose than to take water, after completing which, the weather being fine I ordered him to sea in the evening."

"In all cases, except when in for repairs, I place men on board to see that the law is not violated, as many of these vessels put in for the harbor and make taking water and seeking shelter an excuse either to get men or land them, or to allow them a chance to see their friends."

What a crime it was for several of the crew of the American vessels who lived in the port of Shelburne to desire to get on shore to see their friends. The officer complains that the American captain came for the purpose of putting his men ashore and not to take in water. Here is the valiant commander of a government cruiser who prevents his Canadian fellow citizens from coming on shore to see their friends, on the ground of some technical regulations of the Government. I come to the case of the *Pearl Nelson*, of which I told the Minister of Marine just now, when he interrupted the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Ellis), with an enquiry regarding that vessel's name. I told him I would be able to show that the *Pearl Nelson* was fined \$200 by the custom house officer, and that the captain of that vessel was refused permission to land the clothes of a dead Canadian at the port of Arichat until \$200 was paid.

Mr. FOSTER. We will hear how you will prove it now.

Mr. EDGAR. I will prove it just as I said I would prove it. I take, in the first place, the allegation of the American captain who says:

"I had lost a man on the Grand Banks named James Sampson, who belonged to Arichat, and I wanted to land his effects if the customs officers would allow me to. Some of my crew belonged in that neighborhood. William Batineau, my cook, and nine others of my crew took boats off the deck and went ashore without asking my permission. I saw them, but had never known that was any objection. I had been in this and other British and American ports frequently, and witnessed the landing from my own and other vessels' crews, but never before heard such landing was illegal or improper. These men took nothing with them from the vessel, nor carried away anything but the clothes they wore."

"From the time I left Provincetown I had been into no port anywhere. Next morning after my arrival in Arichat, at 8.30 o'clock, I went ashore to enter at the custom house and found it closed. I called at nine o'clock and it was not opened. I went again at ten o'clock and found the collector opening the office door. I made the regular inward report to him, and requested permission to land the clothes of James Sampson, who had been lost from my vessel on the Grand Banks."

"He told me he had sent a man for me. After I got there this man came into the office and was holding my papers, and told the man to go back and take charge of the vessel."

"I asked him why he held my papers. He replied he seized her because I had allowed my men to go ashore before reporting at the custom house; that all he could tell me was, he said he would telegraph to Ottawa and find out what to do with me, and he did telegraph immediately. About 5 o'clock p.m. the collector received an answer, and told me to deposit \$200, and the vessel would be released. The collector would not allow me to land this dead man's clothes until after I had paid the \$200 fine."

That is his allegation.

Mr. FOSTER. What day was that?

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose the 18th of September. Now, what does the report of the hon. Minister of Marine say:

"The Minister also submits that it is clear from Capt. Kemp's affidavit that he was guilty of an infraction of the customs regulations in allowing men to land from his vessel before she had been reported, and the Minister of Customs having favorably considered Capt. Kemp's representations as to his ignorance of the customs regulation, requiring that vessels should be reported before landing either men or cargo therefrom, has remitted the fine of \$200 which had been imposed, in the case of the American schooner *Pearl Nelson*."

The enclosed shows that the report of Mr. Johnston, when the remission was made, was dated 22nd October, more than a month after the fine had been imposed. There is no contradiction to the allegation that this man was not allowed to land that dead man's clothes until he paid the \$200. He was fined for sending some men on shore with the dead man's clothes, I suppose.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. EDGAR. Well, without them. I do not care how it was, he was not allowed to send this dead man's clothes on shore until he paid the fine. Let us take a case of another class—a case in which a vessel was refused permission to buy a few trifling supplies. The captain says:

"On Tuesday, 5th October, we made Shelburne, N.S., and arrived in that harbor about 8 o'clock, p.m., on that day, short of provisions, water and oil to burn. On Wednesday, I sailed for the inner harbor of Shelburne, arriving at the town about 4 p.m. On going ashore I found the custom house closed, and hunted up the collector and entered my vessel, and asked permission from him to buy 7 lbs sugar, 3 lbs coffee, $\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 bushel potatoes, and 2 lbs butter or lard or pork, and oil enough to last us home, and was refused. I stated to him my situation, short of provisions and a voyage of 250 miles before, and pleaded with him for this slight privilege, but it was of no avail. I then visited the American consul and asked his assistance, and found him powerless to aid me in this matter. The collector of customs held my papers until the next morning, although I asked for him as soon as I found I could not buy any provisions, say about one and a half hours after I entered, but he refused to give them to me until the next morning. Immediately on receiving my papers on Thursday morning, I started for home, arriving on Sunday. I think the treatment I received harsh and cruel, driving myself and crew to sea with a scanty supply of provisions, we having but little flour and water, and liable to be buffeted for days before reaching home."

The answer of the collector of customs to that is that he had gone to an agricultural exhibition, and he went on:

"I had been on the grounds about 15 minutes when Captain Rose put in an appearance, and I at once came to the office, and he reported his vessel, stated that he was from the Bank bound home, and came in to fill water and wanted provisions as follows, viz., 7 lbs sugar, 3 lbs coffee, 1 bushel potatoes and 2 lbs butter. This was all. I took a memo. and attached it to his inward report, and oil is not mentioned. Stated that he had plenty of flour, fish and other provisions sufficient for voyage home. I gave him permission to fill water at once, but as the treaty made no provision for purchase of supplies I would telegraph to the Department at Ottawa, and no doubt it would be allowed."

Mr. BOWELL. Quite right.

Mr. EDGAR:

"Captain Rose expressed his willingness to remain until a reply was received. He called at the office next morning (Thursday) at 6.30 a.m. and not finding I had received a reply, said as the wind was fair and a good breeze, he would not wait longer, and would take a clearance, which I gave him."

The hon. Minister of Customs says the collector was quite right to telegraph to the grand panjandrum at Ottawa. I will quote to the hon. Minister of Customs the words of the hon. Finance Minister again:

"It is one thing to hold a technical construction, and it is another thing to enforce it."

Mr. EDGAR.

Perhaps the hon. Minister of Customs will tell us that the collector enforced these stringent regulations because the Americans did. I think I have heard that contention before, but the hon. Minister of Finance meets that very question in his speech, because he has surrendered rights of that kind; and as an excuse for doing that which I do not think required any excuse at all in this Parliament—he should rather have excused the previous acts of his administration—with reference to the concessions made in Article 10, he said:

"A great deal was made of the apparent injustice of subjecting vessels obliged to put in for humane purposes, such as vessels in distress and vessels under stress of weather to come under the clause of the treaty that allowed vessels to come in for those four purposes. A great deal was made of the difficulties that were thrown in their way, and the obstructions that were placed apparently by Canada, in the way of their exercising and enjoying those privileges that the treaty of 1818 clearly and distinctly provided they should enjoy. I think, Sir, that this House and the people of this country will agree with me that it was not undesirable in the interests of good neighborhood, in the interests of the good reputation of Canada for humane and friendly consideration to vessels in distress, obliged to put into our ports for shelter, and especially where they had under the treaty right a right to come in under such circumstances, that we should remove any obstructions or hindrances that lay in their way."

Then the hon. the Minister of Finance goes on to say:

"It was urged, on the other hand, that in the United States our fishing vessels were not treated with the same stringency that those vessels were which under treaty right are permitted to come into our waters for those four purposes, and evidence was placed before the commission to show that in the port of Portland the course pursued was a more liberal course than the stringent regulations which had been used in Canada. The collector of that port who had been collector for 10 years was examined and gave his testimony as to the treatment of the Dominion vessels in the United States waters. He was asked:

"During the time you have been deputy collector, whether or not, there have been numerous cases of Dominion vessels, including vessels engaged in fishing in that port, and if they failed to report, though lying more than twenty-four hours, have penalties been imposed for such failure during the term of your service?"

"His answer was, as I remember:

"If there were any instances of Dominion vessels failing to report when lying more than twenty-four hours, their presence has been overlooked by the port officers. I do not recall from memory a single instance when or where a penalty was imposed, and I find no record of any such payments in the accounts of this office."

So that our Customs Department had not even the miserable excuse that the others were doing it to, and if they had that excuse two wrongs would not make one right. What was the opinion about this harsh construction of the treaties of Mr. Chamberlain himself. In speaking at Mr. Wiman's banquet, he is reported in the *London Times* to have said:

"This interference, whether justified by law or not, inevitably provoked great irritation and ill-feeling in this country, and it is not too much to say that for some time peaceful relations between the two greatest free nations in the world—or, if not peaceful relations, at any rate, friendly intercourse between them was at the mercy of officials acting at a great distance from the central authority, who might be hot headed or indiscreet or unreasonable in the exercise of extremely delicate functions."

"Nations are often more apt to resent petty affronts and injuries than they are to resent serious invasions of natural rights."

Now I should think Mr. Chamberlain was right on that point at any rate. Let us see whether the Americans resented this or not. Let us see whether they quietly submitted to this interference. I will not say whether the Americans did not too hotly resent this; I will not say whether they were not too touchy on the subject. But I want to show that our Government should have understood the people they had to deal with, and should have known how sensitive the Americans are with regard to any interference of that kind with their commerce; they should have understood what would have been the results of that interference. What were the results? From the beginning to the end of all the correspondence in this book, we see that there was the strongest feeling created; we see that Mr. Bayard, who is not usually supposed to be an ill-tempered or unreasonable man, used language with reference to vessels, all through the unfortunate summer of 1886, of this kind. Speaking of the case of the *Novelty*, he said:

"Against this treatment I make instant and formal protest as an unwarranted interpretation and application of the treaty by the officers of the Dominion of Canada and of the Province of Nova Scotia, as an infraction of the laws of commercial and maritime intercourse existing between the two countries, and as a violation of hospitality, and for any loss or injury resulting therefrom, the Government of Her Britannic Majesty will be held liable."

With reference to the prohibition of purchasing herring from Canadian weirs for canning, Mr. Bayard writes:

"Such inhibition of usual and legitimate commercial contracts and intercourse is assuredly without warrant of law, and I draw your attention to it in order that the commercial rights of the citizens of the United States may not be thus invaded and subjected thus to unfriendly discrimination."

The Secretary of the Treasury was asked to report upon these subjects, and he speaks of "the unworthy and petty spite" of the Canadians in dealing with the Americans. He also said:

"The Dominion of Canada brutally excludes American fishermen from Canadian ports. * * * I believe there never has been in the past and I hope there never will be in the future such passionate spite displayed by the officers of the Government, as has during the last summer been exhibited in the Dominion of Canada towards well meaning American fishermen."

That was from the Secretary of the Treasury. Then the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives made a report, and they reported in much the same line. They also suggest the motives of the Canadians to use these means in enforcing what they considered their rights:

"The motives and purpose of such denial have been openly proclaimed by Canada, and plainly avowed by Canada to be first, the punishment of such vessels because the United States levies a duty on Canadian fish not fresh for immediate consumption, such as the Government levies on all such fish not the product of American fisheries and imported from any foreign place whatever, and secondly, to coerce the United States to exempt such Canadian fish from all customs duties, and to enter into other new reciprocal relations with the Canadian Dominion and Newfoundland. It is a policy of threat and coercion, which, in the opinion of your commission, should be instantly and summarily dealt with."

It was instantly and summarily dealt with and they showed in that report what it was they dealt with. It was this conduct of the Custom Department, which the hon. gentleman has said to-night was right, that they dealt with. Then came the retaliation Act. What language is used about that Act in the official correspondence brought down by the Government?

"The Senate rose to a high level of patriotism in defence of national honor. The series of unneighborly, brutal, and illegal outrages upon American commerce in Dominion waters has been resented with becoming vigor and dignity. The Senate, with only one dissenting vote—and that vote cast under a fantastic interpretation of the measure has armed the President with full, adequate and just powers of retaliation."

So I have traced, I think, that Retaliation Bill and all the possible and fearful consequences which it might have involved, directly and clearly to this indelicate, ill-advised and unstatesmanlike action of our Government in 1886. Well, even after that our Government were not dismayed. No, Sir, like ancient Pistol they had brave words at any rate, and it was after that, it was on the 1st February, 1887, that we had the famous report of the Privy Council, which was sent over to England, and which purports to be the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I do not know whether I have any right to pry into the authorship or not of that document; but I should judge from the terms of it, and from the turns of sentences in that document, that the Minister of Justice had more to do with it than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The hands are the hands of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Jacob. In that grave State paper, they justify everything they have done, and they say:

"It is not to be expected that, after having earnestly insisted upon the necessity of a strict maintenance of these treaty rights, and upon the respect due by foreign vessels while in Canadian waters, to the municipal legislation by which all vessels resorting to those waters are governed, in the absence moreover of any decision of a legal tribunal,

to show that there has been any straining of the law in those cases in which it has been put in operation, the Canadian Government will suddenly and without the justification supplied by any new facts or arguments withdraw from a position taken up deliberately, and by doing so in effect, plead guilty to the whole of the charges of oppression, inhumanity, and bad faith, which, in language wholly unwarranted by the circumstances of the case, have been made against it by the public men of the United States."

Here is the historic sentence, which comes in now,—

"Such a surrender on the part of Canada would involve the abandonment of a valuable portion of the national inheritance of the Canadian people, who would certainly visit with just reprobation those who were guilty of so serious a neglect of the trust committed to their charge."

These were brave words indeed, but they were sent home by His Excellency on the 1st February, in a despatch to the Home Office, and as soon as the Home Government had time to consider the situation, they promptly sat upon Her Majesty's Government here, and in a despatch sent by cable from the Colonial Secretary to the Governor General, they say:

"Her Majesty's Government, while endeavoring to procure this *ad interim* arrangement, feel it right to intimate to you that they are disposed to think, after much consideration of the entire subject, that the best and simplest settlement of the present difficulties might be arrived at if both parties would agree so as to permit the discussion of the more extended commercial arrangements—to provide for a term at least, if not permanently, the condition of things which existed under the Treaty of Washington, fish and fish productions being again reciprocally duty free, and the fishery being once more reciprocally thrown open. They are, however, of opinion that it would be the clear interest of the Dominion that no suggestion of a pecuniary indemnification should be made in proffering this arrangement."

And that was within two days accepted by the Governor General in a cable to England, so that the high words, and the still more high-handed proceedings of the hon. gentleman could not be tolerated in England, but, fortunately for Canada in that instance, were interfered with. I am not so much surprised that England could not, after that, trust Canada to negotiate a treaty. These gentlemen nearly got Canada, nearly got England, and nearly got the Empire into a war with the United States. It was, therefore, not surprising that England could not trust the Canadian Government to negotiate the treaty. But, though that is the case, I would not like to be in the House when any Canadian commercial treaty is adopted which has been made for us by representatives of Downing Street, without entering a protest against that, because I think British diplomacy in colonial matters has always been a failure. We had hoped that we had outlived that stage of Canadian existence ever since, in 1874, Mr. George Brown went to Washington as a delegate, not from Downing Street, but from Ottawa, to negotiate a treaty. Of course he was authorised in Her Majesty's name, as he had to be. Afterwards, we settled in Halifax the amount of the claims against the United States, and we did it most successfully, without any Downing Street agent to manage it for us, and I had hoped that the ground which was taken, in 1862, by Mr. Blake in regard to that matter, and which, I think, you, Mr. Speaker, will recollect, would have been followed for the future. I think it is unnecessary, in order that Canada may have fair play with the United States, to invoke the warlike power of Great Britain. That is all a piece of clap-trap. We know that the English Government will not send its ironclads and open fire upon the cities of the United States in our behalf. England might do that in Alexandria or in Burmah, but she will not do it in regard to the United States. That is the last thing she will think of in this world. But we have claims of our own, and we should go to the United States and say to them: It is worth your while to make a treaty with us at any time, because it will be immensely to your advantage to make that treaty, and not only to make it but to keep it. It is not the ironclads or the armies of Europe that keep treaties in the present age, but it is the mutual benefits derived from them

by the countries who are parties to them. If that were not the case, how could Switzerland, that little State in the midst of Europe in arms, successfully make treaties? But we know that she does, and that Portugal does, and that those treaties with larger powers are entered upon and honestly carried out. We do not need the assistance of England to make our treaties or to have them kept after they are made. I will just trouble you with a statement of the enormous value of Canadian trade to the United States as compared with other countries in the world. There are only three countries in the world that have a larger trade with the United States than Canada, and those are England, Germany and France. We have a more valuable trade with the United States than that great Empire of Brazil or that fertile island of Cuba, both of which are her neighbors. We have double the trade of Italy, Belgium or the Netherlands; we have more than treble the trade of China, Mexico or Japan; we have more than four times the trade they have with Spain, more than five times their trade with Russia, more than six times their trade with the five republics of Central America in the aggregate, and ten times the trade with Chili and Portugal. And to say in that condition of affairs that we should look for an agent to come from Downing Street to make a fair treaty for us is not reasonable. A few years ago, when the present First Minister was in power, in 1868, two of his colleagues were in London, looking after, among other things, the San Juan difficulty. They were Sir George Cartier and Mr. William Macdougall, who were at that time representing the Government very ably; and, in a letter to Lord Granville, dated the 29th December, 1868, they gave expression to these sentiments:

"Our experience of past diplomacy in the settlement of boundaries in North America, in which the disposition on one side to concede, and on the other to encroach was always present and always resulted disastrously to Canada, admonishes us that a similar disposition, and similar results, may be feared in the future."

That was the statement of the hon. gentleman's colleagues nearly 20 years ago; and surely, Mr. Speaker, if they were right in their historical account of what had happened in the past diplomacy, they were right in what they were afraid would happen in the near future; for we know that San Juan Island was given away, we know since then the Fenian claims, in the Treaty of 1871, were abandoned, and I am not at all satisfied that if Canada had the negotiation of her own arrangements, about the fisheries with the United States, and was not interfered with one way or another, we might not have done better than we have. Now, Sir, as to this treaty itself, the concessions do seem to be all on one side. There is very little in the treaty at all. It is spread over a good deal of ground, it is like very thin butter spread over a large slice of bread. It looks very much as if the plenipotentiaries, after spending nearly three months, came to the conclusion that for the credit of themselves, every one of them, they must do something; that it would never do for them to go home without coming to some settlement, and so they patched up a little arrangement about the headlines; they made concessions to the Americans about entries in the customs ports, and they gave nothing on earth to Canada except a provision, in the 12th clause, that Canada is to have the same rights for her fishing vessels in American fishing grounds, as were conceded to the United States. But even that, the Minister of Finance in his speech, had to admit did not amount to anything at all; he was almost ashamed for it, and he apologised for it. So, while not desiring to oppose the treaty as it stands now, I think it is comparatively harmless, but I think it contains a great many provisions which should have been conceded by us without negotiations by the delegates at Washington. I am sorry to say that it does not contain free access to the United States' markets for fish for our people down by the sea, and that is one great desideratum that they all seem clamoring for. But apart from that, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. EDGAR.

having made a protest against the action of the Government in 1886, and against the negotiation of Canadian treaties by Downing-street diplomatists, I will vote for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). At this very late hour of the night, or rather early hour of the morning, I do not intend to detain the House very long. I would not trouble the House at this moment were it not for the importance of the treaty for the people whom I have the honor to represent. Ever since the negotiations between the United States and Canada the people of my county have been looking anxiously forward to this settlement, and so far as I have been able to learn the settlement which has been arrived at gives general satisfaction. A great deal has been said with regard to the treatment which the Americans have received at the hands of Canadian officials. Now, on this point, I desire to read the testimony of a captain belonging to the United States who was engaged in the fisheries. In a letter to the *Boston Herald*, dated 9th November, 1886, he says:

"So much has been written and printed about the experiences of American fishermen in Canadian waters, and the indignities put on them, I wish you would open your columns and give your readers an insight into the other side of the story. I sailed from Boston for North Bay on 16th June, not knowing just what the cutters would do or how the law would be interpreted. I neared the coast with fear and anxiety. The first land sighted was Whitehead, and immediately cries came from aloft: 'Cutter in sight ahead!' I rushed to the deck, found the vessel which proved to be the *Houlett*, commanded by Capt. Lorway, nearing us rapidly. At time of sighting the cutter we were standing alone inshore. She hoisted her flag to let us know what she was, and we immediately 'about ship' and put to sea to get out of her way, for fear we might be put on the prize list of the captures. We finally headed up for Port Mulgrave in Canso, expecting to receive rough usage from the authorities, but, to our surprise, found Collector Murray a perfect gentleman, willing to assist me as far as he could without encroaching on the Canadian laws. From there we put in at Port Hawkesbury and boarded the cutter *Conrad*, and asked the captain for instructions in regard to the three mile limit, and what privileges, if any, we had. I was answered, in a courteous and hearty way, that he did not have them aboard, but would go ashore in a few moments and get me a printed copy of the regulations, which he did, and assured us that if we followed them we would be unmolested; that he was there to see that the law was not violated, but not to cause unnecessary annoyance. After receiving instructions from the captain, thanks to him, I went to the custom house and entered my vessel, paying twenty-five cents. I found a very pleasant gentleman in the collector, who did all in his power to relieve my mind and make us comfortable.

"Souris was our next port of landing, where we also reported, and were well treated. From there we went to Malpeque, where we found another gentleman in the collector. We met the cutter *Houlett* at Cascumpec, and had several interviews with her commander, Captain Lorway, whom I found a quiet, just and gentlemanly officer. My vessel was one of the fleet ordered out of harbor by him. At that time it was as good a fish day as one could ask for, and the instructions were plain that at such times we had no right to remain in harbor. At no time is there much water to spare on the bar, and it is a common occurrence for vessels to ground in going in or out, and that some did touch was due to ignorance of the channel or carelessness on the part of captains. At the time the order was issued the weather was fair, but before all the fleet could work out through the channel, one of the sudden changes in weather, so much to be dreaded on such a coast, came, and the cutter rescinded the order and the fleet returned. It has been printed in a Boston paper that, owing to being forced to sea by the cutter's orders in bad weather, my schooner, the *Andrew Burnham*, fouled two Englishmen and narrowly escaped serious damage. If true it would look like a hardship. It was simply this: In getting under way, in a small and crowded space, finding I would not have room, I dropped our starboard anchor. That not holding, we let go the other, and it brought us up all right; not much in this to point to as an outrage or danger from stress of weather. I believe Captain Lorway to be a man who would carry out all the requirements of the Canadian laws, but I saw nothing in my experience in those waters that could be considered as being arbitrary, or taking a mean advantage of his official authority to annoy anyone. Captain Lorway has been a master of vessels for twenty-five years, is a man of high reputation as a seaman, and as good a judge of whether the weather is favorable for a vessel to go to sea as any man who walks a deck, and when he ordered the fleet to sea he went himself, and I know he would not order a vessel to leave harbor if there was any danger of loss of life or property. We reported at Cascumpec, and were treated the same as at all other ports we touched at. If our vessels would attend to reporting at the custom house, the same as they do in our ports, no trouble would be met with.

"If we had 'free fish' it would give the Canadians some recompense for what our fishermen want, viz., the right to go anywhere and everywhere, use their harbors, ship men, get provisions, land and mend our nets, buy salt and barrels, and ship our catch home by rail or steamer without expense or annoyance, the same as we have heretofore.

"If we had had this privilege last year, myself and vessel would have been \$5,000 better off this season, and all the fishermen in the bay would have been in the same boat with me. I do not say that I am too honest not to fish within the three-mile limit, nor do I believe there is a vessel in the fleet who would not, if the cutter was out of sight. I made two trips to the bay, both of which were very successful, and I lived up to the requirements of the law as well as I knew how, and did not find them obnoxious, or to interfere with my success, and everywhere I went I was courteously treated by the officials—especially so by both the cutters. Should it be a bay year next season, I hope to meet them again. Those who openly preached that they would go where they pleased, do what they wanted to in spite of law or cutters, shipped men, smuggled or openly fished inside of the limit, and indulged in the satisfaction of damning the cutter, the captain, the Government and everything else when they knew they could do it with impunity, and that the men they were talking to could not resent it by word or blow, were looked after sharp and were not extended the courtesy that was shown so many of us.

"In the interest of fair play I could not help writing you and asking you to give this to your readers, if not taking up too much of your valuable space.

"Very respectfully,

"CAPT. NATHAN F. BLAKE,

"*Schnr. Andrew Burnham, of Boston.*

"Boston, 6th October, 1886."

This is what Captain Blake says as to his experience in dealing with our customs officers and captains of cutters, and it is far from being in accordance with the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite. I think, however, that authority should be satisfactory to those gentlemen; first, because the authority comes from the United States, and, second, because the authority is named Blake. Here is an extract from the paper in which that letter was published:

(*Extract from the Boston Herald, dated 9th October, 1886.*)

"A FISHING CAPTAIN'S EXPERIENCE.

"The letter of Captain Nathan F. Blake, of the fishing schooner *Andrew Burnham* of this city, which we published on Wednesday, would apparently indicate that the Canadian officials have not been disposed to push the requirements of their law quite as rigorously as some of our fishermen have maintained. Captain Blake says that he has experienced not the least trouble in his intercourse with the Canadian officials, but that, as he has treated them courteously, they on their side have reciprocated in like terms. There is, undoubtedly, a great deal of bitterness felt on both sides, and probably this bitterness has led both parties to be ungracious in their own conduct, and to exaggerate the wrongs they have endured, hardships frequently due to an unwillingness to observe the requirements of the law as these are now laid down. If all American fishing captains exhibited the same courtesy and moderation that Captain Blake has shown, we imagine that there would be very little trouble in arriving at an equitable and pleasing understanding with Canada."

I wish now to call the attention of the House to the condition of our fisheries, for they have been presented before this House as in an unsatisfactory state and particularly the fisheries from the part of the Dominion from which I come. In 1873 the value of Nova Scotia fisheries was \$6,500,000, in 1878 \$6,131,000. It will be remembered that in course of the discussion in this House a few days ago more than one hon. member contended that during the period from 1873 to 1871 the fishing interests in Nova Scotia made progress but since that date had declined. I find by referring to the fisheries from that time to the present that, although the value in 1873 was \$6,131,000 it had increased in 1882 to \$7,131,000, and in 1886 to \$8,415,000, or an increase of 15 per cent. The same may be said in regard to the Island of Cape Breton, although an hon. member, I think the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island, stated the other day that there had been a great exodus and that the fisheries are in an unsatisfactory condition. I propose to give a statement showing not only that the fishing industry is in a state of prosperity, but that it is in a state of great prosperity. In 1882 the value of the fisheries of Cape Breton was \$1,080,000; in 1886, \$1,561,000, being an increase of 50 per cent. We also find the number of men employed larger than it was when hon. gentlemen opposite occupied the Treasury benches. In 1877-78 we had employed in the fisheries 6,680 hands; in 1886-87, 7,591, or an increase of 11 per cent. I desire now to quote from

the *Halifax Morning Chronicle* an article on the subject of the fisheries and the operation of the Government laws against the American fishing vessels. It states, in its issue of January 13th, 1888, as follows:—

"THE MACKEREL CATCH.

"The last number of *Bradstreet's* contains a number of elaborate tables, in connection with the trade of the United States, showing the production of wheat, cotton, fish, and a variety of other articles, during the year 1886, as compared with previous years. The table relating to the fish trade will afford the people of the United States the most convincing proof of the absurdity of the claim that our fisheries are of no value to them. If such figures were sent out from a Canadian source their accuracy might be challenged, and it would no doubt be pretended that they were cooked in the interests of our fishermen, for the purpose of securing the removal of the duty. The facts and figures given by *Bradstreet's* are open to no such doubt, and there can be no question that their wide circulation will have a strong effect in causing the Americans to see the folly of the course they have been led to adopt, in rejecting the opportunities which have been offered them of settling the fishery question on a fair and reasonable basis.

"The mere statement of the fact that during 1886 the primary industry of the New England fishermen, the catching of fish, has been unremunerative, fails to give anything like a definite idea of the result of their exclusion from our waters upon their business, but the figures in *Bradstreet's* are intelligible enough to be understood by any one, and show conclusively that the use of our waters is a vital necessity to the fishermen of the Eastern States, and is of immense importance to the trade and to the people."

"It appears that the mackerel fleet in 1886 only secured 80,000 barrels, as against 330,000 barrels in 1885, and as against a much larger quantity than last year's catch in every year since 1869. The effect of this short catch has been to raise the price and to check the consumption. The increase from these Provinces, notwithstanding the duty, has been larger than in 1885. It is further stated that the effect of the duty has been to change the course of the export trade, most of the fish now sent by Boston merchants to Hayti and San Domingo being packed in the Provinces instead of in the States. In respect to cod there is a reduction in the catch of upwards of 79,000 quintals, a falling off which may be attributed to the difficulty of procuring bait, or may be explained by natural causes, similar variations having occurred in previous years, but figures in relation to the mackerel catch are too remarkable and too uniform in previous years to be explained away. The number of barrels caught each year since 1881 is as follows:—

1881.....	391,857
1882.....	378,863
1883.....	226,685
1884.....	478,076
1885.....	329,943
1886.....	81,953

"If the cruisers sent out by the Dominion Government had performed their duty effectively there can be no doubt that the disparity would have been greater."

I find that the same authority gives for the year 1887 the catch as 88,382, and goes on to say that our friends on the other side of the House say the cruisers have performed their duty too effectively and carried out the laws too rigorously against American fishermen, while we have the statement of the *Halifax Chronicle* to the contrary. This shows the effect that the fishery protection service had upon the catch of mackerel by United States fishermen and it proves conclusively that the fish usually caught by the people of the United States in our waters have been caught by the people of Canada, and that the benefit accruing from the catching of this fish accrues to the people of Canada. I shall not take up any longer the time of this House except to say that I have much pleasure in supporting this treaty, and I am satisfied in doing so that it will be a matter of satisfaction to the people whom I represent, a people who are largely engaged in the fishing industry and a people who do not regard this matter in the same way as some hon. gentlemen have pictured to the House and to the country since the beginning of this discussion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

CLAIMS OF MR. KING.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou) for Mr. WELDON (St. John) moved for:

A Select Committee to be composed of Messrs. Ives, Edgar, Wood (Brockville), McDougald (Pictou), Casgrain, Mills (Annapolis), Flynn,

and the mover, to examine into and report upon the claim of James King, as set forth in his petition received by this House on 21st March, 1888; with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all reports made by Commander Gordon, or any other officer engaged in the Fishery Protection Service, to Government, on the condition of the fisheries, the effects of the Protection Service, and the probable result of the continuance of the policy of excluding American fishermen from our ports and waters.—(Mr. Davies.)

Copies of all tenders received by the Government for fencing the Eastern Extension Railway in Nova Scotia, and the Intercolonial Railway, from Pictou Landing to Windsor Junction; and also, a statement showing the names of the party or parties to whom contracts have been awarded, if any have been awarded, and length of fence each has contracted for and amount to be paid for work.—(Mr. Kirk.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, &c., between Mr. John Knight and the Government; also, the Railway Department and any of its officers, in relation to damages sustained by him in connection with the Derby Branch Railway, in the County of Northumberland, New Brunswick.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, &c., between Mr. Allan Knight and the Government; also, the Railway Department and any of its officers, in relation to damages sustained by him in connection with the Derby Branch Railway, in the County of Northumberland, New Brunswick.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, &c., between Mr. Patrick Clancey and the Government or any of its officers; also, with the Railway Department and any of its officers, in relation to damages sustained by him in connection with the Derby Branch Railway, in the County of Northumberland, New Brunswick.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Correspondence between Mr. Albert Bryanton and the Railway Department and any of its officers, and any one on his behalf; also, all reports and instructions between said Department and its officers in reference to the placing of a switch and platform at said Bryanton's, on the Derby Branch Railway, in the County of Northumberland, New Brunswick.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Correspondence between Mr. Samuel Russell and the Government of the Dominion, or any of its officers, with all communications and reports from such officer or officers, in reference to a claim for damages to his property in connection with the Derby Branch Railway, in the county of Northumberland, N.B.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Copy of all correspondence between the Government and any person or persons relating to the claim of the Mississauga Indians, under the various treaties in reference to unceded lands, together with any reports and plans in connection therewith.—(Mr. Madill.)

Return of all correspondence, petitions, reports of engineers, and others, regarding the construction of a harbor of refuge at Wellington, Lake Ontario.—(Mr. Platt.)

Return of all correspondence, petition, reports of engineers, and others, respecting the dredging of the Pictou Harbor, Bay of Quinté, not already brought down.—(Mr. Platt.)

Return of all correspondence and petitions respecting the construction of building for post office, Customs office and Inland Revenue office in the town of Pictou.—(Mr. Platt.)

Copies of all papers, writings and reports between Mr. Allan Bryanton and the Government of Canada, or anyone on his behalf, or between the officers of the Government and him or anyone on his behalf, or between the Government and their officers, in relation to the placing of a platform and switch near his place on the line of the Derby Branch Railway, in the county of Northumberland, N.B.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Return of all papers and correspondence relating to the location of the Experimental Farm at Grenfell, in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Return of all lessees of grazing lands under old form of leases; 2nd. The number of these who have fully complied with the terms of the leases; 3rd. The number who have partially complied, showing to what extent; 4th. The number in arrears for rent, showing to what extent; 5th. The number of old leases now entirely unoccupied.—(Mr. Davis.)

Copy of all correspondence, reports and recommendations having reference to the claim of Captain George H. Young, of Winnipeg, that he and Stretcher-men Bailey and King, of the 90th Battalion, rescued the wounded Priest, Rev. Father Moulin, at Batoche, on the 11th May, 1885; and that the said rescue was not effected by Doctor Gravelly, of Cornwall, as stated in the report of the Surgeon General of Militia as presented to Parliament in May, 1888.—(Mr. Scarth.)

Return of all tenders received by the Government for the supply of coal during the past calendar year, the names of successful tenderers and the rate per ton in all contracts for coal entered into by the Government during the same period.—(Mr. Guillet.)

Return showing 1st. The date of Henry Symth's engagement by Department of Agriculture; 2nd. The date at which his services were dispensed with; 3rd. The amount per diem or month paid him for

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou).

travelling expenses; 4th. The entire sum paid for travelling or other expenses; 5th. The entire sum paid for services of any kind, and travelling and other expenses from the 1st of January, 1887, to 1st of March, 1888.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return of all Dominion Scrip issued for any purpose in connection with Manitoba and the North-West Territories; the dates and amounts of the several issues, and the purposes for which they were made; the mode or modes of redemption; the amount of each issue so far redeemed, and the balances outstanding on the 1st March, 1888.—(Mr. Wilson, Elgin.)

Return giving the names and dates of the appointment of each Colonization Inspector and Homestead Inspector in the North-West Territories, including Manitoba; the salary paid to each, also the travelling expenses per diem or month, the full amount for salary and travelling or other expenses, paid to each from the date of his engagement up to the 1st of January, 1888.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing separately in regard to companies doing business under Dominion license, the amount of fire insurance at risk on the 31st December, for each of the years from 1881 to 1887, both inclusive, the number of policies in force, the total amount of cash paid each year and the total amount of expenses for each year, the percentage of losses and expenses to premium income, and the expense per \$1,000 at risk.—(Mr. Bowman.)

Return of all tenders for militia clothing since the 1st of January, 1883, showing the name of each firm or party tendering, the amount of each tender, and the name of the person or firm to whom the contract or contracts were awarded.—(Mr. Bowman.)

Copies of the papers concerning the application of George J. Macdonald, in connection with the Centennial Exhibition of 1876.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2.30 a.m., (Tuesday.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 17th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RETURN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the return of Joseph Gauthier Esq., to represent the Electoral District of the County of L'Assomption.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 90) to incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company (from the Senate)—(Mr. Masson.)

JUDGES' SALARIES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into a Committee, to consider the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts, and to provide that the yearly salaries of the undermentioned Judges shall be as follows:—

In Ontario—

The Chief Justice of Ontario.....	\$7,000
Three Justices of Appeal, each.....	6,000
The Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench.....	7,000
Two Judges of the High Court of Justice, Queen's Bench Division, each.....	6,000
The Chancellor of Ontario.....	7,000
Three Judges of the High Court of Justice, Chancery Division, each.....	6,000
The Chief Justice of the Common Pleas.....	7,000
Two Judges of the High Court of Justice, Common Pleas Division, each.....	6,000

In Quebec—

The Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench.....	7,000
Five Puisné Judges of the said Court, each.....	6,000

The Chief Justice of the Superior Court.....	7,000
Twelve Puisné Judges of the said Court, whose residences are fixed at Montreal and Quebec, each.....	6,000
Sixteen Puisné Judges of the said Court, whose residences are fixed elsewhere than at Montreal or Quebec, including the Judge of the District of Terrebonne, each.....	4,500
The senior Puisné Judge residing at Quebec, if the Chief Justice resides at Montreal, or the senior Puisné Judge residing at Montreal, if the Chief Justice resides at Quebec, in addition to his other salary.....	1,000
In Nova Scotia—	
The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.....	6,000
The Judge in Equity.....	5,000
Five Puisné Judges of the said Court, each.....	5,000
In New Brunswick—	
The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.....	6,000
The Judge in Equity.....	5,000
Four Puisné Judges of the said Court, each.....	5,000
In Prince Edward Island—	
The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, being also Judge of the Court of Vice-Admiralty.....	5,000
One Assistant Judge, being also Master of the Rolls in Chancery.....	4,000
One Assistant Judge, being also Vice-Chancellor.	4,000
In Manitoba—	
The Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench.	6,000
Three Puisné Judges of the said Court, each.....	5,000
In British Columbia—	
The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.....	6,000
Four Puisné Judges of the said Court, each.....	5,000
In the North-West Territories—	
Five Puisné Judges of the Supreme Court, each..	5,000

Also that there shall be paid to each of the Judges hereinbefore mentioned attending, as such, any court held at any place other than that at which he is directed to reside, for travelling allowances, his moving expenses and five dollars for each day he is absent from his place of residence; also that the yearly salary of four County Court Judges of British Columbia shall be \$2,000 each, during the first three years of service, and after three years of service, each \$2,400, and that any one or all of such County Court Judges may likewise accept from the Province of British Columbia the office of Stipendiary Magistrate and accept remuneration from that Province; and also, that in the case of the Honorable Sir Adam Wilson, late Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice for Ontario, the superannuation allowance to be granted to him shall be the same as if the salary hereby proposed to be fixed for his office as such Judge, had been the salary fixed by law at the time of his resignation.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. JAMIESON. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to mention by way of privilege a matter which arose yesterday in connection with the debate upon prohibition. It will be recollected that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) charged that last year when I had charge of the Bill to amend the Canada Temperance Act that I refused to press the measure. In reply to that I stated that any action I had taken had been in accordance with the advice of the friends of the measure selected from both sides of the House at a meeting which had been convened for the purpose. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) when referred to by me stated that he had no recollection of such meeting. Of course in order to put myself right—

Mr. SPEAKER. I would request the hon. gentleman to state at once what is the question of privilege. He is now referring to a debate which took place yesterday and I do not see there is any question of privilege in that.

Mr. JAMIESON. I have simply to say that the meeting I referred to, there are three members in the House now who attended it and which the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) had forgotten. I wish simply to put myself right on this question, as it might be considered a question of veracity between myself and the hon. member for Brome

(Mr. Fisher). I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman had no intention of misrepresenting the matter, but—

Mr. SPEAKER. I hardly think this is a question of privilege.

Mr. JAMIESON. My statement is this—

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. member abandon the question of privilege?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has stated what I did not say yesterday and I wish to repeat what my statement was. My statement was this: That I had proposed—

Mr. SPEAKER. I have stopped the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). The hon. member when the question comes up again might have an opportunity to explain, but just now it will interfere with the business of the House.

EVIDENCE BEFORE THE RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. HOLTON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to repeat the question which I asked the Government last Friday, that is, whether it is intended to lay before the House and distribute to the members the evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Railways. As I said then I repeat now, it seems to me that we cannot intelligently discuss this Bill without this evidence in our hands.

Mr. BOWELL. Immediately upon the question being brought before the House by the hon. member for Chateaugay (Mr. Holton) the other day, I saw the Clerk of the Printing Committee and asked him if they had not those reports printed. He said that they had but in very limited numbers. I then gave him instructions to have them printed immediately and distributed among the members and he promised to do so. Since then I have not thought of it.

Mr. HOLTON. I am asking Parliament with regard to the evidence. I know that when the Minister of Railways laid the report of the Commission on the Table, on the 29th February last I think, there were certain documents accompanying it, but not the evidence, and it is the evidence for which I am particularly asking now.

Mr. CASEY. I have no doubt that the Minister of Customs—

Mr. SPEAKER. Surely the hon. gentlemen do not mean to have a debate on this. The question has been put and an answer has been given, therefore a debate is not in accordance with the Rules of the House.

Mr. CASEY. Is it not allowable to point out the importance of having those papers on the Table? It has been allowed before, I think.

Mr. SPEAKER. It has been allowed by controverting the Rules.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 65) respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 5,

Mr. MITCHELL. Before that clause is adopted, I wish to read a statement attributed to the American consul at Halifax, a gentleman who has taken a great interest in this

question, as there seems to be some difference of opinion about this provision:

"United States Consul General Phelan, of Halifax, N.S., was in Washington the other day, on his way to his home in St. Louis. In speaking of the recently concluded Fisheries Treaty, he said:

"The advantages accruing to the United States under the provisions of the new treaty have been greatly under-estimated. New fishing grounds have been opened up to our fishermen and all doubts removed as to our right to avail ourselves of them. We are no longer fishing on sufferance. Under the existing treaty we can only enter Canadian ports for wood, water, shelter and repairs. Even then we are subjected to a disagreeable espionage. Under the new contract we are liable for no pilotage dues, and at the same time enjoy the benefits of light-houses and other safeguards of navigation. Our vessels can no longer be seized upon the trumped-up charges of 'hovering.' We can now enter Canadian ports for fresh supplies, provisions, &c., saving the necessity for returning home in the midst of the fishing season. Our vessels can sell or transship cargoes, and can always enter the nearest port for anything they may lack.

"To my mind the Canadians have gained nothing. It may be said that the treaty might go further than it does, but it is certainly a vast improvement upon the existing agreement. While our fishermen may not be entirely satisfied, it would be a serious matter, as they would quickly realise, should the Senate reject the new convention. A convincing argument is the very general dissatisfaction expressed by Canadians with the provisions of this treaty. Without regard to party they are opposed to it. It is likely, however, to be ratified by those who are in duty bound to support the Government. The Canadian fishermen, however, will never be satisfied with it, while the practical operation of its provisions will make it decidedly popular on this side of the line."

I am not going to make any observations, but simply give this as the opinion of a gentleman intimately acquainted with the whole question from the beginning.

On section 6,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This clause, I have no doubt is a necessary provision, the necessity of which is shown by the correspondence which has taken place between the American Government and the Governments of the United Kingdom and Canada. It is a pity, however, that the Government did not recognise this principle and act upon it without being forced to do so by treaty, but exercised a meddling oversight by means of vexatious reports and impudent regulations made by the Customs Department that well nigh drove the two countries into war.

Mr. BOWELL. One would suppose, to hear the hon. gentleman repeat that story from time to time, that new regulations were adopted and enforced by the customs authorities and the Government. For the information of the House, I can inform the hon. gentleman that no new regulations were enacted and no change was made in the law. The only thing done was to carry out the law in regard to fishing vessels, which were placed in the same position as vessels engaged in ordinary commercial transactions. We applied to them the same rules and regulations that were applied to all commercial vessels or all vessels trading in our ports. There were no new regulations, but the law as it existed, and has existed for years, was rigidly enforced in those as in other cases.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does my hon. friend forget that only two years ago the Government brought in a Bill in order to perfect a defect that existed in those laws, so as to enable the Government to make those seizures?

Mr. THOMPSON. That was not a customs regulation at all. There was no amendment of the customs laws, nor did any case whatever occur under that Act.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not enter into the question whether any case occurred, but I say that the statement of the hon. Minister of Customs that there was no new law with refer-

Mr. MITCHELL.

ence to the entrance of these vessels into our ports, was incorrect.

Mr. BOWELL. What I said I repeat, that no new law was passed and no new regulations adopted by the Customs Department. The Minister of Justice very clearly stated what the object of that law was.

Mr. MITCHELL. This House passed a law affecting the powers of the Minister of Customs, or the Government, to seize and delay vessels for certain violations that were not provided for before.

Mr. EDGAR. Whether new laws or regulations were passed or not, the hon. the Minister of Customs developed extreme activity in annoying and worrying the Americans, and in devising unwise means of putting those regulations into force against our neighbors of the United States during the summer of the year 1886. That is what they complained of; and, as I pointed out before—and I cannot point it out too often, until the hon. gentlemen and the country also understand the position—he had not even the poor excuse that the American Government were enforcing their customs regulations against our fishermen in the same way. They were not doing so. As the hon. the Minister of Finance said a few days ago, the American Government expressly avoided doing so during the very time that the hon. the Minister of Customs was enforcing those regulations. The hon. the Minister of Finance said:

"It was urged, on the other hand, that in the United States our fishing vessels were not treated with the same stringency that those vessels were which under treaty right are permitted to come into our waters for those four purposes, and evidence was placed before the Commission to show that in the port of Portland the course pursued was a more liberal course than the stringent regulations which had been used in Canada. The collector of that port, who had been collector for ten years, was examined and gave his testimony as to the treatment of the Dominion vessels in the United States waters. He was asked:

"During the time you have been deputy collector, whether or not, there have been numerous cases of Dominion vessels, including vessels engaged in fishing in that port, and if they failed to report, though lying more than twenty-four hours, have penalties been imposed for such failure during the term of your service?"

"His answer was, as I remember:

"If there were any instances of Dominion vessels failing to report when lying more than twenty-four hours, their presence has been overlooked by the port officers. I do not recall from memory a single instance when or where a penalty was imposed, and I find no record of any such payments in the accounts of this office."

Now, when that is a specimen given by the hon. the Minister of Finance, our plenipotentiary at Washington, of the evidence before the Commission showing how the Americans treated our fishermen, I think the hon. gentleman would be far more justified in the eyes of the public if he would stand up and acknowledge frankly that during the year 1886 he led this country to the brink of war with the United States. He would stand better with the country if he would frankly acknowledge he was wrong, and there would then be some reason for excusing his action. But when we know that he enforced those regulations so as to prevent, under severe penalty, Canadian citizens who happened to be fishermen on American vessels landing at their own homes, when their vessels were in Canadian ports, to see their families, under severe penalty, and when he even prevented the clothes of dead Canadian fishermen being landed until a fine of \$200 was paid, I think that the less the hon. gentleman attempts to justify his conduct the better for him.

Mr. FOSTER. While that assertion is still warm before the House, I wish to give it an emphatic denial. The hon. the member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has said again to-day that the captain of an American fishing vessel had his vessel seized and a fine of \$200 imposed, and had to pay

that fine, and that the reason for the seizure of the vessel and the imposition of the fine was that he came in to land the clothes of some dead seaman. The hon. gentleman cannot prove that assertion from the blue-books he cited. The captain has stated in his own affirmation that he came in under stress of weather, that ten of his men landed in boats without having previously entered at the customs, and the vessel was seized for that offence and that alone. The \$200 fine was deposited for that offence and that alone. It was the day after the offence had been committed and after the vessel had been seized and the fine imposed, that the captain himself came on shore and brought with him the clothes of the seaman, and he gave these clothes to somebody who delivered them to his friends. To say, therefore, that the seizure was made and the fine imposed for bringing these clothes ashore is to make a statement which is not true. This charge was also made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis). When I asked him to name the vessel he could not do so, but the hon. the member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) said it was the *Pearl Nelson*. So much for that charge. With reference to the *Laura Sayward*, the hon. gentleman read correspondence in which it appeared that the captain was badly treated. The hon. gentleman did not make himself sufficiently acquainted with the blue-books that were before him, for if he had, he would have found in the later correspondence that this same Captain Medeo Rose made an affidavit contradicting entirely the alleged statements which were read by my hon. friend. I will read his statement to the House, made on the 20th April, 1887:

"I called at the custom house early the next morning before seven o'clock; stated that, as the wind was fair and blowing a strong breeze, I would not wait for a reply to telegram, but take a clearance, which the collector gave me. I was treated kindly, allowed to enter my vessel after customs hours, and a clearance granted me next morning before the office was supposed to be opened. I was at the port again in November, on my way to the Banks, and the collector allowed me to report my vessel inwards and outwards and gave me a clearance at eight in the evening.

"The statements purporting to have been made by me to the effect that the collector refused to give me my paper when I asked for it, also that his treatment towards me was harsh and cruel, driving myself and crew to sea, having but little flour, water, &c., are all untrue.

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true."

The hon. gentleman's information in this respect was, therefore, not correct, and his statement based on it consequently not well founded.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not take back a single word of what I said last night, and my hon. friend is trying to get out of the whole thing upon a quibble. As to the case of the *Pearl Nelson*, I state again to-day that these dead men's clothes could not be landed until the fine of \$200 had been paid. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that the fine was imposed upon this captain for having landed some Canadians on shore to see their friends, but until the captain had paid that fine of \$200, which was remitted more than a month after, he was not allowed to land the clothes of the dead fisherman, and that is not denied by any of the Canadian officers, from the beginning of the correspondence to the end. There are two things in that transaction which I complained of: One was the imposition of the fine of \$200 and the seizure of the vessel for allowing two Canadians to go on shore; and the other was that before that fine was paid, the captain would not be allowed to land the clothes. As to the *Laura Sayward* there is nothing in the statement I make in which I am mistaken. The hon. gentleman will recollect that in that case I complained, not that the captain did not get out his papers when he landed, because this was not material to the question, but that he was not allowed to buy for the American fishermen seven pounds of

sugar, three pounds of rice, and a little oil and something of that kind. That was refused.

Mr. FOSTER. They were never denied any right.

Mr. EDGAR. This paper shows that the officer of the Minister reported that he did deny them the right, and that he telegraphed to the Minister of Customs twice in one day to know whether those people could buy a pound of sugar and two pounds of potatoes.

Mr. BOWELL. He did quite right.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister says that was quite right, but the Minister of Marine says he did not do that at all. He tries to make out that there was no refusal.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say so. I say that the officer acted under his instructions. He had no instructions to allow commercial privileges to a fishing vessel, and, when he was asked for those privileges, he first did as an officer should do; he said, I will telegraph to Ottawa and see if I can get instructions to do that. That is what he did, and he did not make an explicit denial of the request made to him, but said, it is not in the line of my duty and I will telegraph to Ottawa. There was no lack of provisions for the preservation of life, and that is shown by the second affidavit.

Mr. EDGAR. I will leave it to the Minister of Customs, who has stated that the officer did quite right in refusing to give this relief.

Mr. BOWELL. I said that, if he did refuse, he did what was right.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister did not say that he did so.

Mr. BOWELL. I did.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister said that the officer did right. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that he did not do it at all, and the Minister of Customs says he did it, and it was right for him to do it. The Minister of Marine says that, if he did it, it was wrong, and the other Minister says that, if he did it, it was right.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am surprised that those two hon. gentlemen should remain in the same Cabinet with the Minister of Finance, after the views which he has put forward. Certainly, the inhuman acts which they have endeavored to justify have been denounced by the Minister of Finance, and that ought to lead those hon. gentlemen to retire from the Cabinet of which the Minister of Finance is a member. Why should they remain in the Cabinet with the Minister of Finance, who is marking out a different policy altogether from that which they are attempting to pursue? I would like the Minister of Finance to give us some explanation in regard to this clause. The Minister of Justice, in an elaborately prepared memorandum, informed the council that it was utterly impossible to maintain an efficient protection over our fisheries if such a rule as this, which was the principle contended for by Mr. Phelps, was recognised. I have no doubt that the Minister of Finance has fully considered that question, and will be able to give us a full and satisfactory answer to the declaration of the Minister of Justice in that regard. I am sure that the Minister of Finance has no intention of throwing open our inshore fisheries to be poached upon, or to leave this Government utterly helpless to exercise police protection over them; and, as I have full confidence in the judgment of the Minister of Finance in this matter, I have no doubt that he will be able to satisfy the House that he is able to give that protection which the Minister of Justice said it was possible to afford.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). On a previous occasion, I called the attention of the Finance Minister to what appeared to me to be a clause providing for reciprocal advantages, but which, while giving the American fishermen the advantages

claimed in our own ports, with regard to pilotage dues, harbor dues, light dues, and so on, did not give the same advantages to our fishermen in American ports. The hon. gentleman then pointed to clause 12, which says that:

"Fishing vessels of Canada and Newfoundland shall have on the Atlantic coasts of the United States all the privileges reserved and secured by this treaty to United States fishing vessels in the aforesaid waters of Canada and Newfoundland."

As I claimed then, I claim now that this is not sufficient to give the reciprocal privileges which we should have. There are no exceptions in this, and I would suggest that, after clauses 4, 5, and 6, the hon. gentleman should insert a clause to the effect that these privileges shall be given, provided similar advantages are given to the fishing vessels of Canada in the ports of the United States. That would set the matter at rest, I think, because, at present, I think it would be open to some doubt.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that it is not my business to alter the treaty. The treaty speaks for itself, and we are simply providing the legislation which is necessary to carry the treaty out, so far as Canada is concerned, and it will be quite time enough to call upon the Government of the United States or the Congress of the United States to take action when any case arises in which some privileges are not conceded which the treaty pledges them to concede.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I can hardly agree with the hon. gentleman in this matter. If we get into a misunderstanding at the outset, it will be very difficult to have it set right. I suppose the other party to this treaty, that is the United States, cannot take any objection to having this made clear. If it was the intention, as the hon. gentleman says it was the intention, to have it made clear at the outset, it would not change the meaning of the treaty if a clause were put in there securing the same privileges to the fishing vessels of Canada in the ports of the United States as the fishing vessels of the United States are entitled to in our ports. I mean in regard to the exemptions from pilotage dues, light dues, and the other dues which are mentioned. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to say that, in his judgment, this Article 12 of the treaty places Canadian vessels in precisely the same position in American ports as the American fishing vessels will be placed in our ports under the operations of this treaty as to exemption from these dues?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You are quite clear on that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am quite clear on that point. That was the object of placing that clause there. It was placed there for that purpose.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the other way would have made it much more distinct.

Mr. MITCHELL. I had not my reference book when the Minister of Marine spoke a while ago in relation to the *Sayward*, but, having sent to the *Hansard* office for the book, I find the affidavit of Medeo Rose, the master of the *Laura Sayward*, and I find it is to this effect

"Being then on Western Bank on a fishing trip, and being short of provisions, we hove our anchor and started for home. The wind was blowing almost a gale from the north-west and being almost dead ahead, we made slow progress on our voyage home. On Tuesday, the 5th October, we made Shelburne, N.S., and arrived in that harbor about 8 p.m., on that day, short of provisions, water, and oil to burn. On Wednesday I sailed for the inner harbor of Shelburne, arriving at the town about 4 p.m. On going ashore I found the customs house closed, and hunted up the collector and entered my vessel, and asked permission from him to buy 7 lbs. sugar, 3 lbs. coffee, and $\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 bushel of potatoes, 2 lbs. butter or lard or pork, and oil enough to last us home, and was refused."

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

I understood my hon. friend the Minister to contradict a statement made by the hon. member from West Ontario, and to say that no such thing occurred. The affidavit goes on:

"I stated to him my situation, short of provisions, and a voyage of 250 miles before me, and pleaded with him for this slight privilege, but it was of no avail. I then visited the American consul, and asked his assistance, and found him powerless to aid me in this matter. The collector of customs held my papers until the next morning although I asked for them as soon as I found I could not buy any provisions, say about 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ hours after I entered, but he refused to give them to me until the next morning. Immediately on receiving my papers on Thursday morning, I started for home, arriving on Sunday. I think the treatment I received harsh and cruel, driving myself and crew to sea with a scant supply of provisions, we having but little flour and water, and liable to be buffeted about for days before we came home.

"Mass., Essex, s. s., 13th Oct., 1886.

"Personally appeared Medeo Rose and made oath to the truth of the above statement.

"Before me,

"AARON PARSONS,

"*Nota y Public.*"

I merely read that in defence of the attitude assumed by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), to show that the statement he made in relation to the refusal to grant these trifling things to the vessel, was true. Now, while it is true, as the Minister of Customs said, that he was not acting contrary to his instructions, did any Government in the world ever refuse in such a case as that to supply to a vessel in distress a few necessaries, and send her to sea without almost the necessaries of life? Why, Sir, the thing is ridiculous. It is instances like these that have brought about that ill-feeling with the United States, which the hon. Minister of Finance so vividly described in the able speech he delivered a few days ago when introducing this subject.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call my hon. friend's attention to a subsequent affidavit made by Medeo Rose made 20th April, 1887, in which he states that a former statement was untrue.

Mr. MITCHELL. On what page of the book?

Mr. FOSTER. On page 110 of the United States Senate documents, No. 113.

Mr. MITCHELL. We have not those papers.

Mr. FOSTER. I have them.

Mr. MITCHELL. But you should furnish the House with them.

Mr. FOSTER. They were laid on the Table eight or ten days ago.

Mr. MITCHELL. Were they distributed?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

Mr. MITCHELL. I speak from the evidence you have laid upon the Table of the House.

Mr. FOSTER.—

"It is stated to the collector that I was from Western Banks, bound home, and required provisions as follows, viz: 7 lbs. sugar, 3 lbs. coffee, 1 bushel of potatoes, 2 lbs. butter, and to fill water. This was all. The collector told me to fill the water, but as there was no provision made in the treaty for the purchase of supplies or stores, he would telegraph the department at Ottawa at once; that no doubt they would be allowed; and I consented to wait until the next morning for a reply."

Then he goes on with the extract which I read before, stating that he called at the custom house the next morning, that no word had yet been received from Ottawa, and

that he concluded, as the breeze was fair, not to wait. He then concluded :

"That is the second affidavit made by Medeo Rose."

Mr. MITCHELL. Does that statement contradict his statements? No, it does not. His affidavit is specific. He does not bring any complaint against the collector; he does not say that he was received harshly by the collector; he simply says that inasmuch as the collector refused to allow him the privilege of purchasing these things, the treatment of the Government was harsh. That was the meaning of his affidavit, not that the collector behaved ungentlemanly to him, but that the policy of the Government was harsh. That was Medeo Rose's statement of 13th October, 1886. Any later affidavit I have not been able to find in this book, and I have looked it over carefully. It may be here, but I can find no affidavit containing the statement the hon. gentleman has read. If the hon. gentleman has any additional papers connected with the fishery question, he should have laid them before the House in order that the House might be charged with the whole case as it appears to the country and as it appears to the American Government, and to our own Government at this moment. Medeo Rose's statement is quite clear :

"I stated to him my situation, short of provisions, and a voyage of 250 miles before me, and pleaded with him for this slight privilege, but it was of no avail. I then visited the American consul and asked his assistance and found him powerless to aid me in the matter. The collector of customs held my papers until the next morning, although I asked for them as soon as I found I could not buy any provisions, say 1½ hours after I entered, but he refused to give them to me until the next morning. * * * I think the treatment I received harsh and cruel, driving myself and crew to sea with a scant supply of provisions, we having but a little flour and water and liable to be buffeted for days before we came home."

That is sworn to in 1886.

Mr. EDGAR. I am perfectly willing to accept the statement which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has read, though I have never seen it, as the subsequent affidavit on this point by Capt. Rose; because the statement, as he has read it, corresponds with the statement of the collector of customs which I read last night, and on which I founded this charge, and not on the original statement of Capt. Rose, which, however, was substantially correct. I made the charge, not of having been refused his papers, but of having been refused by the collector at the port, the right to buy seven pounds of sugar, three pounds of coffee, and so on, and that until they could hear from the headquarters at Ottawa by telegram, this man could not purchase even those little supplies; and I contend that was a harsh and unfriendly treatment of this captain. The collector's own statement, published in defence of himself, was as follows :—

"I gave him permission to fill water at once; but as the treaty made no provisions for the purchase of supplies, I would telegraph the department at Ottawa and no doubt it would be allowed. Capt. Rose expressed his willingness to remain until reply was received. He called at the office next morning (Thursday) at 6:30, and finding I had not received a reply, said, as the wind was fair and a good breeze, he would not wait longer."

That is what I stated last night. I did not charge that the parties acted contrary to the treaty, but I charge that the interpretation of the treaty was harsh and unfair. As the Minister of Finance stated :

"It is one thing to hold a technical construction, and it is another to undertake to enforce it."

I say that they did hold an extremely technical construction of the treaty, and they undertook not only to enforce it, but they did enforce it.

Mr. LAURIER. We have had so far two affidavits from Medeo Rose, but there is a third one which the Minister has not alluded to. The hon. gentleman will find it on page 111 of the book from which he quoted :

"I, Medeo Rose, of Gloucester, being under oath, do depose and say, that I was master of the schooner *Laura Sayward* during the year 1886, and that I am now master of the schooner *Gleaner*, of Gloucester.

"On April 18, 1887, I went into the lower harbor of Shelburne, Nova Scotia, in said schooner *Gleaner*, for shelter and water.

"On the morning of April 19, Mr. Atwood, the collector of customs, with two men wearing badges, which I supposed were Government badges, came on board. Their appearance filled me with fear, for I felt some trouble must be in store for me when Collector Atwood would leave his office and come so far (about 4 miles) to board my vessel. I invited him into the cabin, where he showed me a copy of my statement of October 13, 1886, in regard to the treatment I received from him when in schooner *Laura Sayward* (October 5, 1886), and asked me if I made that statement. I told him I did. Well, said he, everything in that statement is false. I told him my statement was true. He then produced a prepared written statement, which he read to me, which stated that my statement of October 13 was untrue, and told me that I must go on shore and sign it. Being nervous and frightened, and fearing trouble if I refused, I went on shore with him, to the store of Mr. Purney, and before Mr. Purney signed and swore to the statement.

"On the afternoon of the same day, realising the wrong I had done, I hired a team, and with one of my crew (Augustus Rogers), went to the custom-house and asked Collector Atwood to read to me the statement I had signed. He did so, and I again told him it was wrong and that my first statement was true.

"He said I did not ask for all the articles mentioned in my first statement; that he did not refuse me my papers, and also that that statement might be the cause of his removal from his office. I told him I did not want to injure him, and I did not want to make myself out a liar at Washington.

"About the 3rd day of June last I went into Shelburne again solely to get a copy of the last statement. I went to the custom house, taking the same man (Augustus Rogers) with me, and asked Collector Atwood for a copy of the statement.

"He refused to give it to me, and said my lawyers had been advising me what to do and that I need never expect a favor from him.

"The above is a true statement of the case. The statement obtained from me by Collector Atwood was obtained through my fear of seizure if I refused.

"MEDEO ROSE."

I find this affidavit is accompanied by another from Augustus Rogers :

"I, Augustus Rogers, one of the crew of schooner *Gleaner*, being duly sworn, do depose and say, that I went with Capt. Medeo Rose to the custom house at Shelburne, Nova Scotia, on the 19th day of April last, and also on the 3rd day of June. I heard his conversation with Collector Atwood on both occasions, and hereby certify that the statements of those interviews, as made above, are correct and true.

"AUGUSTUS ROGERS."

"MASS., ESSEX, s. s. :

"Personally appeared Medeo Rose and Augustus Rogers, and made oath to the truth of the above statements before me.

[Seal.]

"AARON PARSONS,

"Notary Public.

August 3, 1887.

So the case is far worse than was stated by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar).

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if, when he read the statement of Medeo Rose, he was aware of the second communication being in the book? If he was aware of it, and read the other statement alone, without communicating the whole matter, he was concealing from this House an important fact and was misleading the House. I am not saying he was doing that; but I ask him, was he aware when he read the state-

ment a few minutes ago, of the subsequent affidavit of Medeo Rose ?

Mr. EDGAR. In the same book, on the opposite page.

Mr. FOSTER. The only book was this, Senate documents, No. 113; and I read Medeo Rose's affidavit as given in that book, which flatly contradicted his first affidavit. I did not know what was in the book. I do not know the book yet.

Mr. EDGAR. It is on page 111 from which the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) read, only the affidavit the hon. gentleman read was dated 29th April and the other was dated 3rd August.

Mr. FOSTER. I see it exactly. I did not know it was in the book.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. FOSTER. I knew there were other statements in regard to Medeo Rose. I have sent to the department for them, and I will have them all here in a few minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We have them.

Mr. LAURIER. Are there others?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, there is still a sequel.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Then you knew it.

Mr. FOSTER. With the permission of the House I will read the sequel when I receive it.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in the tightest place he ever found himself in his life.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CASEY. I take that back. I have no doubt, from our experience of the hon. gentleman in this House, that he has been in a great many tight places in his life, and he may have been in a tighter place than this. One thing, however, is certain: that he concealed facts which he knew, and that he was aware of an affidavit made by this Captain Rose subsequently, the one he read to the House. To-day he brought this affidavit forward as a surprise, as he thought we had not the documents from which he was quoting, and which he took care that we did not possess, by his aid at least, and which contained the subsequent affidavit to the one he quoted, stating that the second affidavit, the affidavit which the Minister read, had been extracted from him, Capt. Rose, by pressure exercised upon him by the officers of the customs of Canada, that he had been terrorised into giving that former affidavit to clear the Dominion Government, and to clear the hon. Minister, from accusations that might be brought against them. Then the Minister tells us that although this affidavit was on the opposite page to the affidavit he read, he did not know anything about it. One of two things is true: either he misled the House as to his knowledge of the subsequent affidavit, or he had not the common gumption or sense to look upon the opposite page to see whether there was something bearing on the case. He must confess to either ignorance or to misleading the House, and I do not know which is most damaging to an hon. gentleman occupying his position, and I think a confession of ignorance is about as damaging as anything. I do not accuse him of these charges. I only state with what he must accuse himself, if he is to escape the accusation of telling the House an untruth—he must accuse himself of gross ignorance in matters connected with his own department. Now he tells us there is something else. When he sat down he hinted in a mysterious manner that there was something else to be produced, some sequel. What is the card he has got under the table—has he got anything up his sleeve?

Mr. MITCHELL.

He has said that there is something else; and if there is something else, now is the time to tell it to the House. But apart from the utter humiliation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, which has resulted from this short debate, and I cannot call by any other name a confession of ignorance or falsehood on the part of an hon. gentleman in the position of the Minister, there is something else that requires to be noticed. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has pointed out the inconsistency between the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice said some time ago, before the negotiations, that the privileges granted under this clause we are discussing, would utterly destroy our control of the inshore fisheries, and if they were granted we would not be able to prevent the United States fishermen from using them as they pleased. I believe the Minister of Justice is right, and I must confess he very generally is in a technical matter. But the Minister of Finance has taken the other line. He agreed to the clause as it now stands. And the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) asked for an explanation of the different views held by the hon. gentleman, and the Minister of Finance gave him an answer. And what was the answer? He said "carried." We all know the Minister of Finance is the controlling power in the Cabinet, that he has been working for and has attained to that position, but still under the circumstances we think the Minister of Justice ought to have received more consideration from his superior, from the virtual leader of the Cabinet, than was given to him and the rest of the Cabinet by simply uttering that word "carried." It was as much as to say: I have been to Washington and have agreed to this provision; it is none of your business whether it surrenders the inshore fisheries or not—I say "carried." This is the only argument the hon. gentleman advanced in regard to the question. It is cavalier treatment of the Minister of Justice and the rest of the Cabinet and of his venerable chief, to put the matter in that shape. It is due to the House and to his chief and the junior members of the Cabinet, that he should give some explanation as to how he reconciled the memorandum of the Minister of Justice with this clause of the treaty to which he has agreed. He must take one of two positions: either the Minister of Justice was wrong in his statement that the granting of those privileges to American craft would destroy our control of the inshore fisheries, or, if they would be destroyed, the hon. gentleman should state the reasons why it was necessary that we should grant those privileges. It is for him to speak now. "Carried" is not a sufficient argument in a matter of this national importance. It is for him to speak and explain why he said "carried," and why he sits on the Minister of Justice in the way he has done.

Mr. THOMPSON. I wish to say a few words, but not at all in the way of removing the imputation which the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Casey) has made, for I do not feel in the least sat upon. I do not admit for a single moment that the privileges I objected to as being likely to be injurious to our fishing interests, are conceded by this treaty or by the Bill now before the House without qualifications and without safeguards which will remove the objections I foresaw. I do not see how hon. gentlemen have made so much out of those affidavits of Medeo Rose. Let me call attention to what those affidavits are. I am sure that if they read them again they will hardly find a case on which to make an attack on the Government or the department for maladministration, or too severe an administration of the custom or fishery laws. In the first place the gentlemen opposite who are opposing this treaty with great vigor this afternoon, rely on the *ex parte* statements of a man who has made at least three conflicting affidavits which have been already before the House, and who has also made a fourth affidavit, which, we understand, is contradictory to the other

hree. So that hon. gentlemen will see that in pressing this charge as they have, they are at least pressing it on the testimony of a witness whose evidence they would not ask the humblest judge in the country to give judgment upon. The hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Laurier) read the third affidavit, and I would specially ask him to read that again. He will find that it is most craftily drawn and that the position of Medeo Rose in this matter is this: First he made an affidavit charging ill-treatment on the part of the Government, or customs officials; next he made an affidavit stating that he had been well treated, that the officer had referred to Ottawa for instructions, but that he found it convenient to depart without waiting for a reply, and had no complaint to make. The third affidavit which he made in view of the other two and for the purpose of removing the second, strange to say, from beginning to end, although made with that view, does not state that the second affidavit is untrue.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, it does.

Mr. THOMPSON. Let me remind the hon. gentleman what it does say and he will find that I am stating a fact, although I make the statement from memory. Medeo Rose says he went to tell the customs officer that the first affidavit was untrue and that it was extorted from him by fears, but when he came to give his affidavit as to whether it was true or false he does not dare to swear it was untrue. We have his assertion to the customs officer that the second affidavit was untrue, and we have the statement that he made that assertion corroborated by the custom house officer, but Medeo Rose does not dare to swear it was untrue from beginning to end of this affidavit. He says he made it from fear, without one word being alleged to show that there was a threat of seizure or the slightest reason for apprehension on his mind that there would be any seizure or that he had been treated unfairly in any way whatever. Let me call the attention of the hon. gentleman to what the law was that the custom house officer was administering. It was the fishery law of Canada, enforcing the Treaty of 1818. It was no new law, no customs regulation, but that which had been the law of the Province of Nova Scotia in which this transaction occurred for thirty years, and no custom house officer or no other officer of the Government could possibly dispense with the requirements of that law. It is not a question of whether Medeo Rose needed or not the mere permission to buy a few pounds of tea or coffee, but having gone there and having remained there for purposes which were not warranted by the treaty, his vessel was liable to seizure and he was liable to a heavy penalty under an Imperial statute and a statute of the old Province of Nova Scotia passed thirty years ago. What he wanted the custom house officer to do was substantially to say that the seizure would not be made and that the penalty should not be enforced. Would the hon. gentlemen entrust custom house officers, scattered as they are all over the country, to have dispensing power as to penalties like these? All the officer could do in such a case was to refer it to the department, and when he did refer it to the department, Medeo Rose, according to his own statement, considering, perhaps, that he had little need of the provisions, took advantage of a favorable breeze and went to sea.

Mr. LAURIER. Just let me refer the hon. gentleman to this third affidavit. The hon. gentleman says that Medeo Rose did not say the second affidavit was false and the first true. This is what Rose says in his affidavit:

"On the afternoon of the same day, realising the wrong I had done, I hired a team and with one of my crew (Augustus Rogers) went to the custom house and asked Collector Atwood to read to me the statement I had signed. He did so, and I again told him it was wrong, and that my first statement was true."

It will be observed if the first statement is true, the second was not. He does swear he says he told Collector Atwood, and if what he swears he told the collector was true, I would take it, when he repeats the same thing under oath, he intended it to be true. After all it matters little what are the statements of Medeo Rose in this matter. What is the charge that is brought against the Government? The charge is that those customs regulations were harassing and oppressive, and is that charge true or not true?

Mr. THOMPSON. They were not customs regulations.

Mr. LAURIER. Call them customs regulations or any regulations at all. At all events they were the regulations of the whole Government, and the charge is that they were oppressive and harassing to the American fishermen. Is that statement true or is it not true? That is the charge, and the fact is that the Government have pleaded to-day that they were most gentle in their treatment of the American fishermen. The Americans do not want any more of that gentleness. They want to get rid of it, and the Bill we are passing now is to enable the Canadian Government to deal gently with the American fishermen. Henceforward they will be able to extend gentleness in their treatment, and henceforward they will be lenient with them and the American fishermen will practically have their own way.

Mr. EDGAR. There is no use in the Minister of Justice trying to make out that any of these affidavits, or all of them, refute the fact that this Government official refused the supplies and had to telegraph to Ottawa to get permission to give them.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not deny that. I said he was obliged to do so by the law.

Mr. EDGAR. There is nothing contradictory to that in the affidavits of Medeo Rose or the Collector of Customs. That fact remains. But, Sir, if the Minister of Marine was unable to discover this affidavit of Rose upon the opposite page from the one that he read from, I wonder if he was unable to discover the letter from Secretary Bayard to Sir Sackville West which is upon the same page as the affidavit which he read; and in that letter of Mr. Secretary Bayard there is a reference made to this Rose dispute in terms which I think were directed in a statesmanlike manner to the extraordinary conduct of this Government in 1886. Mr. Secretary Bayard, in transmitting to Sir Sackville West this third affidavit of Rose, says:

"I should transmit the documents without further comment, but that, enclosing your note to me of July 18 last, you stated that you were further 'instructed to ask whether the United States Government have any observations to make thereupon.'

"In my reply to you on the 19th of July, I promised to comply with your request, and for that reason I now remark that the incident which had been the subject of this correspondence affords but another illustration and additional evidence, if any were needed, of the unwisdom of imperilling the friendly relations of two kindred and neighboring countries by entrusting the interpretation and execution of a treaty between them to the discretion of local and petty officials, and vesting in them powers of administration wholly unwarranted and naturally prolific of the irritations which wise and responsible rulers will always seek to avoid."

That is the line we have been taking in criticising the course of the Government and their officials in 1886, and I am sure it is a broad and statesmanlike and correct line.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must say it appears to me a most extraordinary thing, requiring the attention of this House to be called to it, that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries should not have made himself aware of the letter from Mr. Secretary Bayard to Sir Sackville West, under the date of October 21, 1887, and, if he had ever read that letter, how he could possibly have told us

that he was unaware of the existence of these three affidavits. It seems to me utterly incredible that a letter of Mr. Bayard to Sir Sackville West should have escaped the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If it did escape his attention, all I can say is that his mode of conducting the business of his department is most extraordinary and unprecedented. If he did read that letter, he knew the existence of those three affidavits, and I think, in view of the existence of that letter, the hon. gentleman's explanation is very extraordinary indeed. Now, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice, who must also have seen this letter, whether our collector did or did not prepare a written statement, as this Capt. Rose alleges, and did submit it to this man to be sworn to. I think, after what Mr. Bayard stated, enquiry ought to be made into that matter.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not see why the hon. gentleman should ask me. He is not an officer of my department, and I have nothing to do with the matter. But what I know is that the second affidavit of Capt. Rose, in which he states that he was well treated, was fully corroborated, not only by the officer himself, but by others as well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think enquiry should be made as to whether our officer submitted the affidavit to this American captain to swear to it. I think that ought to be done in a matter which was of sufficient importance to be noticed in a letter from the Secretary of State to the British ambassador. The whole circumstances are simply remarkable.

An hon. MEMBER. Fishy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, fishy in the extreme.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is one extraordinary statement made by the Minister of Justice. He attempts to discredit the statement of Capt. Rose by the allegation, but the second affidavit is against the statement in the first one; but when the third affidavit was made, contradicting the one made before, that ought to prove the man unworthy of belief. But the hon. gentleman fails to notice this fact: that the man swears that he made the second affidavit under fear that his vessel would be seized, and that he would be placed in the power of the officers of a British port. The hon. gentleman also fails to notice that the third affidavit is sustained by the statement of another party to the transaction. My hon. friend shakes his head, I presume to signify that I am stating something that is incorrect.

Mr. THOMPSON. If you will allow me, I will state what I mean. I explained, when on my feet before, that what had been spoken of as the corroboration of the affidavit was merely a corroboration of the fact that this man had stated to the collector that his former statement was untrue, but there was no corroboration of his allegations of fact. It is a mere corroboration by a witness who was present when Capt. Rose said to the collector, "My former statement is untrue;" and I call the attention of the committee to the fact that he did not swear that the affidavit was untrue, but simply said so to the collector.

Mr. MITCHELL. He did swear that it was not true, as I understand. In addition to that, Mr. Augustus Rogers swore:

"I, Augustus Rogers, one of the crew of schooner *Gleaner*, being duly sworn, do depose and say, that I went with Capt. Medeo Rose to the custom house at Shelburne, Nova Scotia, on the 13th day of April last, and also on the 3rd day of June. I heard his conversation with Collector Atwood on both occasions, and hereby certify that the statements of those interviews, as made above, are correct and true.

"AUGUSTUS ROGERS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

"Personally appeared Medeo Rose and Augustus Rogers, and made oath to the truth of the above statements before me.

"AARON PARSONS,
"Notary Public.

"August 3, 1887."

How can the Minister say that it was not sworn to? Both of them distinctly contradict the statements made in the second affidavit, and Mr. Augustus Rogers confirms the statement of Medeo Rose that he did it from fear of arrest. The thing is as plain as can be, and I am surprised that a statement should be put before the House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and confirmed by the Minister of Justice to the contrary. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says he did not know of the existence of these papers.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then that makes the matter worse. If he did, he ought to have told it to the House. The Minister of Justice listened to the statement made by him, and he sat still, and allowed the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to mislead this House by the statement that Medeo Rose had contradicted the previous affidavit he had made. The thing is outrageous.

Mr. THOMPSON. All I can say in conclusion is that there is not one word in the statement of Augustus Rogers which is inconsistent with the second affidavit of Medeo Rose. He simply states that he was present when Capt. Rose made certain statements. The hon. gentleman perhaps knows how carefully devised some of these affidavits are drawn with the view of representing a certain state of facts, when they do not entail the penalties of perjury upon the person who makes them. Here is the second affidavit distinctly recalling the charges made in the first, and the third affidavit, in which he beats all around the compass, and does not say as a matter of fact that the statements he made in the second affidavit are untrue at all. But the person who drew the affidavit, and I venture to say it was not Medeo Rose, is very careful indeed to insert all kinds of statements that he had contradicted it, and eliminate altogether the statements contradicting it in the affidavit which was sworn to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I look on the explanation of the Minister of Justice as hair-splitting. It is a nice piece of special pleading, and, from his well-known ability in that line, I can understand how he could mislead this House by such special pleading. He says there is no sworn statement that Captain Rose's second affidavit was false. I will read again what Capt. Rose said:

"On the morning of April 19, Mr. Atwood, the collector of customs, with two men wearing badges, which I supposed were Government badges, came on board. Their appearance filled me with fear, for I felt some trouble must be in store for me when Collector Atwood would leave his office and come so far (about 4 miles) to board my vessel. I invited him into the cabin, where he showed me a copy of my statement of October 13, 1886, in regard to the treatment I received from him when in schooner *Laura Sayward* (October 5, 1886), and asked me if I made that statement. I told him I did. Well, said he, everything in that statement is false. I told him my statement was true."

Mr. THOMPSON. He said so, but does not swear to it.

Mr. MITCHELL.—

"He then produced a prepared written statement, which he read to me, which stated that my statement of October 13 was untrue, and told me I must go on shore and sign it. Being nervous and frightened, and fearing trouble if I refused, I went on shore with him to the store of Mr. Purney, and before Mr. Purney signed and swore to the statement. On the afternoon of the same day, realising the wrong I had done, I hired a team and, with one of my crew (Augustus Rogers), went to the custom house and asked Collector Atwood to read to me the statement I had signed. He

did so, and I again told him that it was wrong and that my first statement was true."

This statement was sworn to by Mr. Aaron Parsons. This is Capt. Rose's statement:

"He said I did not ask for all the articles mentioned in my first statement; that he did not refuse me my papers, and also that that statement might be the cause of his removal from his office. I told him I did not want to injure him and I did not want to make myself a liar at Washington. About the 3rd day of June last, I went into Shelburne again, solely to get a copy of the last statement. I went to the custom house, taking the same man, Augustus Rogers, with me, and asked Collector Atwood for a copy of the statement. He refused to give it to me, and said my lawyers had been advising me what to do, and that I need never expect a favor from him. The above is a true statement of the case. The statement obtained from me by Collector Atwood was obtained through my fear of seizure if I refused."

Yet the hon. the Minister of Customs tells us that Capt. Medeo Rose did not, in this affidavit, declare his statement was untrue. I will read the words again: "I told him it was wrong, and that my first statement was true." The captain signed to the truth of this last statement, and is sustained by Mr. Augustus Rogers in the most complete manner possible, as I have already shown. Mr. Rogers made the following affidavit:—

"I, Augustus Rogers, one of the crew of schooner *Gleaner*, being duly sworn, do depose and say, that I went with Capt. Medeo Rose to the custom house at Shelburne, Nova Scotia, on the 13th day of April last, and also on the 3rd June. I heard his conversation with Collector Atwood on both occasions, and I hereby certify that the statements of those interviews, as made above, are correct and true.

"AUGUSTUS ROGERS."

What better evidence can be adduced. True, the hon. gentleman has chosen to assail the testimony of Capt. Rose because he made the second affidavit, although that affidavit was made under fear of arrest and seizure of his vessel, but the moment the captain had made his second affidavit he found out his mistake and at once tried to recall it, and his final statement is confirmed by the evidence and affidavit of Mr. Rogers, who was present the whole time, and swore to the truth of the captain's declaration and to the truth of the facts as stated in his first affidavit.

Mr. McNEILL. Where was that affidavit drawn up?

Mr. MITCHELL. At Essex, county of Massachusetts.

Mr. McNEILL. I should think we all have heard of hair-splitting Yankee lawyers.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. the Minister of Justice has a strong imagination. He has imagined a host of lawyers advising this Capt. Rose, who has been giving them so much trouble and drawing his affidavit so carefully that he might get out of it, no matter whether he was swearing to a lie or not. But it appears from the papers that it was not Capt. Rose who was advised by the lawyers, but the collector of Shelburne, for he told Capt. Rose that his lawyers had advised him about the matter. It was the affidavit which Collector Atwood coerced Capt. Rose into signing, that was drawn by the lawyers for that particular purpose. That was the affidavit which the Government, through their officer, coerced this man into signing, and which he afterwards, when free from that coercion, declared under oath to be untrue. That was the affidavit drawn by the lawyers, and it appears that Capt. Rose, when he signed it, did not know exactly what he was swearing to. There is no need to read over the documents again, for it has been clearly proved that Capt. Rose made a declaration in the second place under coercion, and I submit it was forced from him with the approval of the Government, because these facts have been known to them for some time, and they have not yet dismissed Collector Atwood. This captain was coerced into swearing to

a lie in order to get the Government out of a scrape. The affidavit was a lying one, drawn out by the lawyers, and not the spontaneous affidavit of Capt. Rose before other parties. But there is one point outside of that which has not yet been explained, and to which I merely wish to call attention again without dwelling on it at all. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not yet explained—I do not know whether he can or not—the reasons of his ignorance of the affidavit which is on the page opposite to the one he read. How it was that he knew of the existence of the lying affidavit, the bull-dozed affidavit which sustained his case, and in regard to which this Government are responsible, because they have maintained in office the man who forced that affidavit on Capt. Rose—how it was he knew about that and did not know about the subsequent free, spontaneous, and amply corroborated affidavit, he has not explained. I say the subsequent affidavit was amply corroborated, because Augustus Rogers, who was present on both occasions—who was present when the collector terrorised Capt. Rose into making the false affidavit, and who was present on the subsequent occasion—certifies to its truth. The hon. gentleman may take whichever horn of the dilemma he chooses. He may admit he was ignorant of the subsequent affidavit, and, therefore, unfit to be where he is and to have taken part in the conference at Washington, or he may admit that he knew of its existence and concealed it from the House by speaking as if no such thing were in existence. I do not know which horn of the dilemma would be more discreditable to him as a Minister of the Crown.

On section 7,

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When this Bill was under discussion on a previous occasion, I took the opportunity to draw the attention of the House to the concessions made to the American fishermen under this and the previous clause, showing, according to my judgment, that we had, under these clauses, yielded up the whole value of our fishing privileges and had obtained nothing whatever in return. I maintain that the use of our ports for the purpose of securing bait and supplies and the transshipment of cargoes is a privilege of unestimable value, so far as the American fishermen are concerned, and that the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Finance, and the other hon. gentlemen who spoke on that side, have not been able to show a single advantage gained by the Canadian fishermen on our side. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, pointed to several articles in various newspapers, showing the advantages of the treaty from our point of view. Now, I hold in my hand the *New York Herald* of Sunday last, in which an interview is reported with Mr. Phelan, the Consul General of the United States in Halifax.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps my hon. friend was not in the House when the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) read every word of that interview, so that it is already in *Hansard*.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The interview he read was in the *Montreal Herald*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think not. Was my hon. friend in the House when my hon. friend for Northumberland read that interview?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then perhaps this is a different one altogether.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes.

"The advantages of the treaty," Mr. Phelan replied, are manifold. Among other things it opens up valuable fishing bays to us by removing all doubts as to our right to fish in them. This in itself is no small matter, inasmuch as Canadians had pre-

viously claimed that we were permitted to fish there only on sufferance. Under the Treaty of 1818 we had no right to enter Canadian ports, except for four things—wood, water, shelter and repairs. Even in these cases we were subjected to an unpleasant espionage, and as carelessly watched as if we were so many pirates. Again, the treaty relieves our vessels entering Canadian ports for the purposes named in the treaty of all dues, pilotage and every charge whatever, and at the same time they enjoy the benefits of light-houses, buoys and other safeguards to navigation, the same as Canadian vessels do. The treaty also eliminates the word 'hovering' from the Canadian statutes, under which some of our vessels have been seized and condemned. Under the treaty, an American vessel coming in damaged can repair and procure fresh supplies, provisions, etc., and refit and save the necessity of returning home for this purpose. All these privileges, you must understand, were denied us under the old treaty. Now our vessels can unload, sell or transship their cargoes, and in case they are short of supplies at any time, they can enter the nearest port and get them. In short, we have surrendered nothing and gained a great deal. The Canadians have surrendered everything and gained nothing. All the gain is on our side. True, the treaty might go further than it does, but it is certainly a great improvement on the one now in force. The disadvantages under which we have suffered during the past two years in the way of seizures on technical grounds cannot be committed under the present treaty. It is my deliberate judgment that it would be a serious matter for our fishermen if the new convention should be rejected. To do so means a return to the old Treaty of 1818, under which our people have chafed so long."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is the date of that paper?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is the *New York Herald* of Sunday, April 15.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is marvellously like that interview in Montreal.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes, but it goes a little further. At any rate, it is not of any importance whether it is the same statement or not. It corroborates the statement that we have surrendered all the advantages of which we were possessed under the old Treaty of 1818, and have gained nothing from the Americans in return. I think that is an opinion, from the American side of the case, which will more than counterbalance all the quotations which have been read to the House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to understand, if I can, the real meaning of this section. When the motion for the second reading of this Bill was made, I ventured to make some observations on the Bill, and especially with reference to the 6th section, which has been passed, and the 7th section, which is now before the House; and I submitted, with some humility, that I could not quite understand what was the meaning of those sections. I asked the Minister of Justice what was the meaning of those sections in his opinion, those sections being, to my mind, the key to the whole treaty, but the hon. gentleman was a little out of temper at the time, and he declined to give me the information I asked for. Afterwards, he delivered what was characterised as a most spirited address, which seemed to suit his friends on the other side of the House; but I had asked for that information with no object in the world except to obtain the information. It seemed to me, as I stated at that time, that there was no controlling power provided for, to determine when or when not the American fishermen could get the privileges which are accorded to them under that section. For instance, I stated that the privilege of transshipment was a great privilege which they sought, and I felt that, under that section, although it might not be intended to give them that privilege, the section could be so construed as practically to give them that right of transshipment. I pointed out that United States fishing vessels, according to the section, entering the

"Ports, bays and harbors of the eastern and north-eastern coasts of Canada, under stress of weather or in consequence of

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

any casualty, may unload, reload, transship or sell (subject to customs laws and regulations) all fish on board, when such unloading, transshipment or sale is necessary as incidental to repairs."

And I asked, as I now ask, who is to judge whether it is necessary as incidental to repairs or not? Nobody can judge. The captain may say, I propose to remain here two or three days, and, in my opinion, my fish are in such a condition that I must transship them. It is not to be supposed that the collector of customs in each port is to have the right to interpret the treaty. That right is not vested in him. The result is, that that section will be so construed that the privilege of transshipment, the most valuable privilege that the American fishermen have asked for, is practically conceded to them. According to the 7th section, the master of any United States fishing vessel who has received a license may obtain

"Such provisions and supplies as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels, and any such vessel, having obtained a license in the manner aforesaid, shall also be accorded, upon all occasions, such facilities for the purchase of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels."

Now, the hon. gentleman says that this treaty does not give them the right to purchase bait. It seems to me that bait is a part of the outfit of a fishing vessel. At any rate, it is so argued, and I think can be successfully argued. If a captain says: "I have lost my bait in this storm and I want to purchase more," the treaty says that he may, and all I have contended for is that this treaty, which is said to be an interpretation treaty, which is said to be intended to make matters clear, has simply made them so confused and so difficult to understand that practically the right to purchase bait and the right of transshipment cannot be refused to American fishermen. Now, I have already called the attention of the Minister to the 7th section, and I repeat my request for information in regard to it. The first part of that section says:

"The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and any officers of the Government of Canada whom he may authorise for that purpose, shall grant promptly, and upon application, and without charge, licenses to United States fishing vessels to purchase in established ports of entry of the aforesaid coasts of Canada, for the homeward voyage, such provisions and supplies as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels."

And the latter part of the section goes on to say:

"Any such vessel, having obtained a license in the manner aforesaid, shall also be accorded upon all occasions such facilities for the purchase of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels."

Now, the first part of the section would lead anyone who was seeking to find out its interpretation to believe that it was only after the master of the vessel had closed his voyage and was going home, and required some small supplies which he would need for that homeward voyage, that he would be entitled to obtain the necessary supplies, but the latter part of the section seems to have a different effect. It appears to state that any vessel which has once obtained a license, shall, in future, on all occasions, have the same facilities for the purchase of supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels. Of course there will be a great deal of controversy as to what "casual and needful provisions and supplies" are. My impression is that this treaty will receive at the hands of this Government, if it be adopted, and from the officers of the Government, a very broad and liberal interpretation. My opinion is, that the Canadian officers hereafter will not be very astute in examining the demand of the American fishermen, under this treaty, to purchase supplies or to purchase bait or anything else. They will practically give them what they want, but it seems to me that this clause is very curiously worded, and I ask whether a license once obtained is intended to enure for the following season, or whether,

when a license is obtained in the early part of the summer, the party is only to be entitled to purchase supplies as he needs them from time to time during the then season. If that is the case, that will enable these men to do what the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Fisheries have declared would be fatal to the fishing interests of the Maritime Provinces. I do not desire to prolong the controversy on these points, which I think have been put very fairly before the House and the country, but the quotations which have been put before the House from the Minutes and the State papers show clearly that, in the opinion of those Ministers, it would be fatal to the interests of everyone, and especially to the interests of the fisheries in the Maritime Provinces, if the American fishermen were allowed to come in there and make their purchases of bait, if they were allowed to make the harbors and shores of the Maritime Provinces the base for carrying on their fishing operations. Now, it appears to me that if an American fisherman can come into port and claim that, by casualty, he has lost his outfit, he may purchase a new outfit, as the 6th section says. I think that the word "outfit" of a fishing vessel includes bait as a part of it. I may be wrong. When a fishing vessel goes, for instance, to take cod-fish from the Banks, the outfit which she takes to enable her—and, as my hon. friend on my right remarks, almost all she needs as outfit—to carry on the fishery, is the fresh bait. In old days, these fisheries on the Banks were carried on by means of salt bait, but when the fishermen discovered that fresh bait was taken more readily, they have, of late years, used only that. No fisherman would presume to go to the Banks and say his outfit was complete unless he had sufficient fresh bait to last him for his voyage. My impression, therefore, was that the word outfit was intended to cover bait, fresh as well as salt. It would not be contended that it would not cover salt—the bait seems to me to be in precisely the same category. Therefore if a vessel has gone to the Banks, providing herself with a supply of bait, in the first instance, to last a fortnight, and afterwards enters one of the ports of the Maritime Provinces, and the master says that from some casualty she has lost her bait, you have no means of testing the accuracy of his statement; and hon. gentlemen opposite, both to-day and previously, have told us what their opinion is of the character of the men who man and control these vessels, and how they will make any statement that is necessary in their interest. If he goes there and says that, from casualty, he has lost his outfit, he is entitled under this interpretation, to replenish it. But not as a matter of favor. He says, under the treaty: I have come here and as a right I demand to purchase my outfit. He will not speak with bated breath, as he has been accustomed to do, when pursuing his fisheries under the Treaty of 1818. He will now come and say: I demand this as a right. Now, I would like the hon. gentleman, if he deems it necessary to reply to my observations at all, to answer me whether, in his opinion, it was intended that the license should be granted to American fishermen when they go into a bay in the early part of the season, and having got that license, which they get as a matter of right, does that entitle them to purchase, in the words of the 7th section, "such casual and needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels from time to time." If it was only intended they should purchase such casual and needful supplies as are required for the home voyage, then the hon. gentleman will see that the first part of the section concedes that privilege entirely—the latter part of the section was intended to grant something else—that on all occasions after having obtained his license, he can obtain such casual or needful provisions as he requires. If that is so, you have given up everything, you have enabled them to make your harbors their basis for carrying on their fishing operations. If that is so,

I need not use any stronger language than the language used by the Minister of Justice himself, that such a concession would be absolutely fatal to the fishing interests of the Maritime Provinces. If it is fatal, and if you have given this up, it is well that we should know it. I suppose this is the proper time to ask an explanation.

Mr. THOMPSON. I should like very much, indeed, to enter fully into this question with my hon. friend, and to give, what I conceive to be the true interpretation of the phrases in these two sections. The hon. gentleman, however, must bear with me if I decline doing so, not at all out of disrespect to him, but because, as he is aware, whatever we may say here in favor of the treaty will be used against it elsewhere. Hon. gentlemen opposite have perfect freedom to suggest the possible constructions that may arise unfavorable to Canada, without any injury to the treaty at all; indeed they are increasing the chances of its acceptance by the United States. But, on the contrary, if we defended the treaty as we might be disposed to do under other circumstances, and made a statement of our views on the construction of various points suggested to us, we are making a case for those who are disposed to find fault with the treaty in another place. The hon. gentleman, however, will, I am sure, appreciate what I shall endeavor to say in reply to the remarks he has just made, in a general way. He has correctly quoted me as saying that if we should do anything which can make the harbors of the Maritime Provinces a base of supplies for the United States fishermen, we would, practically, give up our whole case and adopt a measure which will be extremely detrimental to the interests of our own fishermen, at a time when they are hampered, to some extent, by an adverse duty in the markets of the United States. But I do not regard the sections which the hon. gentleman has referred to, as to any extent making Canada a basis of supplies for the United States fishermen. On the contrary, I think they contain but a liberal and fair extension of the right of shelter and repairs which are secured to the United States fishermen by the Treaty of 1818. Now, in the first place, as regards the question of transshipment. The hon. gentleman will remember that the treaty itself deals generally with the subject of transshipment in that section of it which provides for the right of transshipment being given to the United States fishermen on certain conditions; those conditions being, principally, the admission of our fish free into the United States; so that the treaty deals with that particular subject in that specific way. But when we come down to give, in section 6, the right of shipment in certain specified cases, we are dealing, not with the general right of transshipment, not conferring, I take it, the general right of transshipment of cargo at all, but we are ceding simply the right to transship cargoes in certain cases, one of which lately occurred, but which have been of rare occurrence, and in which it would be most harsh to refuse the right of transshipment; these cases being cases of vessels coming in out of repair and in distress, and with their fish in such a condition that they would spoil or have to be thrown overboard, unless the master were allowed to transship his cargo. He would not be permitted by the Treaty of 1818, even under this extreme circumstance, to transship his cargo, or even to sell it in Canada, if he were willing to pay the duty upon it; but this simply allows him, under circumstances of that kind, where transshipment is necessary and incidental to repairs, to transship. I take it that instead of its being ambiguous, or difficult to ascertain the condition of the vessel when she comes in to make repairs, under these circumstances it is very easy of ascertainment. The United States vessels are to be subject to supervision, by boarding officers and customs officers, and in addition there can be no transshipment effected without certain entries being made in the customs house. There

will be supervision at every point; first of all, when they enter the three mile limit they will be subject to the inspection of our officers who will ascertain their *bond fides* in entering the harbors where they come, and if they transship their cargoes they will have to make customs entries. A few words as to what the hon. gentleman said about licenses. I understand that hon. gentlemen opposite are rather inclined to believe that this construction might be placed upon the treaty: that a vessel going seaward towards the fishing grounds might, early in the season, obtain a license for the purchase of supplies. Now, I do not think that is the construction that can be applied. A vessel is only entitled to apply for a licence to obtain those provisions and supplies which are ordinarily sold to trading vessels for the homeward voyage, and I should think it very extraordinary if it were set up on the part of any of the American fishermen on going to the fishing grounds that they would expect to get a license in order to obtain the casual and needful supplies for a homeward voyage, when it would be impossible for them or for the person who gave the license to ascertain what supplies would be needed for the homeward voyage, or whether any would be needed. I do not think that the construction is at all reasonable, that after a vessel has obtained a license she shall forever afterwards be entitled to obtain those supplies, nor do I think any such contention will be made. I think the proviso in that section is simply to take care that the condition of the vessel having been established, the necessity of obtaining supplies having been established, a license shall be given, notwithstanding any provision in the law to the contrary, and that every facility shall be given to the captain of the vessel to make the purchases which the license authorises him to make. The section which provides for the right of making good damages or losses arising from disaster, is simply an extension of the provision of the Treaty of 1818. If a vessel lost a bowsprit, or sustained any slight damage whatever, she had a right to come in for repairs, but if she lost her nets she would not have the right to come in and purchase nets, strictly speaking. It is simply, I say, a fair extension of the provisions of the Treaty of 1818, in regard to repairs, an extension which we were asked to make on some occasions, but which it was beyond our power to grant.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With the latter part of the remarks made by the hon. Minister I quite agree. The hon. gentleman says that, under the Treaty of 1818, if a vessel lost her bowsprit, or some other part of her gear, she had a right to come in for repairs. It is perfectly true the vessel had no right to buy supplies, or transship cargo. Her right was confined simply to repairing the damage which had been caused to some part of her gear. Now, the hon. gentleman says that, under this treaty; they have extended that right; I agree with him, and the only question is as to what extent they have extended it. It seems to me that, while there may be three or four constructions put upon the 6th section, the construction which American captains will put upon the section—and I make these observations without any desire to criticise the hon. minister too sharply—is that, when he comes in to repair running gear or bowsprit, the captain will say that, my fish are in such a condition that I must send them on, in order that the repairs may be made. Who is to question the right of the captain to land them, if it is incidental to repairs to land them? Who is to question his right if he also demands transshipment as incidental to the repairs? Formerly, under the old treaty, the vessel came in for a specific purpose, which was understood by the collector, and if he exceeded that purpose his vessel was liable to seizure. But this treaty confers on the captains of American vessels the privilege, when they come in, to repair losses which have happened to their vessels; and they may then transship

Mr. THOMPSON,

their fish, unload or sell them if these acts are necessarily incidental to repairs. The language is unfortunate, for no one can say what is incidental to repairs and what is not incidental. The American captains will put a broad construction upon this term. Any one acquainted with fishing knows what will happen. Suppose a fleet of 200 vessels are fishing off Margaree or Cheticamp on the coast of Cape Breton, or off East Point. They may come into harbor on the approach of a storm and one of the captains may say that he wants to make some repairs as he has lost some gear. He reports to the custom house, and states that as the repairs will occupy ten or twelve days, he desires to land his cargo and send it on. Who is to question his right?

Mr. THOMPSON. We can ascertain the fact, and he is responsible for the penalty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. Minister say that a sub-collector at Cheticamp or Souris would dare to say to one of the American captains: You claim that right to do this under the 6th clause, we will seize your vessel and test your case in the courts. I do not think officers would dare to do so. I am talking of the practical construction and application of the section. It seems to me that when the hon. gentleman stated formerly that concessions of this kind would destroy the fisheries of the Maritime Provinces, he stated the truth. Again, the hon. gentleman claims that it would not be fair to press him to place a construction upon the words of the section. But that is surely not a fair contention on his part. It is not fair that this country should be called upon to ratify the treaty without knowing the meaning to be put upon the most important words in it? Surely we should understand what is the real meaning of the concessions we are making, and that the United States should understand what is the real meaning of the concessions which they are receiving. If "outfit," as I contend it does, includes bait as well as salt, and if the construction of the 6th section is as I put it just now, everything for which the Americans have ever contended has been given up to them. The hon. gentleman, in referring to the 7th section, stated, if I understood him rightly, that American fishing vessels will only be entitled to purchase supplies when they are on their homeward voyage. But an American fisherman is only on his homeward voyage when he is leaving the last port in the bay. What is the use of getting a license then? Surely the hon. gentleman must see that some meaning must be accorded to the last part of the section, which states that after they have obtained such licenses they shall on all occasions be accorded permission to purchase such casual supplies, etc., as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels. The meaning of the clause is this: that an American fishing vessel coming down to the bay can obtain a license when she comes into the bay. And after obtaining her license she, from month to month and from week to week, is entitled under the license to go into any Canadian port and purchase any such casual supplies as she may require from time to time. I cannot put any other construction on the last part of the section. It has no meaning unless it means that.

"She shall be accorded upon all occasions such facilities."

Surely it must mean that, and if it does mean that, the hon. gentleman sees he has made our harbors the basis to enable them to carry out their fishery. If he has done so as the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Justice have said, he has struck a fatal blow at the fisheries of the Maritime Provinces. He says, in his Minute of 1887:

"If the Provinces are to be judges, it is most prejudicial to their interest that United States fishermen should be permitted to come into their harbors on any pretext, and it is fatal to their fishery interests that those fishermen, with whom they have to compete at such a disadvantage in the markets of the United States, should be allowed to enter for supplies and bait, even for the pursuit of the deep sea fisheries."

It is, therefore, fatal to the fishery interests that they should be allowed to enter for supplies and bait. It appears to me the broad construction of those two sections will enable them to do that which my hon. friend says will be fatal to our interests. That broad construction is the construction American fishermen will contend for—that is, the construction they will give it, and that broad construction is the construction the American people will endorse. My own impression is that is the construction we will finally have to accept. The hon. gentleman says, truly enough, and it would be a very fair argument in answer to their contention, that the transshipment of their fish and the purchase of supplies and bait is provided for in another part of the treaty. Of course it is, but it is provided for in this part of the treaty too, under the circumstances mentioned in the section. The question is, who is to declare when those circumstances exist and when they do not exist? An American captain comes in and says: I have lost my outfit from casualty. There is nobody to dispute it. You must accept it and when you do he has the right to buy a new outfit, and the outfit if it embraces salt must necessarily embrace bait. If that is so we are giving away, by this section, everything he wants, and the latter part of the other section which gave him the right to transship and purchase bait when they admit our fish duty free, will never be brought into operation, because practically he will have the right under the section we are now considering, if that construction I am submitting to the House is adopted, and I believe it will be. My own impression is, and I have heard it stated by some gentlemen, that the American Senate will not ratify this treaty. Personally, I do not think that would be an unmixed evil. I, for one, do not fear we will have a repetition of the disastrous state of affairs we had in 1886. We are not going to have that any more. There will be no enforcement by this Government of the obnoxious customs laws, whether this treaty goes into operation or not. There is no doubt about that. The language used by the Finance Minister, and acquiesced in by the members of the Government, puts that beyond doubt. We will have our rights under the old treaty and they will be maintained with a firm hand, and not with the technical exactness in which the Minister of Fisheries in 1886 tried to carry them out. In 1887 a new state of matters was introduced, and I do not think that the Americans complained very much of their treatment in that year. I rose for the purpose, as far as possible, of getting light myself upon the meaning of those sections, and if anything I could say would add to the information of others, I thought it well to speak, as I believed it desirable that this House should understand the matter thoroughly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman was making the treaty I could understand his action in this matter, but we are not doing that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was trying to arrive at the meaning of this section, and I think it is very important.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the course he has taken is the course that would be taken by the deadliest enemy of the Canadian fishermen.

An hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; and I will show it. We are not now making a treaty, Sir. The treaty is made and we are not deciding whether we will accept this treaty. That the House has already unanimously decided, and the hon. gentleman himself, after discussing this treaty, closed his remarks by saying he intended to vote for it. I say that we are not making a treaty, and as we are not deciding whether we will accept the treaty, for that has been done

and done unanimously by this House, I say that every word the hon. gentleman is using in the criticism which he has offered to the House, he knows is impotent to change a line in that treaty, but he knows that all the weight and influence that his position in this House, his position as a member of the legal profession, will give him, will be quoted hereafter in opposition to the rights of Canadian fishermen and in support of the claims of American fishermen. I cannot understand a man, who professes to be the friend of our fishermen, taking this course. If his object, Sir, is to aid me, if his object is to aid Canada in getting this treaty adopted by the American Senate, then his conduct is intelligible; but from any other standpoint I say that I am astounded that a gentleman of the legal profession, a man having the knowledge of public affairs that the hon. gentleman has, should take up the time of the House, as he has, after the House has solemnly decided by a unanimous vote to ratify this treaty, when he knows he cannot change a line in it. I am astonished at the hon. gentleman standing on his feet here and for this length of time endeavoring to make a case for the United States fishermen against the Canadian fishermen, and throwing all the weight and influence of his legal opinion, whatever that may amount to, into the scale of the American fishermen against the Canadian fishermen.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not know what I have done to merit this extraordinary scolding at the hands of the hon. gentleman. When I first addressed the House I ventured to ask information on those most important clauses which the hon. gentleman has incorporated in this treaty, clauses which were susceptible of a broad meaning, the result of which would be to surrender our fisheries entirely to the United States. I venture respectfully to ask the hon. gentleman and the Minister of Justice who accompanied him to Washington, and who was a party to the construction of this treaty, I ventured to ask them what was the understanding come to by the plenipotentiaries at Washington as to the meaning of those words, and I was answered with a flippancy altogether unfair and unjust. I was not answered, in fact, at all. I was not told whether the construction I said those clauses were susceptible of was the proper construction or not in the opinion of the hon. gentlemen, or whether it was the construction generally adopted by the plenipotentiaries at Washington. The hon. gentleman did not tell me then and when I ventured to exercise my undoubted right in this House, before I voted for the passage of that treaty, and asked what it really meant, I am sat upon by the hon. gentleman and lectured as if I had done something wrong. What does the hon. gentleman mean? Does he ask us to accept every word and clause of this treaty in ignorance of its real meaning; does he want the fishermen to believe that they have conceded nothing when it may turn out they have conceded all? Does the hon. gentleman want me to vote blindly for a clause of this treaty which the Minister of Justice has said admits American fishermen to our ports and bays, carrying off our fisheries from us? What does the hon. gentleman take me for? I am here, Sir, solely and earnestly looking for information which I believe to be of the greatest importance, before this House adopts this treaty. I am asking it, too, at a time when the treaty is before the United States Senate. I say it is unworthy of this Parliament, and unworthy of the hon. gentleman, to seek to smuggle through a treaty under the assumption that it contains a secret meaning which he wishes to hide from the American people. I thought the day had gone by for any underhand dealings between the two great nations. I thought we were going to deal frankly and honestly with our friends to the south of us. I say it is in the highest interests of peace for this assembly of Canada and the Senate of the United States, if they adopt that treaty, to thoroughly understand what its real meaning

is. Does the hon. gentleman want that before the next season goes by, a construction should be put on that treaty by the Minister of Fisheries diametrically opposite to that which Mr. Bayard puts on it? Does he want us brought to the point of the bayonet, to which he says the administration of the Fisheries Department brought us two years ago? Does he want us brought to that condition of affairs which Mr. Bayard describes in that private and confidential letter he wrote to the hon. gentleman? I trust not; and if he does not, we can only bring about a better and more cordial state of affairs by dealing honorably and frankly with each other, and, if we have entered into a treaty, by understanding what the real meaning of the treaty is. If we have made concessions, in heaven's name let us understand the full meaning of them; and if hon. gentlemen are going to vote, let them know what they are voting for. I will not submit to be lectured by the hon. gentleman in the tone and manner which he has assumed to-day, when I ask what construction is put upon that treaty by himself and the other plenipotentiaries. I was within my right, and instead of being lectured by the hon. gentleman, I was entitled to a fair and decent answer, which I have not got.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to know whether this whole business is a farce or not. If we are not to consider and discuss every line of this treaty, what is the use of putting you in the Chair? We have a right to know what we are doing. We do not approve of this treaty; we do not pretend to say that it is a good treaty or honorable to Canada. We accept it under compulsion, but we have a right to know what we are accepting, and that we propose to know.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had an opportunity of giving this treaty a most careful and deliberate examination; and with all its obscurity and defects, with all its want of clearness of construction or explicitness of statement, he knew that this House could not alter one jot or tittle of it. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat will not pretend for a single moment that, in discussing this treaty, the House is in the position that it would be in if we had before us a Bill on any subject over which the House has perfect control. When we have a Bill before us in which we can alter clauses, hon. gentlemen may contend in the most vigorous terms for the construction of the law or the meaning of a phrase, because it is in the power of the House to alter the Bill upon such representations. But the hon. gentleman knows that that is not our position here. The treaty is made.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is an alternative.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is that alternative?

Mr. MACKENZIE. To reject it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is precisely the position. That alternative was preserved to this House, so that not one line of this treaty can become operative or can affect the interests of Canada until the Parliament of Canada, having deliberately considered it in all its bearings, decides to accept and ratify it. But that is not the position of the hon. gentleman who has spoken. He would have been within the lines of his duty as an independent member of this House if, coming to the conclusion that this treaty was faulty, obscure, or that for any other cause it was undesirable that it should become binding on Canada, he had determined to give it the most unqualified hostility, and defeat it if he could; and even if he stood alone as a member of this House in taking that view, he was bound in the interests of Canada to vote for its rejection. But that was his only alternative, as it is not in our power to alter a line of the treaty or change it in any way. But what did the hon. gentleman do? After giving the treaty the most care-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

ful consideration that he was bound as member of this House to give it, he said:

"The treaty has been agreed upon, and I for one hope that no action will be taken by this Parliament to throw it out. I am willing, Sir, that it should be accepted."

The hon. gentleman having taken that position, having come to the conclusion that he owed it to his constituents and to Canada that this treaty should become a binding treaty, I say that when he stands up here and takes half an hour of the time of this House in order to give the weight of his opinion as a lawyer in favor of the interests of the United States and United States fishermen, I say he is not fulfilling his duty to Canada or the fishermen of Canada. He asks, is it not desirable that we should know what the treaty means. When I submitted the treaty to the House, I explained as fully as I was able, the bearing and operation of each clause. I am not a lawyer, but I do not believe there is any such obscurity in it, or any such doubt can be raised, and as the hon. gentleman alleges. Does he not think that if this treaty is to become law, he had better leave it to United States lawyers, to fight for the interests of United States fishermen, to take the ground he has taken this afternoon? And does he not think he had better reserve his great legal powers to fight for the interests of Canadian fishermen against those pretensions on the part of the fishermen of the United States? I am not disposed to lecture the hon. gentleman, I should be doing very wrongly if I were to attempt it; but he must allow me to say, not with a view to lecturing him, but in order if I can to stop a course which I deem more mischievous to the interests of Canada and Canadian fishermen than any course the hon. gentleman could take. It was with that view that I drew the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he was not making a treaty, and was not in a position to alter a line of it, and, that being so, he was not acting fairly in the interest of Canada in taking a line which the most extreme advocates opposed to Canadian fishermen would take. That was the reason I drew the attention of the House to the unwisdom and the unfairness, in regard to the rights and interests of our own people, of the hon. gentleman expressing opinions on the floor of this Parliament, which might be quoted in the courts, and used by those endeavoring to get advantages over our fishermen under this treaty. I confess I could not understand how an hon. gentleman who professed to be, and I have no doubt is, anxious to promote the interests of Canadian fishermen, could express such opinions and leave them to be quoted by parties at another time, and in another place, against our country and against the interests of our fishermen. Now, I say that if the hon. gentleman holds the opinion he has stated to-day, if the hon. gentlemen around him hold these opinions, they have not discharged their duty in supporting this treaty. I have no hesitation in saying that. I am very thankful to hon. gentlemen opposite for the manner in which they have dealt with this subject. I felt I was justified in saying, when I submitted this treaty to the House, that it was not a question of party, and I felt no little pride and gratification in finding that, to a large extent, hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to recognise that fact to the fullest extent, and to feel that, under existing circumstances, they would be justified in giving this treaty their support. But I do trust that that support will not be affected by statements, made with the weight and authority which their position in Parliament give hon. gentlemen, which may be used to our disadvantage in any other place. Perhaps it is because I am not a lawyer that I am not able to draw these fine distinctions that gentlemen of the legal profession can draw on almost every question and every law, however plain and clear, that may be submitted to them for approval; and perhaps for that reason, I think this is a plain, clear

statement upon which there will be no difficulty whatever in arriving at a sound and just conclusion as to the meaning of the language in which it is couched. I have endeavored to give a frank, candid and explicit statement to the House of my views as to what the treaty contains, as to the effect of its various clauses, and as to the manner in which it was understood those should be operated; and I feel that hon. gentlemen opposite are scarcely fair in endeavoring to take the line that a very few of the members, I am happy to say, have taken, of forcing the Government into making such statements in its support as would be calculated to prevent its ever becoming operative.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has misrepresented my position in this matter. The hon. gentleman has said that I addressed the House as a lawyer, and placed a construction on the treaty which was not in the interest of Canada—a construction calculated to affect injuriously in the future, as well as in the present, Canadian interests. The House will bear me out in saying that I have put no construction on the treaty. I have said that the language of the treaty was so loosely drawn that it is capable of such and such a construction, but I did not say whether I entirely agreed with the one construction or the other.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I pointed out most clearly to the hon. gentleman that the language used was capable of several constructions, and I asked him—and I had a right to have an answer—what was the meaning the British plenipotentiaries, at least, placed upon the treaty, and whether that meaning was accepted by the American Government or not? I am sick of hearing this argument cast against us from time to time that the truth cannot be spoken for fear it may affect Canadian interests. It is time the truth was spoken, and we should endeavor to get at the real meaning of this treaty before it finally passes the House. The hon. gentleman says that my mouth is closed because I told the House that I did not intend to move any resolution against the treaty, but that it ought to be accepted. I did say the treaty ought to be accepted, and I said that with the full knowledge, as the hon. gentleman repeats my words, that we could not alter a line of it. Why did I say so? The hon. gentleman knows well that in that very speech to which he refers, I pointed out the concessions which, in my opinion, Canada had made—concessions, which, if the opinions of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, the hon. the Minister of Justice and the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries were correct, would be fatal to the interests of Canada. But I said this, that if the hon. gentleman's statement was correct; if the relations between Canada and the United States had become strained to the extent he said they had; if we were brought face to face with a condition of facts not far removed from war; if, to use Mr. Bayard's language, we had "entered upon a career of embittered rivalry staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility;" if, to use the hon. gentleman's own language, we had cemented 65,000,000 people and their entire press in bitter hostility to the people of Canada—I said then, as I do now, that such being the case, any settlement, which was not absolutely dishonorable, should be accepted in order that we might get out of the humiliating and dangerous position to which the policy of the Government had brought us. I pointed out as strongly as I could that the harassing and injurious exactions which the Government of the day had inflicted on American vessels in carrying out our customs laws, had been of very great injury to our people, and had been chiefly instrumental in bringing about that irritable state of feeling on their part. I pointed out further that while, technically, hon. gentlemen opposite were, as I believe they were, right in their construction of the treaty, the manner in which they ad-

ministered it was fatal and suicidal, and the result of their administration was to bring us face to face with the determination on the part of 65,000,000 people that the manner in which we had acted towards them with regard to our fisheries should not be repeated, except at the risk of war. I was not prepared, for one, to risk a war with the States; I thought any settlement would be preferable to a condition of things in which we would be brought face to face with war. And I say again, rather than revert to the dangerous condition of affairs in which we were only one year ago, when we had the retaliation Bill passed by the Congress and the Senate of the United States, we should accept this treaty. That, however, does not absolve me from my duty, as a member of this House, to enquire, as minutely as I can, into the meaning of the treaty. I repeat, that common courtesy demands at the hands of the hon. gentleman, and at the hands of the hon. the Minister of Justice, where two constructions may be found as to any important clause of this treaty, that they should say what is the correct construction, instead of denouncing those who point out to their notice these two constructions. They should tell the House what their opinion is, and what the opinion of the plenipotentiaries at Washington is, as to the proper construction.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did so to the best of my ability.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) When I raised the question here to-day, the hon. gentleman did not do so. When I raised the question the other day, in my remarks following those of the hon. the Minister of Justice, he did not do so, and I have the right now to call for an answer. I am not open to the attack of the hon. gentleman of being in any sense unpatriotic, or of having advanced arguments which would be fatal or prejudicial to Canadian interests.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The warmth exhibited by the hon. the Minister of Finance can only be accounted for by two suppositions: First, that the hon. gentleman finds himself in a difficult position.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly; I have explained that.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In the next place, that he is unwilling to explain, because he desires to keep something back from the people of the United States. With regard to the first, I believe the hon. gentleman comprehends that perfectly. With respect to the second, I hope he has no such object in view, because I believe no hon. gentleman here desires, now or at any time, to keep anything back regarding the operation of the treaty, which is susceptible of a different explanation at a subsequent day. What is the position of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies)? He recognises, as every one must, the difficulty of putting a construction on these two clauses, taken together, and he asks the hon. the Minister of Finance, the hon. the Minister of Justice, and the hon. the Minister of Marine, who took part in framing this treaty, to be good enough to explain the privileges which the American fishermen would enjoy under the operation of these two clauses. And what reply has he received? He has received no reply from either of those gentlemen, but the Minister of Finance is sheltering himself under this pretext, this flimsy pretext, as I must call it, for it is nothing else, that he is afraid to give an explanation of the Act for fear it might be used in the United States. He knows that there is nothing to offer in defence of the Act, as far as Canadian interests are concerned, and therefore he is sheltering himself behind that pretext. The case which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has suggested may easily arise. A fishing vessel obtains a license, and desires to know how long it can obtain fishing supplies. To whom is the decision to be left? Are the collectors of customs in

the different ports to give that decision, or are they to come to the Minister of Marine, or the Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Customs? Why do not the hon. gentlemen, while this matter is fresh in the minds of the people, give the information to the country as to how this will affect the question when this treaty goes into effect? I say that every collector of customs along the coast of Nova Scotia, taking that Act and interpreting it for himself, will get into a difficulty, and will have to apply to the hon. gentlemen for an interpretation which they are best able to give. Can an American fisherman when he comes to Nova Scotia, take his license and get his supplies and go to the fishing ground? That is one question which I would like those hon. gentlemen to answer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman reads the clause, he will see that they cannot.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I want the hon. gentleman to interpret that clause for me. I am merely paying that deference to the opinion of the hon. gentleman which he is entitled to from the position which he occupied on that Commission. He is bound, I think, to give us the interpretation which he places upon that clause. Of course, we have heard what he has said, but those who have not had the benefit of listening to him will be even more at sea on this matter than I am. Suppose those American fishermen come here and require supplies, the Minister of Justice says they cannot get them, while the Minister of Marine says they can get salt and go on their voyage. I want that distinctly understood. Then, when they come to port with their cargoes, and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has referred to the privilege which is given to them of transshipping their cargoes, who is to be the judge? Are the collectors of the ports to be the judges whether they are entitled to transship their cargoes or not? The hon. gentleman knows that not one collector out of twenty along the coast of Nova Scotia, or, for that matter, in the whole of this Dominion, is capable of being a judge in regard to such a matter. To whom then are they to apply for the interpretation of this Act? If they were to apply to a harbor master or a port warden, or to some competent authority who would be able to understand the position of the vessels, and whether or not it was necessary for the vessel to obtain these supplies, I could understand it, but the hon. gentleman does not give us any information on that subject, in fact we have no explanation at all. The Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance have not answered the plain, practical question which was put by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), as to what the American fishermen can do. The American consul in Halifax said, in reference to these clauses, when I was speaking to him: I do not know how I am to interpret them; how do you interpret them? I said: When we are in Parliament, and meet the gentlemen who made this treaty, we shall receive from them the explanation, as far as our contention goes, as to the interpretation of the meaning of the treaty, and no doubt you will have your own orders from your own Government; but at this moment I am just as much in the dark as I was before, because now, if anyone were to ask me, if this discussion was to cease now, what the American fishermen can do and what they cannot do, I could not tell them from any explanation which has been given by hon. gentlemen on the other side. I say, therefore, that it is, in my judgment, absolutely necessary that these gentlemen should tell us exactly the bearing which these clauses have in reference to the privileges of the American fishermen in our ports. If this opportunity is passed over without further explanation, they will have to give that explanation when each case is presented for their consideration, and it would be far better for them to do it

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

while the matter is fresh in the mind of every hon. gentleman here.

Committee rose.

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

After Recess.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

The following member, having previously taken the oath according to law, and subscribed the roll containing the same, took his seat in the House:

JOSEPH GAUTHIER, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of L'Assomption, introduced by the Hon. W. Laurier and Mr. Amyot.

FISHERIES TREATY.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 65) respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MITCHELL. I was out of the House during a part of the time that the discussion was going on this afternoon, and just as I came in I heard an utterance from the Minister of Finance which I regretted very much indeed to hear. It was to the effect that if hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House felt that this was a bad treaty for Canada, they had not done their duty in allowing it to pass without putting it to a vote and endeavoring to defeat it, or something like that. I think I defined, the other night, pretty well, my attitude in relation to that treaty. I stated that I looked upon it as a complete give-away of the interests of Canada, but, notwithstanding that, knowing as I do the past transactions between England and this colony, where any conflict came up in regard to our rights as between the United States and this country, I felt, and I fear I shall always feel, that the interests of Canada are likely to be given away, except under severe pressure. The hon. Minister of Finance stated truly the other day the lamentable fact of the existence of a hostile feeling in the United States that has grown up in reference to ourselves. Now, while I believe that that hostile feeling has been mainly created, indeed I may say entirely created, by the want of tact and judgment in the administration of our fishery rights under the Treaty of 1818, I must say that if the existence of this ill-feeling which has been so lucidly described by the Minister does exist in the United States—and I regret to say that I believe it does, from what I see in their press, from the statements of their public men, and the facts recited in the correspondence and despatches of the Secretary of State and their representative at the Court of London—I say while I believe that state of things does exist, I must justify myself for not opposing this treaty, not because I think it is in the interest of Canada, so far as regards the material concessions on either side, but I justify my acceptance of it upon the ground that it is a means of leading to peace, and a settlement of a question which has long been a source of ill-feeling. Whatever may be the fate of the treaty in the United States Senate, England never can recede from that treaty made at Washington; she never can go back and claim the rights that we enjoyed before the unfortunate treaty was signed. Now, Sir, I say this in justification of myself, and to put my views on record in the *Hansard*, in order that they may go to the country. Whatever other gentlemen may do, they can answer for themselves; whatever motives may have influenced them, that is their business; for myself I want it placed on record that the reasons why I do not oppose this treaty are not that we have got the rights we were entitled to get under the Treaty of 1818, rights which were clearly

recognised for many years in the correspondence and despatches between the Governments of England and the United States, but it is because I see in it a prospect of peace and more cordial relations with our neighbors. We never can go back to our old rights. If that treaty is rejected by the Senate of the United States, will England attempt to enforce the headland system for us, after what has been done at Washington? Will she attempt to enforce exclusion from bays along our coasts, after what has been done at Washington? No, Sir; we have got to confine ourselves and our pretensions in the future to the points and delimitations specified in the Treaty of Washington. Therefore, while I do not approve the treaty, while I cannot give it my cordial support on its merits, I say that the one great point in the whole matter in its favor is, that by it we may hope to secure peace with our neighbors the Americans, and that peace may lead to an extension of commercial intercourse between the two countries. Could it accomplish that I feel that it will have accomplished a very great deal. And that is the one point in its favor, and the only point. I do not know what provoked my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to make the retort I heard as I came in, but I feel I must make this statement to the House before I withdraw my opposition to the treaty; I do so purely upon the ground of endeavoring to establish a friendly feeling with our neighbors on the other side of the border, and in the hope that once these friendly relations are restored, relations that never should have been ruptured, once they are restored this treaty may lead to more extended commercial intercourse, and to that greater prosperity which existed from 1854 to 1866.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I agree with the sentiments which have just been expressed by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) with regard to the unfortunate existence of unfriendly feelings in the United States towards Canada. I must say that I think they are in great measure due to the course pursued by the Government in this very matter, who first tried a spirit of reconciliation, and then turned round and used those harsh measures which, I must say, might have resulted much more seriously than they have done. Speaking for the Maritime Provinces, I think the people accept this treaty somewhat in the same spirit of the hon. member for Northumberland, for the purpose of getting rid of that feeling of irritation, and in a desire to attain to more friendly relations between the two countries; and also, I believe, with the object—certainly that is the desire in the Maritime Provinces—of securing more extended commercial relations. Therefore, I am glad that a treaty has been made. I do not think it is necessary, at this stage of the debate, to go into particulars. I regret not having had an opportunity of being present while the debate was going on. I may say, however, that under the circumstances, I think it is about as good a treaty as could be made, considering the peculiar circumstances in the United States, and the unfavorable time when the negotiations were entered into. I think if our Government had been more anxious, they could have chosen a more favorable time, and perhaps have got a better treaty. But we have this treaty now before us. While it is true that we cannot alter it, that treaty is now between the two great powers of Great Britain and the United States—yet we have a right to discuss it, and to obtain explanations in regard to it; more especially since we are responsible for putting the Act of Parliament upon the Statute-book. As representatives of the people we have the right to examine, to criticise, and to require explanations. I have carefully read the treaty. I think there are some portions of it that might have been rendered more clear in its language, and I fear it may eventually lead to complications and difficulties. That portion of the treaty which is embodied in the 7th section contains a great difficulty, to my mind. I cannot construe it as to

obtain any clear view with regard to it. With regard to the 6th section, and the word "outfit," there is no doubt in my mind, taking the whole text of the treaty, that it must include bait; and when we find in the other sections that they have a right to purchase provisions, supplies and outfits, we see that a construction has there been given to the word "outfit" in other portions of the treaty which will include bait. But be that as it may, I believe it will be a benefit to our people as much as to the United States, because I think the more trade we can get the better it will be for our people, and it will tend to more closer commercial relations. With regard to the 7th section, I was not present when the Minister of Justice gave his explanation, but I must say that if the construction is confined to the homeward voyage I cannot understand the meaning of the latter portion at all, because we must construe that along with the rest of the treaty. We find that a license may be granted when the vessel is on a homeward voyage. So far that is very clear. The vessel on a homeward voyage, may, upon application, get a license to purchase in established ports of entry, the necessary supplies it may require. Having obtained a license an American fishing vessel shall be authorised:

"To purchase in established ports of entry of the aforesaid coasts of Canada, for the homeward voyage, such provisions and supplies as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, casual or needful supplies.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I must say it is a difficult matter, and I think it is one that we should discuss and see clearly what it involves. The section continues:

"And any such vessel having obtained a license in the manner aforesaid, shall also be accorded upon all occasions such facilities for the purchase of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels."

If I construe that as a lawyer, and I do so with diffidence where I find other legal gentlemen may take a different view, it is that if a vessel gets a license she will be entitled to get on all occasions those supplies. I think it is a matter of regret that this should not be made clear, because I believe, I may say I am confident from my own personal acquaintance with some of the gentlemen connected with the treaty on the American side, that the spirit in which the treaty was approached was a most friendly one towards Great Britain and Canada, and the consideration was entered upon with a view of getting rid of the difficulties that have existed since 1818 in the construction of the treaty and the headland question. It seems to me that the language should have been a little more clearly definite, and we are fairly entitled to explanations. We can reject the Bill, but we cannot alter the treaty, which, however, cannot go into effect unless assented to by the Parliament of Canada; but when we come to discuss the provisions of the Bill we are responsible, as representatives of the people, for the language of the statute; and I say that in enacting these provisions we should do it in language that will prevent difficulty, remembering that this is an international question, not one between individuals but between two great countries, the Imperial power and ourselves on one hand and the adjoining republic on the other. I repeat that I entirely endorse the views of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that we should not oppose this treaty. I believe in the spirit which has actuated the framers of the treaty, and I hope, whatever the results may be, nothing may arise under it to disturb the friendly relations between the two countries, but that all action under it may be of such a character as to restore friendly feelings. I have very strong opinions on this subject, because it is one of very great importance to my constituents. In our hour of distress and trouble, when we met with as great a calamity as any city could meet with

the men who came to our succor at that time were the people of the United States, and we have a strong desire to get rid, as far as possible, of all possible causes of irritation between the two countries, and more especially with a view to promote an extension of our commercial relations with the United States. I trust the result of this treaty will be such as I have indicated, and that all the efforts made will tend to accomplish that result; but it is our duty to weigh the question carefully, obtain all necessary explanations, and have the question discussed so that the people will thoroughly understand it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thank very sincerely my hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Weldon) for the spirit in which he has approached this very important question, and I feel the more the friendly expressions to which he has given utterance in reference to this treaty because, coming as he does from one of the principal ports of the Maritime Provinces, no member of the House is better able to speak on this matter, and perhaps no one is more interested than is the hon. gentleman in having this treaty one that will be fair and just to the great fishing interests of Canada. I must remind my hon. friend, however, that expressions of opinion are not of much value, that in times past when plenipotentiaries or high commissioners who have been engaged in the construction of treaties, have afterwards attempted to put a construction on what the treaty contained, they were told, and very properly told, that they had no power to give any construction to the treaty any more than any other individual, and if they were witnesses before a court of law and under oath testified as to what was the intention of the framers of the treaty, it would not have any weight, because it is held that the treaty must construe itself. If there is, therefore, vagueness, the hon. gentleman will see I cannot remove it; if there is any question of doubt that arises, my hon. friend will see that no explanation I could give would be of any avail. I have no hesitation in saying that my hon. friend is much better able to construe this treaty than I am, and for the reason that the construction of this treaty would not depend on laymen like myself, but on legal gentlemen whose profession naturally throws upon them the responsibility of giving constructions of Acts of Parliament. My hon. friend says we are throwing this treaty into an Act of Parliament; but that does not change it. My hon. friend knows that neither this Parliament nor the Senate of the United States, nor any party connected with this treaty, can in the slightest degree alter one of its provisions; the treaty will have, so long as it lasts, to speak for itself, and it is the terms of the treaty and not any construction I can give it that will be held to be operative. What might be of greater weight would be where members of Parliament, gentleman occupying high positions in the legal profession, hastily committed themselves to very strong expressions as to the true and legal construction of any clause of this treaty, for such opinions might be quoted afterwards in a court of law as giving a particular construction as to a portion of the treaty, this opinion being given at the time of its discussion by a member of Parliament; and I, therefore, think it is very much to be desired that we should as far as possible avoid, as we cannot alter the treaty, that being beyond our power, giving any construction of the treaty that would be held or might be held to be an unfavorable construction in regard to the interests of our own people. I put that to my hon. friend. But I desire to draw my hon. friend's attention to what I think has been overlooked by the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), and by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and that is that this treaty must be read as a whole. It is not going to be a single clause in the treaty that will decide its meaning. We have provided in the absolute part of this treaty that certain facilities, rights and privileges will be conceded

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

to vessels coming into our ports in distress. They have the right to tranship, but that does not give the right of transshipment to a vessel not in distress. There is not an hon. member in this House who has said we ought not to give the right to unload and transship, if it is absolutely necessary to the vessel in distress, in order that she may make repairs. She may unload, she may transship so far only as necessary. If the repairs that a vessel requires do not make it necessary that she should unload, she cannot unload. I am asked by an hon. gentleman, who is to be the judge in all such cases. You must bring the principles of common sense to bear upon a question of this kind. If any vessel comes in and claims the right to unload and transship her cargo, you would bring professional men, shipwrights, who would say that the vessel was in a condition that made it necessary to unload or not. You would have the means of subjecting the matter to a question of evidence, and it is upon that the decision would be made. She could not transship cargo simply because she said she was in distress; she must prove it, and it must be perfectly obvious that she is entitled to the benefit and advantage that the treaty confers. Suppose she is loaded with salt fish, she could not transship, she could not sell her fish, because she could unload the salt fish and after the repairs had been made reload without suffering injury. But if the cargo was fresh fish and it was necessary that she should unload for purposes of repairs, she was entitled to transship that cargo or pay the duties and sell the cargo. Is that not right?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Did I understand the hon. the Finance Minister to say that an American vessel with a cargo of salt fish could not transship it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say that coming in for repairs entitled the vessel to enter. The clause says that in consequence of any casualty she may unload, reload, transship, or sell subject to the customs laws and regulations, all the fish on board; then such unloading or transshipment, or resale must be incident to the repairs.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is no distinction between fresh fish and salt fish.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The distinction is this, that it is as far as necessary. If the cargo was salt fish, there was no necessity for selling or transshipping.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all. If the cargo was salt fish she could unload and reload, but she may not sell or transship unless it is necessary, and that only would become necessary when her cargo was of fresh fish, and for the purpose of avoiding the destruction of that cargo. That, I think, is perfectly clear and obvious. Then, Sir, I want to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to another point, and that is that you must construe this treaty not by a clause, but by the whole. You give these provisions to vessels coming in in distress. You say that a vessel if she is damaged in a storm, or if she has lost her rigging, or lost her sails, or lost her salt, or lost her bait—I will go to the length of that—and I will say that a fair and liberal construction of that clause would, in my judgment, entitle a vessel in distress, having by shipwreck lost her salt and bait, to such outfit as would enable her to be relieved from the consequences of that storm. That I do not hesitate to say, but my opinion, of course, is worth no more than that of any other gentleman in this House in reference to this matter. But I would not hesitate to give it such a construction as that because the object is, in the comity of nations for the purpose of good neighborhood and friendly relations, to succor a vessel in distress as far as the necessity of the case demands. That is the position and that is the object of that clause. But when you come to transshipment it is confined to that. You not only have to read that

clause, but to read the 7th clause in connection with casual and needful supplies, such as "trading vessels," not "fishing vessels" are entitled to. It is limited to casual and needful supplies. It does not outfit her for the fisheries at all. You can give her such supplies as will take her home, or having given her a license to purchase supplies to take her home, you give her such casual and needful supplies as the necessity of the case may demand. But, Sir, they are limited to these. If you come to the question of commercial privileges, suppose one of those fishing vessels demanded that they should be entitled to supplies and entitled to purchase bait, and to transship their cargoes, the answer is that that is all provided for in the contingent sections, and the United States plenipotentiaries have agreed that United States fishing vessels shall only be entitled to those commercial privileges; to the purchase of supplies, to the purchase of bait and to the transshipment of cargoes when they make fish free—when they take the duties off fish and enable the fishermen of Canada to go into the markets of the United States on the same terms as their own fishermen. You have not only to consider those two clauses but you have, in order to interpret them, to consider the broad, general principle laid down under which those commercial privileges that the advantage of transshipment shall be enjoyed by vessels that are in distress, and that are driven in by stress of weather and obliged to be furnished with this relief in order to remove this inconvenience to them, and it is evidently the opinion of both sides of the House we should give this aid to vessels in distress. I will not take up the time of the committee further than to say that it is not in my power to give any explanation which will have any more weight or influence than that of any other person. The treaty is not to be construed by me, but it is to be construed by the principles of common law, which ought to be the principles of common sense. If there is a vagueness it is not in my power, or in the power of the House, to remove it: We have to take it as it is, or reject it. As I am happy to say we have by common assent agreed to take it, I do hope that we will not have a very extended discussion on nice points at this time which I think might probably be attended with considerable inconvenience.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If the hon. the Minister of Finance had made this statement earlier, I think that a great deal of this discussion would have been avoided.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did make this explanation. Read my speech at the beginning of this question, and you will find that I am merely repeating myself now.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister of Finance in his speech is rather at variance with the principles he has laid down to-night. I think no one reading clause 6, under which the hon. gentleman provides that cargoes may be reshipped, would for one moment contend that it applies to any one class of cargo, no matter what that vessel may have on board—whether it is fresh or salt, under the provisions of this clause as it has reference of an extensive character. They can reship this cargo and whether it is salt or fresh fish that is distinctly provided for in this clause. But the next question with reference to the procuring of their supplies was explained by the hon. gentleman on a previous occasion. After reciting that clause, he says:

"That was another concession. There is no doubt at all, Sir, that these were rights which under the strict terms of the Treaty of 1818 they could not demand, nor could they insist upon their being granted; but at the same time I think I am within the judgment of the House on both sides, when I say that in the case of a vessel which is homeward bound and requires provisions or needful supplies to take her home, if, for instance, she has some of her rigging carried away, or some of her salt washed overboard, and is obliged to lose her voyage in going back to a distant port to refit, a provision that she may obtain casual and needful

supplies of that kind was demanded in the interests of good neighborhood, and it was not going too far to say that we would allow them to enjoy those advantages."

Therefore under those circumstances she can come in and get supplies, not to take her home, but to continue her voyage without going back to the United States at all. The hon. gentleman also says:

"And is obliged to lose her voyage in going back to a distant port to refit. It was in the interests of good neighborhood and it was not going too far to say we would allow them to enjoy these advantages."

Here the hon. gentleman distinctly lays down the principle that any vessel losing part of her outfit may supply that outfit and may return to the fishing grounds without going back to the United States to purchase them. That is exactly the comparison which my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), laid down in the earlier part of this discussion.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is just one point that the hon. the Minister of Finance stated which I will refer to now. I am not going to take the time of the House discussing it at any length.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Do not apologise.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not apologising. I never apologise to anybody as a rule, even when I am wrong. I follow the example of the hon. the Minister of Finance, and always claim to be right. I think the hon. gentleman went a little too far in his contention. He said that it would be impossible for any interpretation of his to have any effect in the construction of the treaty hereafter, and that gentlemen on this side of the House, who had a legal training, were better fitted to interpret the treaty than he was who made it. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that for a very considerable time after the convention of 1818 was made, in construing that document, constant reference was made to the opinions expressed and the discussions that took place at the time the arrangement was made. We had an advantage in the case of the convention of 1818 that we have not in this treaty; the protocols which have been laid before us in connection with this treaty are not of the character of the protocols of the convention of 1818. We had in the latter the arguments used and the positions set up by the negotiators on either side, and the conclusions at which they arrived; and we know as a fact that United States statesmen, in construing that convention, time and again referred to the opinions and arguments used; and will anybody tell me that if a question should arise five or ten years hence, they will not turn up those secret protocols which we have not got sight of, for the purpose of determining what the construction of the treaty is? I think the hon. gentleman has gone a little beyond himself in taking the position he has done. I regret that the ancient system of giving us in the protocols all the propositions and arguments that were presented was not followed in the case of the Washington Treaty. The more astute statesmen of to-day think concealment is the best policy, and no doubt the hon. gentleman has been astute in concealing what the propositions and arguments advanced by him and those opposed to him were. If we could only ascertain the positions taken by my hon. friend, and the able arguments which he no doubt used, with regard to getting extended trade relations, we should have an amount of information that would be valuable to Canada, and we should then be able to judge for ourselves, what the prospects of those extended trade relations are. Therefore I do not agree with my hon. friend in saying that any utterance of his would have no effect in the interpretation of that treaty. If it were given, that utterance would have a weight hereafter that if the American Senate ratified the treaty after that utterance was made, and with the knowledge that it was made, it would be in a measure bound, and the future

decisions of the two countries would be determined, by the interpretation my hon. friend should put on the treaty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that the same rule does not apply to the construction of a treaty as to the construction of an Act of Parliament. In the case of an Act of Parliament, the courts do not refer to any expression of opinion given by any of the members who voted for it, in deciding what the meaning of the Act is; but in the case of a treaty it is not so. It is an agreement between two contracting parties, and the words of one of those parties are very often receivable as the very highest evidence of what the meaning of the parties was at the time. I would give the hon. gentleman a historical and memorable instance of that. The hon. gentleman will remember the difference of opinion that arose as to the construction of the Treaty of 1818. A contention was put forward by the United States that their fishermen had a right to purchase bait notwithstanding that according to the treaty they could only enter our ports for the four purposes of purchasing wood and water, for shelter, and for repairs; and when the contention was put forward that within the words of the treaty they could also enter for the purchase of bait, what was the reply of the hon. Minister of Justice? It was, that cannot possibly be the construction of the treaty, and I will give you the very best evidence in the world of it. When the contracting parties sat down to make that treaty, the commissioners, on behalf of the United States, proposed to introduce into the treaty the very word "bait," but it was rejected, and it is not now open to you to say that the treaty includes it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman quite misapprehends me. I did not discuss the question as to what would be shown by the proceedings and protocols. That is not an *ex post facto* expression of opinion by one of the commissioners; it is a something of an entirely different character.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman is perfectly right, and he will recollect that when we were pressing him this afternoon for his opinion as to the construction of the treaty, we did not ask what his opinion as a lawyer was now on the construction of these words, but what was intended by the contracting parties at the time they drew that clause; and I maintain that the intention of the parties is the best evidence in the world as to what the meaning of the treaty is.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is good evidence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But the hon. gentleman this afternoon denounced me in right good set terms for having ventured to say, not that such was the construction of the treaty, but that it was open to such a construction; and after he had denounced me for saying that I had no doubt that would be contended for by the United States, what does he say to-night? I have no doubt, he says, that construed in accordance with the broad comity of nations, the word "outfit" will include the word "bait"—just what I was contending this afternoon when I pointed out that it was important that we should know exactly what the meaning of the treaty was before it passed. The hon. gentleman says that by this clause, the American fishermen may load, unload, transship or sell, if transshipment, unloading or selling are incidental to repairs consequent on stress of weather or casualty. We do not differ on that point, but the difficulty was in applying a practical construction to the clause. If a man reports that under stress of weather he has been driven into a harbor, and contends that it is necessary to make repairs and to transship, there is nobody who can control him, and it is therefore a matter open to endless litigation, difficulties and disputes. The hon. gentleman was right enough in

Mr. MITCHELL.

calling our attention to the fact that under article 11 of the treaty, special provision is made enabling the American fishermen to purchase provisions, bait, ice, seines, lines and all other supplies and outfit, under a certain state of facts recited in that clause, and the hon. gentleman said that provision having been made in that article for the purchase of supplies and outfit, it is perfectly plain those articles cannot be purchased under the 6th section of this Bill. But the hon. gentleman is wrong, because while these may be purchased under the 11th article of the treaty when the contingency which brings it into operation arises, they may also be purchased under the 6th section. He admits that they may be driven in by stress of weather, and it is necessary, as incidental to repairs, that they shall purchase an outfit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman says no doubt they can, irrespective of the 11th article, altogether.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are two different cases.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman states the argument which I barely suggested, and for the suggestion of which he denounced me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, the hon. gentleman did, but I am not going to bandy words any longer. I am satisfied I was right in calling the attention of the House to the true meaning of these two important clauses of the treaty, and I am satisfied that the suggestion I made as to the possible construction of those two sections has received the endorsement of the hon. gentleman himself, and, so far as my remarks this afternoon were concerned, instead of denouncing me as he did in the extreme language he used, I deserved his approbation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before we leave these two sections I would just say a few words. I do not think my hon. friend was open to the animadversions of the hon. the Minister of Finance when my hon. friend called the hon. gentleman's attention to the possible construction that might be put by the opposite party upon the provisions contained in these two sections. Nor do I think that because we have no power to amend the provisions of the treaty, we ought, therefore, not to discuss them or seek to ascertain precisely what they mean. It is quite true, as the hon. gentleman has said, that we have no power to alter a single line or word of the treaty. There is no doubt of that, but we are called upon to ratify the treaty; and being called upon to ratify it, although we have voted once on the second reading, the very object of going into committee and taking another reading of the Bill, which the hon. gentleman proposes to ratify the treaty, is to give the House an opportunity of reconsidering that which is done; and if, upon examination, it is found that these provisions of the treaty were not what we for the moment supposed they were, but were of a different character and conceded more than we were willing to concede, this House would be altogether remiss in its duty if it did not avail itself of the opportunity afforded it, at the different stages of the Bill, to reconsider what it had already done. I do not think that the Minister was called upon to commit himself to anything when he was asked to state what was the intent of these sections. We did not ask the hon. gentleman, as a lawyer, to state his views; we did not call upon him, as we might have called upon the Minister of Justice, to state his views. But the hon. gentleman was a party to these negotiations; he knows what propositions or counter-propositions were made; he knows what the protocols contained and the arguments accompanying them; and that being the case, what we supposed the hon. gentleman would do would be to put upon record his view of what was right, and of what was most favorable, if at all defensible, to this country. That, I think, was a legitimate demand,

and the hon. gentleman had no right to take exception to the question put him, because it would be in the highest degree preposterous to suppose that we should here go into committee to consider the various propositions of the Bill, and confirm what was done in Washington in negotiating the treaty, and, at the same time, refuse to consider the meaning and purport of each of its propositions. Now the hon. gentleman has stated the meaning, and I do not think he has imperilled the fate of the treaty here or at Washington by that statement. The hon. gentleman has told us under what circumstances the American fishermen might buy bait under this 6th section. There is no doubt that a certain contingency may arise when that may be done, and that it is not of universal application under the treaty, or else its other provisions would be wholly unnecessary. The other provisions preclude the possibility of putting a construction on this section other than this, that when the vessel loses part of its outfit by stress of weather, and is obliged to put into port, it may have an opportunity of supplementing what remains by purchasing the necessary supplies. Well, the hon. gentleman might as well have said that, without the indignant denunciation he made of my hon. friend, as to say it now. We were quite right in endeavoring to ascertain precisely what was intended by this treaty; and it does seem to me that the discussion having thrown some light upon the intention of the parties to it, the hon. gentleman has nothing of which to complain in the criticisms of my hon. friend.

On section 9,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to ask what is the reason for the modification or limitation of the penalties which, up to this day, have attached to the offence of preparing to fish within the prescribed waters. The hon. gentleman knows that under the Imperial Act the two offences of fishing and preparing to fish were accompanied with forfeitures in both instances; and it seems to me that the offence of actually preparing to fish, the vessel being in prohibited waters, ought to be punishable with forfeiture just as much as actual fishing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend is quite familiar with the fact that very great difficulties have arisen in connection with the question of preparing to fish, and he will observe that under this clause a vessel may be forfeited for preparing to fish. But this gives to the judge, if he thinks that the question is not sufficiently clear, that the preparing to fish had not gone to the extent of making it necessary to forfeit the vessel, the power to apply a lesser penalty; but, inasmuch as the clause still contains a provision leaving it in the discretion of the judge to forfeit the vessel and everything appertaining to her, my hon. friend will see, I think, that it is more calculated for the efficient and vigorous carrying out of the law than if it were left without giving the judge the discretion which is given under this clause.

On section 10,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I notice that Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the chief plenipotentiary on the side of Great Britain, in several speeches and representations in regard to this treaty, seemed to take great credit because the proceedings had been rendered more easy and more cheap than they were previously. What is the meaning of the words "shall be conducted in a summary manner?" Surely these proceedings must be conducted under the Vice-Admiralty Court, which every one knows has an exceedingly summary mode of procedure.

Mr. THOMPSON. Undoubtedly the proceedings must be conducted according to the practice of the Vice-Admiralty

Court, but the hon. gentleman will remember that that court has discretion in matters of procedure.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not see that the judges of that court can lay down any practice which is not prescribed by statute.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think anything further could be done by this Parliament than simply to enact the words of the treaty in this regard, whatever weight they may have, and it is possible that, if the procedure of the court is not found to be of sufficiently summary character, and if any further powers are required for the Vice-Admiralty judges to modify the practice, legislation elsewhere may be necessary, but, in the meantime, it is well that our statute should embody the words of the treaty. I have no doubt that, without any enactment of the kind, if the Vice-Admiralty judges are willing to do so, the proceedings can be made very summary and comparatively inexpensive. Practically, if the proceedings are made summary, they are inexpensive, and it is only when the proceedings are of a more formal character as regards the pleadings, which may extend to great length, as they sometimes do, that the expenses become large; but, if it is necessary to enforce upon the court any amendments to their practice, until we have legislation in England to transfer to us the jurisdiction over the Vice-Admiralty courts, it may be necessary to seek special legislation.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The question is whether we have any power over the Vice-Admiralty courts.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think we have not.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The practice now is really as summary as it possibly can be. Does the hon. gentleman propose that the Vice-Admiralty Court should sit in any one place—for instance, in St. John for New Brunswick, and in Halifax for Nova Scotia? I think the statute provides that these courts shall sit in those places. Now it is provided, as I understand, that the court shall be an ambulatory court, but I think that will add to the expense much more than if they sat in the same place, because we know that the great expense of these courts is incurred in the travelling of the judges and their officers. I do not exactly understand what is meant by the provision of this clause. Does it mean that if a vessel is seized at Pictou, for instance, the court shall sit there?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, for the purposes of the trial, though the hearing might take place at the capital.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). At present the trial is mostly by affidavits.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not always now.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Of course, there is a *viva voce* examination also, but the great expense now is incurred by the travelling.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it is contemplated that power should be given to the judge to go to the place of the detention of the vessel, but I quite agree that in most cases there would be less expense in trying the matter at the capital than there would be in trying it at the place of detention. It is easier for the witnesses for the vessel to go to the capital, where the owners can get the advice and assistance of their consul and where they can get counsel; but it is discretionary with the judge on the application of the defence to go to the place of detention. That is, that the Crown shall not apply to fix the place of trial.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Must not that power be given by Imperial statute?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is quite possible that that will be so. In all probability, before long, we shall have jurisdiction over these courts.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) As I understand, this gives to the American Government the right to make the subject of the constitution of the Admiralty Court for this purpose a matter of diplomatic controversy, and to ask the Imperial Government to simplify the proceedings of the court and make them less expensive. The American Government would have a right to complain if they thought there was unnecessary delay or unnecessary expense, and they might suggest what provisions they thought would be necessary to carry this article into effect.

Mr. THOMPSON. I concur with the hon. gentleman to this extent that, if it were found, under the practice of the Vice-Admiralty Court, that the proceedings were of such a character as not to fulfil the provisions of this article of the treaty, that they were not summary and inexpensive, the American Government would have a right to ask, and we would have a right to ask, that the practice should be simplified *quoad* those proceedings.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Would it not be necessary to have additional legislation under any circumstance?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think not. I think, if prompt attention is given to it by the courts, the practice can be made summary and inexpensive. The great difficulty in the adjudication of these admiralty cases is that the judges who conduct the business of those courts have a great many other judicial engagements, but we have power to appoint assistant judges if necessary, and, if those judges are overburdened with work, it will be very easy to appoint assistant judges with the approval of His Excellency, and in that way delay will be avoided, and the proceedings will be made summary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think some Imperial statute will have to be passed on the subject, because, under the treaty, every step, every action or proceeding, in every city, has to take place at the place of detention. I am under the impression, as the courts are now constituted, those cases can be heard alone at Halifax, or St. John, or Charlottetown, as the case may be, and the judge has no power to try a case, for instance, at Canso if a vessel is detained there, or at Pictou. I fancy that some Imperial legislation has got to take place to carry that section of the treaty out.

On section 12, sub-section 3.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman explain the reason for making an exception in favor of bait? Is he not afraid it will lead to smuggling along the coast?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That provision was introduced especially to meet the practice in Newfoundland. In Newfoundland, as I dare say my hon. friend knows, it is the practice of American fishing vessels to sell the small fish that they do not wish to form a portion of their cargo to take back, to the person who catches the bait on the shores of Newfoundland. The practice is to exchange one class of fish for the bait. It was in order to meet that difficulty that we provided not to interfere with a practice that has become very prevalent there, and we provided that bait might be subject to barter.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Of course I can see the force of the explanation. But is the hon. gentleman not afraid that it will lead to smuggling all along our own coast?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, for the reason that no American fishing vessel can come into our waters at all, or be in a position to buy bait, without first obtaining a license, and the moment she obtains a license, she brings herself under the surveillance of the officers of the courts, and they can at once ascertain whether she has goods on board for the purpose of exchanging them with the inhabitants for bait. The fact that she has to obtain a license in order to buy

Mr. THOMPSON.

bait, will bring her into a position that will make it extremely difficult for her to violate the customs law.

On section 14,

Mr. JONES (Halifax). With regard to this amount to be received for licenses, does the Government propose putting that into the revenues of Canada? It would almost appear that they are selling the privileges of the fishermen for the sake of getting a certain amount of money to go into the revenues of the country. Should there not be some understanding that the money derived in that way should be added to the bounty which the fishermen now get? It may amount to a considerable sum, and I think it would be a fair mode of disposing of the license fees received, to devote them to the use of the fishermen, because our fishermen certainly are going to be placed at a disadvantage if these people are allowed to come in, and the money received for licenses should be distributed among them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That subject has not yet received the consideration of the Government. It is an old adage, First catch your hare; and before we give ourselves a great deal of trouble as to the disposition of this money, it will be necessary to obtain it. It is not exactly as the hon. gentleman says. The tonnage fee that requires to be paid by American fishermen will correspond to the duty that our fishermen in the meantime have to pay in the ports of the United States; and the hon. gentleman will see that the fact that they are obliged to obtain these commercial privileges by the payment of this tonnage fee, does not give them the advantage they would otherwise enjoy in competing with our fishermen in the markets of the United States. But the suggestion the hon. gentleman has thrown out is one that he is quite aware would commend itself very much to the consideration of this Government, who have always exercised such a paternal care for the interests of the fishermen.

On sub-section 4,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This clause was really for the purpose of enabling a vessel running in for shelter and running out again, not entering for wood and water, but purely and simply for shelter, to avoid any detention.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am rather inclined to think that the intention was not exactly carried out by the treaty. There are four purposes named, two of which are wood and water, and if American vessels come in for wood and water it is perfectly clear that they must communicate with the shore. So this proviso seems to nullify the concession so far as regards wood and water.

On sub-section 5,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under this section it is competent for the Government to maintain the existence of the *modus vivendi* even if the treaty is rejected by the Senate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish this to be understood clearly. We delegate to the Government the right to continue the *modus vivendi* for two years even notwithstanding the rejection of the treaty by the Senate of the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We would have power to do it by avoiding a proclamation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Parliament delegates to the Governor in Council power to maintain the *modus vivendi* even if the treaty is rejected by the United States Senate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. For the two years only.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The *modus vivendi* is only for two years, and it would be for any such portion as the Governor in Council may see fit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite right.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Has the Government arrived at any policy on that question?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, they have not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). They have not come to any conclusion in regard to giving them the advantage of the *modus vivendi* even if the treaty is rejected by the United States Senate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That has not been considered. We simply propose to take power to do it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under what possible combination of circumstances would the hon. gentleman think it desirable to continue the *modus vivendi*, provided the treaty were absolutely rejected by the United States Senate? The hon. gentleman evidently has considered the question, because he retained to himself powers to maintain the *modus vivendi*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that the spirit running through the whole of this treaty is to avoid difficulty as far as possible, and it will be quite possible even in the event of rejection of the treaty by the Senate to anticipate its adoption at a very early day; and if under those circumstances there was reason to suspect after the presidential election that the question would stand in a different position, it would be very desirable to have the means to avoid any friction in the matter.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If the treaty were rejected by the Senate it would be practically dead.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Technically perhaps not. I am in hope, first, that that will not occur; and, second, even if it did, the hon. gentleman will see that if the Governments of Great Britain and the United States, having practically come to an agreement, found at an early day that the position was favorable to having the subject dealt with in a different way, that difficulty could be got over without much trouble.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman to take these powers is a reasonable one, and I do not think the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will object to it. If we were on the rejection of the treaty by the United States to drop the *modus vivendi*, it would be sure to revive those troubles which the hon. gentleman hopes are pretty well allayed, and I, therefore, think this is a reasonable proposition.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the treaty is rejected, it is at an end and a dead letter, so far as it is a treaty between the two countries, and if the hon. gentleman will reflect for a moment he will see that if these rights are continued for a certain period they must be continued for all time.

Mr. MITCHELL. No. We have reserved scarcely anything by the treaty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, oh!

Mr. MITCHELL. That is the contention I have made all through, and that is the conclusion I have arrived at. As the American people must see that they have gained everything by this treaty, it matters to us very little whether they enjoyed those privileges for the full two years provided by the *modus vivendi* or not. One thing is clear, that we would never be able to enforce our rights subsequently without the British Government behind us, and then it would arouse irritation and bad feeling. But I do not agree with the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), who contends that if the Americans exercise these privileges for two years, they will have them for all time; but if they enjoyed them during two years under this arrange-

ment, the privilege might be continued under a new treaty based upon the same lines.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This section immediately becomes law.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope there will be no address from this House containing congratulations to Mr. Chamberlain and his other colleague, Sir Sackville West, for the great success they have had in giving away the interests of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say in reply to my hon. friend that I shall feel that Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries have had everything that they could possibly expect when this House by a unanimous vote has ratified their proceedings.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have one statement to make. It does seem to me obvious that the last section of the Act which we have just passed by this House is really going further than the plenipotentiaries offered in their proposition for a *modus vivendi*. That *modus vivendi* of the British plenipotentiaries set out the following:—

"The treaty having been signed the British plenipotentiaries desire to state that they have been considering the position which will be created by the immediate commencement of the fishing season before the treaty can possibly be ratified by the Senate of the United States, by the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of Newfoundland. In the absence of such ratification the old conditions which have given rise to so much friction and irritation might be revived, and might interfere with the unprejudiced consideration of the treaty by the legislative bodies concerned. Under these circumstances and with the further object of affording evidence of their anxious desire to promote good feeling, and to remove all possible subjects of controversy, the British plenipotentiaries are ready to make the following temporary arrangement for a period not exceeding two years in order to afford a *modus vivendi* pending the ratification of the treaty."

This was to provide for a state of affairs pending the ratification of the treaty, but there was no proposition, as I understand it, made by the British plenipotentiaries providing that the *modus vivendi* should remain in force in the event of the Senate absolutely rejecting the treaty. The hon. gentleman now has taken power, and if it should be rejected, from what has fallen from him it is perfectly plain that the Government intends to act upon this, that whether the treaty is ratified or rejected the *modus vivendi* remains in force for two years.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understand it was only intended in the event of the treaty being held over.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That was what was intended, but we are going further now.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is not that a little too rapid? You taunted us with the fact that we had unanimously adopted this Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. You will not taunt us again if we let it go?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

INCREASE IN SALARY OF AUDITOR GENERAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 87) to amend the "Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act," chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: Mr. Speaker, the first clause of this Bill provides that the salary of the Auditor General shall be increased to \$4,000

per annum. In asking the House to consent to the proposed increase of salary to the Auditor General from \$3,200 to \$4,000 per annum, I think it but right to state that the present Auditor General, as hon. members are probably aware, assumed office on the 1st August, 1878, at which time the office, previously held in conjunction with that of the Deputy Minister of Finance, was separated from the Finance Department and established on a similar basis as is the office of Comptroller and Auditor General in England. The Auditor General has had in effect to organise an audit staff, and to reorganise the system of audit. Beginning with the audit of the appropriation accounts, he has year by year examined more and more closely into the expenditure voted by Parliament, the result of which, as hon. members well know, is set forth in the voluminous report which has been distributed under the direction of Parliament. He has from time to time, had in addition to the audit of the appropriation accounts, submitted to him for examination and audit, the bank accounts of the Dominion, the Indian accounts, and all the trust accounts and open accounts which the Government have opened with other Governments or with banks or financial agents. During the last year, as his office steadily progressed, the Government have delegated to him the power of auditing the receipts of the Dominion. In fact, it may be said, that at this moment every cent received or paid out on account of the Dominion of Canada is subject to the review and audit of the Auditor General. His duties have increased so much that the Government have felt it only right to ask for the increase named in the Bill, and they are sure that it will receive the consent of members of both sides of the House. Perhaps it may be as well here to give to hon. members a sketch of what has been accomplished thus far by the system of audit established. Every item of the Dominion expenditure of over \$40,000,000 annually is examined in all its details, either before or after payment, and as has been alluded to before, the whole revenue is now being examined in the same way as is done in England, and this audit both of expenditure and receipts has tended to greater watchfulness on the part of the different departments. Apart from the keeping of the appropriation ledgers, both general and revenue, personal accounts have had to be kept of all advances made in all departments; bank accounts, railway subsidies, debt accounts, have all to be scrutinized, and coupons examined; the accounts of the election held in 1887 were reviewed by him, and claims on that head reduced by some \$26,000; similarly on the franchise accounts, claims have been reduced by some \$61,000. Hereafter the stores accounts will be more thoroughly brought under examination. His annual report, containing as it does, a classification of every item both of revenue and expenditure, and containing statements and tables that require much more care than might be supposed from their size, is more complete, both as to number of details and clearness of definition, than any report, dealing with the same variety of accounts and equal magnitude of sums, published by any other country in the world. Hon. members who attend the meetings of the Public Accounts Committee will recognise the labor entailed in the production of all the statements and vouchers required by that committee. I think it will not be necessary for me to make any further reference to the onerous duties of the office, further than to say that all this has been accomplished by a staff of 25, including the Assistant Auditor and extra clerks. The few amendments to the Audit Act, composing the other sections of this Bill, are all introduced with the idea of making the Act uniform in its details, and in no way detract from the powers given by the original Act to the Auditor General. I have only further to state that the Auditor General, while informing me of what has been done in the matter of carrying on the business of

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

his office, has asked me to mention that the loyalty to the office of all the members of the staff, from the Assistant Auditor downwards, and their zeal and intelligence, cannot be too highly commended. I have no hesitation in saying, as the head of the Finance Department, and so being brought in constant and frequent intercourse with the Auditor General, that I believe it would be impossible for members of either side of this House to overrate the careful and painstaking ability of that officer or his conscientious devotion to the duties of the most important office which he discharges. He is in every sense of the word an officer of Parliament. Although he has felt it occasionally to be his duty to differ with members of the Administration, and with the conduct of the affairs of the public departments in carrying out the details of his office, I have no hesitation in saying that he has discharged his duties in such a way as to win the confidence and hearty approval of every member of the Government, as I am sure he has earned it of every member of both sides of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what is intended to be the effect of section 2, which provides that the Auditor General shall be subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Act. At the present time the Auditor General can only be removed by an address of the two Houses to the Governor General, but under the provisions of this clause he would be placed at the mercy of the Government after he has reached a certain age, and would be removable at any time after that age by the Governor in Council. If that would be the effect of this clause, that certainly was not the intention when the Auditor General was appointed. It was intended to make the Auditor General here, as the Auditor General is in England, absolutely free from governmental influence or control, in order that he might be as free as a judge to discharge his duties in accordance with the law. I do not object to his having a retiring allowance if he should retire, but I do not think it is necessary to extend to him in special terms the words of the Superannuation Act. A retiring allowance could be granted to him in some other way, allowing him to remain the independent officer that he is at the present time.

Mr. EDGAR. The 8th section of the Civil Service Superannuation Act would seem to place it in the power of the Government of the day to enforce retirement on the Auditor General, and surely it is not contemplated that that should be the case, because, as I understand, the Auditor General is supposed to be a statutory officer, entirely independent of the Government of the day. The Act gives the Government power, in the case of civil servants who have entered the service after the age of 30 years, as I believe was the case with the Auditor General, and who are possessed of some special qualification, to add something to the number of their years of service, and section 8 says:

"Retirement shall be compulsory on every person to whom the superannuation allowance hereinbefore mentioned is offered, and such offer shall not be considered as implying any censure upon the person to whom it is made; nor shall any person be considered as having any absolute right to such allowance, but it shall be granted only in consideration of good and faithful service during the time upon which it is calculated."

If that is really the effect of this clause, I should think the Government cannot desire that it should be so, and would provide in some other way for a suitable provision being made in case of the Auditor General's retirement.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think it is understood that the Auditor General should be independent of the Government, and be removable in the same way as a judge; but it seems to me that this clause placing him under the Superannuation Act will have the effect which

my hon. friend has just pointed out. The sub-section of section 8 of the Act further provides :

" Nothing herein contained shall be understood as impairing or affecting the right of the Governor in Council to dismiss or remove any person from the Civil Service."

To put the Auditor General under the Superannuation Act might give the Government right to dismiss him.

Mr. CASEY. If the Government merely wish to provide a retiring allowance to the Auditor General, I think they can do it in the same way as is done in the case of judges, who are only removable, like the Auditor General, by an address of both Houses of Parliament. The very usefulness of an Auditor General at all depends on his being utterly independent of the Government ; and I do not remember, although I was in the House at the time, that any of the hon. gentlemen opposite raised the slightest objection to the appointment of the Auditor General under these conditions ; and the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance this evening has been such as to lead us to believe that he approves of the Act under which the Auditor General was appointed, and does not wish to make him any less independent of the Government than he is now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say "hear, hear," and after that declaration he will doubtless say that it is more fitting to provide for the retiring allowance of the Auditor General in some other manner, and not to bring him under the control of the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that the last thing that the Government had in view in this Bill, was to do anything that should enable us to interfere in the slightest degree with the position Parliament has given to the Auditor General. I quite concur in the views expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite that the value of this officer to a very great extent depends on the position he holds as an officer of Parliament, and the sole object we had in view in giving the benefit of the Superannuation Act, was to give a deserving officer the privileges which that Act would confer. But I do see a point in what has been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, that this involves the contingency of the power of removal of the officer by the action of the Government, which certainly was not the intention. I will leave the clause over for such amendment as will enable us entirely to avoid any such thing.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have much pleasure in congratulating the hon. Minister of Finance and the Government on this act of justice to a most able officer. The hon. Minister of Finance will remember that I urged this increase of salary upon him one or two years ago. Although I have always differed politically from Mr. Macdougall, our excellent Auditor General, I have always observed that he is one of the most efficient officers we have in the public service, and I again thank the Government for this somewhat tardy act of recognition of his services.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider the following resolution :

That the salary of the Auditor General of Canada shall be four thousand dollars per annum, and that he shall be subject to the provisions of the " Civil Service Superannuation Act."

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It probably would meet the case if we were to move that section 8 of the Superannuation Act should not apply. That gives the benefit of the Act to the officer, and takes away the power of compulsory retirement.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will look at the Act, providing for retiring allowances for the judges, he might make a similar provision in this case. Let him make no allusion to the Superannuation Act, and there will be no difficulty or misunderstanding.

Mr. BOWELL. If you adopt that plan, you relieve the Auditor General from the monthly payment of the superannuation fund, and place him in the same position as a judge. I understand a judge does not pay anything out of his salary towards the fund out of which he gets superannuation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The object we have in giving him the benefit of the Superannuation Act, is to confer its advantages upon him, and I meet the objection hon. gentlemen opposite have raised by the provision that this portion of the Superannuation Act shall not apply.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The proper course would be to give the Auditor General the same position as a judge, and let him, on retiring, get fifteen years. No doubt he would be free from paying to the superannuation fund.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must see that will not do. There is a special law for judges. After fifteen years, they may ask to be pensioned off, and their pension amounts to two-thirds of their salary ; but in the Civil Service, after thirty-five years, the officers are entitled to 70 per cent. of their salary. It would not do to place the Auditor General in a different position in this respect from the other officers of the service. The hon. the Minister of Finance has admitted that it is not the intention of the Government to interfere with the Act of Parliament, which made the Auditor General a special officer under the control of both Houses, and I think therefore that the clause may be well amended by putting this officer under the Civil Service Act as regards the superannuation. He should contribute to the fund the same as any other civil officer.

Mr. LAURIER. There are two objects to be attained with regard to this officer : First, he must be kept independent of the Government. We all agree upon that point, and then we also agree on the second point that he should be provided a retiring allowance. He will stand in a perfectly unique position. There will not be a parallel in the service to his case, and, therefore, there is no reason why we should not make a special law to enact that he will contribute to the Civil Service fund in the same way as other officers, and still not be under the control of the Government with regard to superannuation. A special law should be devised. It is just as much against the spirit of the Act respecting the Auditor General that the Government of the day should be entitled to reward him, as that they should be enabled to punish him. Section 8, which the hon. the Finance Minister suggests might be left out, provides that, under certain circumstances, the Government could compel the Auditor General to retire. Section 4 of the Act places it within the power of the Governor in Council to reward civil servants.

" The Governor in Council may, in the case of any person who entered the Civil Service after the age of thirty years, as being possessed of some peculiar professional or other qualifications or attainments required for the office to which he was appointed, and not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service, and to the actual number of years' service of such person, such further number of years not exceeding ten, as is considered equitable for reasons stated in the Order in Council made in the case."

It is not right that the Auditor General should be dependent on the Governor in Council to add years to his time of service. Section 5 provides the superannuation of every officer shall be preceded by an enquiry by the Treasury Board. Who will report as to whether it should take place or not ? That is not a desirable position in which to place the Audi-

tor General. Some further consideration should be given by the Government, and a special clause prepared.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On the other hand, who is to decide when that officer is to be superannuated?

Mr. MITCHELL. Parliament.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Then the matter must be brought to Parliament by somebody. It should be brought by the Government. Supposing this officer is perfectly independent, as we are of opinion he should be, of the Government, and you say he must contribute to the superannuation fund the same as any other officer, and is to be superannuated after so many years, when he becomes disabled, he should obtain his superannuation on the same scale as that fixed for any other officer of the Government. Well, the Auditor General will, most likely, when he finds he is failing in health, claim superannuation. He must write to some one, and he will write to the Government, which is the executive of the country. If you say that officer cannot be superannuated without the Government first coming to Parliament to obtain consent, he would not be different from any other officer. Because, if I am not mistaken, the Superannuation Act says that the names of the officers who are superannuated during the year must be reported to Parliament within so many days after the beginning of the Session. Therefore, this officer would be in the same position, and would be reported as such; but, suppose that officer becomes unfit for his work and is unable to claim his superannuation, is the Government to wait for six or eight months till Parliament meets before it can have an officer to discharge those duties?

Mr. LAURIER. Suppose he is unfit for his work to-day?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Suppose he is unfit for his work at any time. The case never arose before, but it is well to discuss it now. Suppose that officer is unfit for his work. He does not ask for his superannuation, or perhaps he is unable to ask for his superannuation. What is to be done? Are we to remain five or six or eight months without an auditor? I think not. I think, if the auditor is unfit for his work, the Government should have the responsibility of replacing that officer during the year until Parliament meets, and should then report to Parliament and let Parliament deal with the matter. The Government would report the circumstances and would say: We had to put some one in there to fulfil those duties; we could not leave the accounts without audit during all those months. But if the officer applies for superannuation, the Government should have the power to grant it if he is unfit for his work. But, if he asks for superannuation and he is still fit for his work, the Government should not grant it, and the Government would have to report to Parliament that the officer had asked for superannuation, but that the Government did not think he was unfit for his work, and therefore did not think he should be superannuated. One of the hon. gentlemen who spoke said the Auditor General should be altogether independent of the Government, that we should not be in a position to increase his salary or to give him any preferment. That is hardly the thing. We are doing the very contrary now.

An hon. MEMBER. Parliament is.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The initiative comes from the executive, and I must say, continuing what the Minister of Finance said just now, that the Auditor General, who was, when he was in Parliament, opposed to us, and voted conscientiously against us, as we voted against his party and against himself, though he has an arduous duty to perform, a very difficult and a very unpopular duty, has performed his duties well. The Auditor General has never been a popular officer, and he never will be a popular officer, because his duties must make him unpopular. He is in the

Mr. LAURIER.

way of everyone. He is in the way of the ordinary officers, he is in the way of the Deputy Ministers, and, no doubt, very often he is in the way of the Ministers as well; and that is the reason why the office was created, and that is why we have supported him, because we think that, when Parliament in its wisdom created that officer, it did so for the purpose in accordance with which he is now acting. I think we agree on both sides as to what is to be done with this officer, and probably the best way would be to pass the resolution, report it, and go into Committee of the Whole on another day and amend it in the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. I submit this point for the consideration of the Minister. To-day, as the law stands, the office of Auditor General can be vacated by death, resignation or by removal on a resolution of the House. It is not intended that, as far as that provision of the law is concerned, there should be any amendment. The only thing contemplated is that, if the auditor was stricken by disease, he should not be left penniless, but should have the same provision as other public servants have. I would suggest that some such clause as this would meet the case:

"The auditor shall have the privilege of contributing to the Superannuation Fund, and, if he resigns or is removed, he will be entitled to the same superannuation pension as if he belonged to the Civil Service."

I think that clause would meet the case.

Mr. THOMPSON. My own view is that we had better adopt the clause as amended, and, as the Bill has to go before the Committee of the Whole, I will consider the matter subsequently. I think it might be better to adopt the terms now proposed, or to make the whole of the clauses of the Superannuation Act apply to the Audit Act. I think nearly every provision of that Act should apply to him except section 8, which makes the retirement compulsory. It has been suggested that this would put him too much in the hands of the Government, that the Government would have to reward him by adding to his years of service, and that the Treasury Board in that way would have the power to influence him. Look at the position now. The auditor is entitled to no superannuation allowance. Parliament can provide for him, but it can only provide for him by an Act, so that practically he is now in the hands of the Government in that way, and the only control which we would have would be that, if that officer applied for superannuation to-morrow, the Treasury Board would have to ascertain his term of service and report whether, being a zealous officer, we should add to his term of service. It seems to me that, in any case, it would be absolutely necessary that the Treasury Board should have the right to investigate whether the officer has arrived at the time of life or is suffering from such an infirmity as would entitle him to superannuation.

Mr. CASEY. It is clear that this officer, being an able officer, and there being no provision for his superannuation, must be put under some regulations, either under a special set of regulations involving perhaps nearly the whole of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, or under a set of regulations which are already applicable to another class of officials, and I urge that he should be placed under the set of regulations which apply to that class of officials most like him—I refer to the judges.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will observe that in that case, in the first place, he would not have to contribute to the superannuation fund, in the second place he would be entitled to two-thirds of his salary if he became infirm the day after he was appointed, and he would be entitled to retire on an allowance for fifteen years service.

Mr. CASEY. No doubt he would have certain privileges under those circumstances which he would not have under the proposed provision. He would not have to contribute

to any superannuation fund, and he would be entitled to a two-thirds allowance after a certain period. The hon. the Minister of Justice knows better than I do after what term of years he would be entitled to that. If judges are entitled to these privileges, why should not the Auditor General be, who is practically a judge, whose position is more important and more responsible than that of any judge in Canada, not excepting the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court? In his relations to the people of the country, he has more to do with the rights and wrongs of the people, and has more control over the executive, than any judge in Canada. I contend that the Auditor General should not have to contribute to the superannuation fund. There is no more reason why he should contribute than a judge, there is no reason why he should not have the same privilege of retirement as a judge. The hon. the Minister of Public Works has raised a great many objections, and has taken the ground that the Government should have power of summary dismissal while Parliament is not sitting.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, the hon. Minister raised this point. He said: Suppose the Auditor General became unfit for his duties; say, for instance, that he became insane during the recess of Parliament. He said: Are we to go on—I understood him to say so—seven or eight months with an Auditor General not fit to perform his duties, and have to wait until Parliament meets before we can have another Auditor General? Well, Sir, apply the same argument in the case of judges. When a judge becomes insane—if such a thing should happen; I do not know that I ever heard of a judge becoming insane—but if, for instance, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court became insane, what are you going to do with him until Parliament meets? You cannot turn out the chief justice, or the judge of any court in Canada, until Parliament meets again; and we have never had any practical difficulty from that provision of the law. If there is no difficulty in the case of judges, who are so numerous, is it likely that difficulties will arise in the case of this one officer? All the arguments that the Minister of Public Works used to show that the Government should have the right to remove between Sessions of the House, an Auditor General who may be, we will say, insane, or unfit for his duty in any way, would apply to the case of Government removing a judge who had become unfit for his duty in any way between Sessions of Parliament. Of course, a judge who is insane, I suppose, could be put in a lunatic asylum like anybody else, and there would be a vacancy in that case, *ipso facto*, and the same would happen in the case of an Auditor General. If he became unfit for his duty by insanity, he would go to a lunatic asylum. If it was urged that he was unfit for any other reason, then the Minister of Public Works says the Government should have the right to decide whether he is unfit or not; but the existing Act says no decision shall be passed on that point until Parliament meets again, and I think it is proper that no decision should be passed upon his fitness or his unfitness, or in any other respect than insanity, or absolute incapacity of that kind, until Parliament shall meet again. Both the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Justice have argued at length as to how his superannuation could be accomplished, saying that, in any case, there would have to be an application to the Government and so on. How is it accomplished in the case of judges? A judge, when he chooses to retire at a stated period, resigns and applies for his superannuation allowance. Why not do the same thing in the case of the Auditor General? If you are going to create an analogy between the Auditor General and any other class of officials whatever, if you are going to place him under the regulations which govern any other class of officials, why not put him, in accordance with common sense, under the same conditions as those which

regulate the retirement of that class of officials whose position is analogous to his own? Put him under the regulations applying to judges. If you want to put him under any Act, put him under the Judiciary Act, instead of the Civil Service Act. It must be kept clearly and distinctly in mind that there is no analogy whatever between the position of Auditor General and a civil servant of the highest grade—no matter how highly he is paid or what his duties are. The Auditor General is an officer of this House, put there as a check upon expenditure, and there must be no analogy created between him and any member of the Civil Service whatever.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me, otherwise he would not have made the statement he did just now. I did not say that because an Auditor General might become unfit for his work, the Government should immediately interfere. But I supposed the case of an Auditor General who, after Parliament has been prorogued, becomes insane. Are we to understand that, for the remainder of the year, until Parliament meets again, the Government shall have no Auditor General, that the Public Accounts shall not be audited?

Mr. CASEY. What do you do with a judge?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will speak of the judge afterwards. Suppose the Auditor General becomes insane. The accounts still have to be audited, and we must have another. The hon. gentleman asks, if a judge becomes insane, do we have to replace him? Of course not; but all the judges will not become insane at the same time, and if they all became insane at the same time, probably a strong remedy would have to be applied. But the hon. gentleman said the Auditor General must be put in the same position as a judge, and as a judge applies for his superannuation after fifteen years, so the Auditor General should be allowed his superannuation after fifteen years. But the hon. gentleman forgets that although a judge may apply for his superannuation, the Government is not bound to give it. The Government examine whether that judge deserves to be superannuated, whether he may not be fit to continue to serve his country, and if they find that he has no claim to superannuation, they say to him: No, we cannot give you superannuation, because you are fit to continue your labor. The hon. gentleman says that we should put the Auditor General out of the reach of the Executive. But the hon. gentleman would put him entirely into the hands of the Government, because he would authorise us to refuse or to grant superannuation, to reward him for his good services, for dereliction of his duty in being too lenient towards other officials or towards the Government. I think the hon. gentleman has established no comparison between the position of a judge and that of an Auditor General. But there is no doubt that if you want the Auditor General to be as we always wish him to be, independent of the Government for the time being, he should be made subject to the Superannuation Act, and he must contribute as any other officer. Why not?

Mr. CASEY. Why does not a judge?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He is not a judge, he is an officer. He has never been called a judge, except this evening by the hon. gentleman. He is an officer of the Government, like any other officer, with this exception, that Parliament has declared that he shall not be removed by the Government, but only by Parliament. Very well, but that does not prevent his being put under the Superannuation Act, provided that clause put him under the control of the Executive. But why should he not contribute as well as any other officer? There is no reason why he should not. The highest officers, men receiving the highest salaries, are made to contribute as well as those receiving lower salaries. Let him be put on the same footing as the others.

Why, after fifteen years, should that officer be entitled to two-thirds of his salary, without contributing to the fund? The deputy heads, after fifteen years, would have only 30 per cent. of their salaries. It is not fair, it is not just to the other officers, and, therefore, if he is to be superannuated at any time, when he becomes unfit for his work, he should contribute to the fund as well as the others.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot agree with the hon. Minister that he is in any sense an officer of the Government. In fact he is distinctly by law not an officer of the Government. He is not in any degree analogous to any other servant. He is a statutory officer like a judge, and he is completely analogous, in his duties, in his appointment, and in the method of his removal to a judge. The Minister says: Why should he not contribute to the superannuation fund? The burden of proof rests on the Government to show why he should contribute, and the analogies go to show that he should not contribute to the superannuation fund. His office and duties are analogous to those of a judge, and not to those of a civil servant. He is in no sense an officer of the Government; he is not removable by the whole Government combined or by the Governor General, except on an address from both Houses of Parliament. He should, therefore, be placed in the same position as a judge in other respects. The Minister of Finance says that even a judge is subject in regard to superannuation to the decision of the Government. I do not grumble about that; but if they give the Auditor General the same position as a judge, he will be as independent as a judge—and we know they are independent. As to the insanity question, I believe that if the Auditor General became insane, and was placed in an asylum under the certificate of two medical men, his position would become vacant. I do not know whether an insane man could hold office or not; that is a question for lawyers. The main point is that there is no analogy between this officer's position and that of the deputy head of a department, with whom the Minister of Public Works compared him; the analogy is with a judge and he should be placed in the same position.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is unnecessary at this stage to enter into the whole question as it is simply desired to carry a resolution respecting increase of salary and his right to superannuation under the Superannuation Act.

Mr. WELDON (St. John.) There is no dispute as to the independent position which this officer should hold. I suggest that a special provision should be framed to meet this case so far as superannuation is concerned, as it will not properly come under the Superannuation Act. I would suggest that the true analogy in regard to the Auditor General is with the judge of the new Court of Exchequer, who is a single judge, and there should be a provision by which a temporary deputy to the Auditor General might be appointed. If the principle is conceded that the Auditor General should be independent of the Government, that he should be an officer of Parliament, and only amenable to that body, we should take care that the provision in regard to his superannuation should be a special provision, which would place him in a proper position.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must get on with the measure or throw it over to the next Session. One portion of the resolution is to increase the salary paid to the Auditor General, which must commence by resolution. Another portion of the proposition is to provide for his superannuation, and that also must commence by resolution. When the Bill is introduced and is before the House, any portion of the Superannuation Act, which would not apply to this officer, could be especially referred to in the Bill. All we wish now to do is to adopt these two propositions: first, that the Auditor General shall have an increase in salary; and, second, that he shall come under the Super-

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

annuation Act, so as to have the right to claim a retiring allowance.

Mr. MILLS. I think the right hon. gentleman was not in his place when the discussion commenced. I believe he has the Act before him, and if he will look at its provisions he will observe that the whole drift of the Act is incompatible with the position of an auditor. An auditor is not an officer of the Government; but the Act deals solely with officers of the Government, and no other class of officials. You cannot apply that Act to this case. You will be obliged to reconstruct the whole provisions of the law relating to the Auditor General, from the beginning to the end, in order to protect the independence of that officer as now constituted. I understood the Minister of Finance not to favor any interference with the independence of the Auditor General, and not to seek to place him under the Administration. That being settled, you cannot apply the provisions of the Superannuation Act to him. If, as the First Minister says, and says rightly, we must commence by resolution with respect to providing for the superannuation of the officer, we need not state that the superannuation shall be under the provisions of the Superannuation Act. Leave out these words in the resolution. If we are obliged to fight this matter, we do not intend to concede the principle which the Minister of Public Works has enunciated. The whole drift of his observations was that the officer ought to be under the control of the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the hon. gentleman knows better than that. I have already given my negative to that, and surely the hon. gentleman should not repeat the statement, when I have already said it was not my belief, it was not my intention, it was not what I said.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I only infer the hon. gentleman's meaning from what he said. I spoke of the difficulties that might arise if this officer were to become disabled, or mentally disqualified, and the observations the hon. gentleman made if they had any point at all were made on this line: that in order that the country might be perfectly secure, the office ought to be under the control of the Government. I enter my protest against that. The hon. gentleman says that was not what he meant in respect to his statement, and I accept his explanation. I am pointing out that in this resolution, relating to superannuation, it is proposed it should be made under the provisions of the Superannuation Act. I am sure the First Minister and the Minister of Justice could have provided for the superannuation of this officer without referring to the Superannuation Act at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In order to remove the difficulty we can strike out the superannuation clause and let the motion remain, that the Auditor General gets an increase of salary merely. We shall leave the superannuation clause for another Session, and I do not think the Auditor General will be thankful to the hon. gentlemen.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think that in a matter of this importance we should be driven from our position upon a mere technicality. The right hon. gentleman was not here when this discussion arose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have heard enough of it to know what it is.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps so, and the hon. gentleman sees that we believe the intention of the Government was very praiseworthy and on proper lines. We contend that this motion was not aptly expressed, because as it is expressed in the resolution and in the Bill it would place the officer in the power of the Government, and the Government repudiate this idea and say they do not want that. Therefore they must devise something else in order to keep the independence of the officer and provide an allowance

for him. The hon. gentleman now says, in a fit of temper, perhaps, that we should strike out this provision for the present. I do not propose that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You do.

Mr. LAURIER. I think it should be removed in its present form. We simply say that the officer shall not be subject to the Superannuation Act, but that he shall be allowed a superannuation allowance. Perhaps the idea of the Minister of Justice is a good one, that we might apply the whole of the Act except one or two clauses, but perhaps the suggestion which came from this side of the House would be the best one, that we should frame a special law for this officer as he is a special officer. If we carry the resolution as proposed to be amended, it will, I have no doubt, meet the views of the Government.

Mr. CASEY. There are two sections in the Act, one saying his salary shall be \$4,000 and the other that he shall be subject to the provisions of the Superannuation Act. I do not see why we should pass more than the first resolution to-night as to his salary. The hon. the Finance Minister who is in charge of the Bill—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was until hon. gentlemen opposite took it out of my hands.

Mr. CASEY. That may be very smart. The hon. gentleman is in charge of the Bill and responsible for it, and before the Premier came into the House he agreed to let the matter of superannuation stand over and merely pass the first clause of the resolution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We cannot do that, because it requires a special clause for superannuation.

Mr. CASEY. You can pass the resolution about his salary to-night, and you can pass the resolution about superannuation later on, when you have agreed to the terms of that arrangement. I quite understood before the Minister of Public Works spoke that form of the superannuation question was to be the subject of mature deliberation by the Government in the meantime.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would suggest that the hon. gentlemen opposite after expressing their views would allow this resolution to pass, and it will be incorporated in the Bill. Before that Bill passes there can be such amendments made as will preserve the complete independence of the Auditor General. In the meantime by passing this resolution we get the assent of the House to give him a superannuation allowance.

Mr. LAURIER. For my part I see no objection to carry the resolution, but I shall endeavor to amend it before it is incorporated in the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objection to an allowance for this officer as well as any other officer in the service.

Committee rose and reported.

ACT RESPECTING FERRIES.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 39) to amend the Act respecting Ferries, chapter 97 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. EDGAR. This is a very important change in the law. It provides that we shall strike out the provisions that there shall be public competition for the licenses of ferries in

certain cases. I do not think we should do that without some very good reason. The original clause is :

"Every license for a ferry shall be under the Great Seal and shall be issued by the Governor in Council after public competition as hereinafter provided."

This amendment is to strike out those words "after public competition." I know the effect of this is limited by the other amendments to put it in force between Canada and the other countries and I know that, according to the other amendments in this Bill, public competition is still left in cases of other ferries. I would like an explanation from the Minister of Inland Revenue as to why public competition under this clause should be abolished.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The change has been correctly stated by the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat. The reason for repealing that portion of section 2 providing for public competition is to make it more convenient to establish such ferries. When I say establish, I use the word in a very limited sense, because all of these licensed ferries are now established, although it is quite possible that some few may be established hereafter. A new application might be made for an international ferry at some point where one does not now exist. The law before 1872 provided that the Governor in Council could give leases for ferries, international as well as Canadian; and in most cases they were given to the corporations of towns in the immediate vicinity where those ferries were established. Government leases were given in some cases to the extent of 50 years without competition, and some of these leases are still running. We have not full control of these international ferries. The only right we can seize by public competition is the right connected with our own side of the river; we can give no rights to land on the opposite shore, and in many cases the arrangement will have to be made between the two parties. There is no power taken by the Governor in Council to interfere with existing leases, many of which have several years to run; but in many cases a large amount of capital has been invested in the maintenance of these ferries under a lease for a certain number of years, and it is thought wise to give the Governor in Council power to extend that time, for not more than ten years (although twenty years was asked), on being satisfied that the parties had performed their service satisfactorily to the public and had invested, perhaps \$100,000 in boats and other plant. That does not apply to Canadian ferries now under lease. On the first establishment of a ferry, tenders would be called for, and there would be competition as at present; but even in the case of Canadian ferries, that have performed their service satisfactorily to the public, and in which large amounts of capital have been invested, there is no reason why they should be taken from the people who have them and put up at public competition. When a lease expires, if tenders were called for, there might be dozens of tenders put in at prices that the existing licensees could not afford to pay, and these might be used as levers for the purpose of extorting money or imposing unfair conditions upon them. Therefore we think it would be safer to leave the extension of the time in the hands of the Governor in Council. Of course, the Act as it stands, gives the Governor in Council power to make regulations as to the toll that may be charged (which differs according to the localities), as to the time of crossing and the capacity of the boats. In most cases these ferries are not sources of revenue. The ferries generally established in the Provinces, or between one Province and another, are for the convenience of the public and not for revenue, and I am sure that in many cases the parties carrying them do not derive little or no profit from them. I have been asked about arrears. We have to take steps to collect in some cases, but I do not think the House would justify us in taking

arbitrary means to collect the license fees from those people who make little or no profit out of the money they have invested, especially in view of the fact that these fees are not imposed so much for revenue purposes as for the public convenience.

Mr. EDGAR. In answer to the enquiry I made about the reason for abolishing competition for the licenses of ferries between Canada and a foreign country, the hon. gentleman has gone into the whole subject of the amendments. As he has referred to these clauses of the Bill, I will refer to them also to show the extraordinary nature of the amendments. In the first place, he proposes that competition should not be required at all for licenses for ferries between Canada and foreign countries. That is one safeguard of the public that is proposed to be removed. Then, in the 3rd section, he provides that instead of ferry licenses being renewable for only five years, they may be granted or renewed by the Governor in Council for ten years without competition. That is a strong provision, and not at all in the public interest that I can see. Then, there is another attack upon the system of competition where, in cases of ferries between two Provinces, it is provided that without seeking for tenders, the Government may authorise the extension of a license for an additional period of five years. Now, that is entirely new, as is the provision for a license for ten years in a case between a Province and the foreign country. That is entirely new. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the difficulty in collecting fees from ferries and the unprofitable character of many of the ferries. But there is nothing in that to explain the reason why he asked Parliament to authorise these changes. He has not told us of any particular case in which it was not in the public interest to call for competition. It requires a very strong argument to convince any man that advertisements calling for applications for licenses for public institutions, like ferries, is not in the public interest. I cannot see any justice for any one of these changes. They put more power in the hands of the Government in connection with a matter in reference to which it has heretofore taken the power out of their hands, to the extent of requiring tenders to be called for in the public interest.

Committee rose and reported, and Bill read the third time and passed.

CHIGNECTO MARINE RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the time for the completion of the works of the Chignecto Marine Railway Company, shall, as respects their title to receive the subsidy heretofore authorised, be the 1st July, 1890, instead of the 1st July, 1889; also that the company may be accorded a further delay of twenty-four months for such completion, on the condition of the payment of a monthly penalty of \$5,000 for each month during which the works remain uncompleted after the first above-mentioned date, and also that the amount of capital mentioned in section 2 of the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 18, as that on which the payment of the subsidies limited so as to make up the net earnings to seven per cent. per annum, shall be \$5,500,000 instead of \$5,000,000.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The committee is so well acquainted with the subject, which has been before the House on a number of former occasions, as to make it unnecessary that I should take up the time of the committee explaining it now. It will be remembered that when the question of constructing and enlarging the canals was brought under the notice of the Government, a very able Commission was organised, comprising the most able

Mr. COSTIGAN.

commercial as well as engineering talent in the country, and they reported that among the first canals which ought to be constructed in the interests of the Dominion was one to connect the waters of the Bay of Fundy with the Gulf of the St. Lawrence. A survey was made of that work and an estimate formed that it would cost about \$5,000,000. Parliament adopted that estimate, and both the Government of my right hon. friend and the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, at a subsequent period, placed a million dollars in the Estimates for the purpose of proceeding with that work. In the meantime, Mr. Page revised the estimates; rock was discovered, and he increased the estimated cost from \$5,000,000 to \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000. In this case, hon. gentlemen opposite will remember that while they felt the work would warrant an expenditure of \$5,000,000, it would not warrant such a large expenditure as \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000, and its construction was abandoned. Subsequently the proposition was brought forward to accomplish the same object by the transport of the vessels from the Bay of Fundy to the Gulf of St. Lawrence by means of a ship railway, and Mr. Ketchum, an engineer of considerable ability, who gave a good deal of attention to that subject, took the work in hand. He brought forward a proposition to the Government, and he was told the only terms upon which we would submit it to the consideration of Parliament was that the entire risk should be borne by the capitalists who undertook the construction of the work. And subject to that it was provided that a sum of \$150,000 a year should be granted for twenty five years for the purpose of securing the construction of this ship railway, which was a work to take the place of the canal which was originally contemplated, and for which Parliament had agreed to provide an expenditure of \$5,000,000, a work which would not only connect the waters of the St. Lawrence with the Bay of Fundy, but would bring the ports of Quebec and St. John 500 miles nearer together than they are now. Both the commissioners, and the very able engineers who first reported on the canal, and took a large amount of testimony as to the traffic which would be promoted by the construction of that canal, led everyone to suppose that the trade and commerce of the country would be greatly facilitated by the construction of this work. The result was that Mr. Ketchum endeavored to float his scheme in the great money market of the world, but he was met by the difficulty that a ship railway of that extent was a novelty. In the London Docks, the means of lifting ships fully loaded by hydraulic pressure was exemplified every day. Every slip showed the feasibility of drawing up a large ship on rails. But the scheme which Mr. Ketchum submitted was a novel one. The question of the engineering difficulties was laid before the ablest engineers, and Sir John Fowler, who is an engineer second to none in London, gave the project his enthusiastic support.

Mr. LAURIER. Who was that engineer?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Sir John Fowler, a man of the highest engineering talent in London. There were many engineers who had the same opinion, but I referred to Sir John Fowler especially because I had it from himself. He is a man of world-wide reputation, and he assured me that, having gone thoroughly with Mr. Ketchum into all the details of this scheme, he was prepared to pledge his professional reputation on its success, provided the capitalists were prepared to embark their money in a scheme which was altogether unprecedented. While I was absent from this Parliament, the terms were revised, and, instead of giving the company \$150,000 a year for twenty-five years, the amount was increased so as to give them the same sum, according to actuarial calculation, in twenty years. Mr. Ketchum, who has spent a large amount of money and of time in regard to this matter, who has expended his own private means in endeavoring to bring this work to a com-

pletion, and has met with difficulties of a financial character in connection with it, owing to the novel character of the work, has reason to believe that he has now found capitalists who are prepared to carry the work to a successful completion, but they ask that this change shall be made in the terms. They ask that there shall be an extension of time of one year for a completion of the work, and that there shall be a further time of twenty-four months allowed, subject to the payment of a penalty of \$5,000 a month for every month during which the work is uncompleted after July, 1890. It appears that twenty-four months is a large extension of time, but practically it is only an extension of twelve months, because there are only six months in the year available for the work, and if you gave an extension of twelve months it would really be only an extension of six months, which is the working period for the operation of the contract. Under the terms of the engagement made by Parliament with this company, all the responsibility rests upon the capitalists and upon the company. They are not only obliged, before they receive a dollar of public money, to complete the contract to the satisfaction of the Government, but they then receive the subsidy per annum only during the successful operation of the work. The extension of time amounts simply to this: that, if any untoward circumstances arose in regard to the completion of the contract, if they were prevented from completing it, if they were a month behind the time, they might have to abandon the entire contract after incurring the expenditure of this large amount of money. The extension of time is, therefore, practically only for twelve working months, and that is made in order to meet any unforeseen contingencies. I do not think it is necessary for me to say more at present than that Mr. Ketchum is very sanguine that, if this extension of time is granted, he will be able to raise the necessary capital and to proceed with the work vigorously.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not wish to discuss the question to-night, or to offer any strenuous opposition to the enlarged time which is proposed to be given, but I must say that I regret that the Government continue to give their countenance to this scheme. Of course, I accept the statement that eminent engineers have given their adhesion to this scheme, but at the same time I have never been able to meet any practical man in the Maritime Provinces who believes that the scheme will be of any real utility. Two or three years ago, it was proposed to give an additional subsidy to this company, I think by the Minister of Agriculture at that time, the Hon. Mr. Pope.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No additional subsidy was proposed.

Mr. DAVIES. It was proposed to change the terms very much in favor of the company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was simply making it 20 years instead of 25 years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) At that time the scheme was characterised by such practical gentlemen as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and others, as a chimerical scheme, and it was stated that, even if it were accomplished, at an immense expense to the people of this country, it would be of very little advantage to the people of the Maritime Provinces. I have failed to meet, either in Prince Edward Island or in Nova Scotia, anyone who has any opinion that this could lead to much benefit to the people of the Maritime Provinces. It is no doubt possible to build a marine railway, and to carry a vessel over it, but I have questioned captains and shipowners in regard to it, and those who are interested in the export of produce, and I have not met anyone who did not laugh at the scheme. Perhaps, when the Bill is brought in, we may discuss it further, but the hon. gentleman has omitted to discuss the most important part of this resolution. The first section of

the Act provides that the term during which a subsidy may be granted from the consolidated revenue fund of Canada to this Chignecto Marine Railway Company, under provisions of the Act 47 Victoria, shall be for 20 instead of 25 years, and the amount shall be \$170,602, instead of \$150,000. That is one of the changes to which I referred increasing the subsidy, as provided for by the Act passed in 1886. I see the hon. gentleman proposes to make that \$5,500,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a clerical error. The substitution of \$5,500,000 instead of \$5,000,000 is a clerical error, and it is to make the Act conform with the contract.

Mr. DAVIES. As it is printed here it is for \$5,500,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In my resolution for \$5,000,000, I proposed to provide the limited subsidy, so as to make up the net earnings to 7 per cent. per annum, shall be \$5,500,000 instead of \$5,000,000. I say that is simply to correct a clerical error, and does not alter the agreement with the Government at all.

Mr. DAVIES. It certainly alters the liability under the Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it is no liability at all. The liability is precisely limited to the amount per annum to be paid for the 20 years, but this, instead of being a liability, is the very reverse; it is a provision by which, when the profits reach a certain figure, the Government shall be relieved, it is a relief from liability. It is a provision that when the profits reach 7 per cent. on a certain amount, the Government shall share equally the profit, and shall only be called upon for the balance between that and the amount we originally proposed to give.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will find that in one part of the Act it is correctly stated.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 101) to make further provision respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited).

Bill read the first time.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BOWELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 92) to amend chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes respecting the Customs.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. BOWELL. I think if the House will allow the Bill to be read the second time now, it will be much more convenient, as it contains a large number of clauses with a good many amendments, to discuss the particulars of each amendment in committee. It will take some little time for me to explain the changes. I propose to take the second reading to-night, and refer it to committee to-morrow, and then move the resolution which has been placed upon the paper, and refer it to a committee, and we can enter into a full discussion in committee of each clause. If the House desires at that time, before going into committee, that I should make any lengthy explanation of the Bill, I shall be prepared to do so.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think there will be no objection to that, but I would repeat the suggestion that it would be advisable to print this Bill with the exceptions in brackets. It is not easy to follow the discussion when so many sections are repealed and substituted by other sections. It appears to me that we could discuss this much more intelligently if the hon. gentleman will have this Bill printed with the sections he proposes to omit, and substituting the new sections.

Mr. BOWELL. I think I can meet the hon. gentleman's proposition. I have an explanation of every clause before me, and the reason for the change, and as he has made the suggestion, I will have these printed before going into committee so that each hon. member may get a copy.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (page 499) respecting the Customs Act.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOWELL. I desire, in the first place, to provide what the word "value" means. In different sections of the Customs Act the word "value" of goods occurs; sometimes the words are "dutiable value." The object of this amendment is to provide that wherever the word "value" occurs it shall mean the duty-paid value of the goods in this market. This occurs now in some portions of the Act and in other portions it does not, leaving it open to discussion, particularly with lawyers, as to the particular meaning to be given to the word in particular cases in which it occurs. The second proposition is to change the penalty which is imposed for undervaluation. If a merchant imports an article, and enters it at 20 per cent. undervalued, he is not liable to a penalty of 50 per cent. of the duty. In other words, if an article is imported and entered at an undervaluation of 20 per cent., if the article is dutiable at 25 per cent. it pays 37½ per cent. I propose to change that provision so that when the value of the article is entered at an undervaluation of 10 per cent. under its real value in the market where it was purchased, the penalty, instead of being 50 per cent., will be only 10 per cent. of the duty, and so on in proportion as the undervaluation is increased. Under this proposition an article will have to be entered at 50 per cent. below its marketable value in the country where it is purchased before the penalty now imposed is enforced.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You are relaxing the regulations.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. If the amount of undervaluation is over 50 per cent. then the penalty would be higher than now imposed. I see the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright) smiles; he does not think this can be possible. The hon. gentleman should draw a distinction between making a law and administering it.

Mr. WRIGHT. I was about to ask whether it was in the direction of relaxation or stringency?

Mr. BOWELL. In the direction of relaxation.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad of it.

Mr. BOWELL. The next proposition in the resolution is one which affects the revenue. If the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) will direct his attention to clause 12 of the Act he will see that this proposal provides that the damage done to any article shall be based upon a valuation. That cannot apply equitably to damage which is done to sugar that pays duty upon its strength as proved by the polariscope. There is a certain reduction given when sugar is tested in the laboratory if it has salt water in it. Under the present system as the law reads a doubt has arisen as to whether the merchant is not entitled, in addition to the allowance which is made when the strength of the sugar is tested by the polariscope, for whatever might be given by way of appraisement. I might give in illustration a case that occurred in Montreal some time ago. There was certain damage, or supposed damage, to a cargo of sugar, and the valuers and underwriters who had insured it paid the importers about 33½ per cent. as damage. They made a like demand on the customs for a reduction. Upon testing the sugar by the polariscope, and after making

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

a thorough investigation as to what was supposed to be the damage done to the sugar, we found that no damage had actually been done. The consequence was that we saved to the revenue by that investigation a very large sum, amounting to thousands. I desire to put that matter at rest in future by changing the law in this particular.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). With respect to changes applicable to sugar—does the hon. gentleman propose to make any change in the polariscope test of sugar?

Mr. BOWELL. No, we do not propose to make any change as to the mode of levying the duty. This change is in order to prevent importers from being paid more than they should be paid in case of any damage being done to sugar by salt water or otherwise.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is this extra power taken to determine the value? Does it do away with the clause providing for appraisement?

Mr. BOWELL. No. It is to meet a case of this kind. A gentleman goes to a foreign country and buys an article, for which he pays say \$600. I give the hon. gentleman an actual case. Then he pays to the inventor \$200 a year for the use of it for ten years, and at the end of that time the article is not his property. Now, what is the value of the article for duty? That is only one among thousands of cases that arise all the time. The last provision provides for the abolition of giving bonds for the ex-warehousing of goods from one warehouse to another and transferred from one port to another. Under the present system, every merchant, if he transfers bonded goods from one warehouse to another, has to supply bonds. When I tell the House that in Montreal, in one year, over 10,000 bonds are given, hon. gentlemen will readily understand the amount of work and expense attending the giving of bonds. I propose to add to the Customs Act a provision which makes the owner of the goods liable in the penalties the moment he makes an ex-warehouse entry of goods. It will relieve the trade of an immense amount of trouble, annoyance and expense, and at the same time will protect the revenue just as well as is done at the present time.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The original importers?

Mr. BOWELL. Any one who owns the goods, the original importer or a trader to whom the goods were transferred. If goods were transferred from Halifax to Brantford, the merchant making the entry would have to give a bond. Under the proposition now before the House he would not have to give a bond, the fact of his making an ex-warehouse entry would make him liable.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I certainly think the Minister cannot be found fault with in this regard. It has been charged by traders and merchants that the hon. gentleman is a little severe at times, but the last provision is certainly in the interests of trade no less than the custom house officers. If the revenue is secured there is no reason why this cannot be done, and any one in trade can understand what the relief will be. He deserves the smiles of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright) on this ground. The only danger I see is whether the Minister being given power to place value for duties, which he seems to think is necessary in some cases, there was danger of the exercise of arbitrary measures in some cases.

Committee rose and reported.

ADULTERATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of the Bill (No. 47) to amend the Adulteration Act, chapter 107 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 18th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 102) to enable the Central Ontario Railway Company to alter the location of their line of railway and to mortgage their road to a greater amount than \$20,000 per mile.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Bill (No. 103) to provide for the examination and licensing of persons employed as engineers elsewhere than on steamboats.—(Mr. Cook.)

Bill (No. 105) to prevent the practice of fraud by tree peddlers and commission men in the sale of nursery stock.—(Mr. Boyle.)

THE TERRITORIES REAL PROPERTY ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON (for Mr. WHITE, Cardwell) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 104) further to amend chapter 51, Revised Statutes, "The Territories Real Property Act." He said: One of the purposes of this Act is to authorise the appointment of an inspector of registration offices in the North-West Territories, in order to secure uniformity of practice in regard to the registration of deeds. The other provisions of the Bill are principally intended to reduce in several particulars the expenditure connected with the registration and the practice of procuring certificates of titles.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FLOODS OF THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. BERNIER (for Mr. PRÉFONTAINE) (Translation) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to put into execution shortly the means suggested by divers parties and among others, by Captain Legar, to sink pillars in Lake St. Louis, in order to lessen the dangers and damages of floods in the St. Lawrence, on the south shores, in the counties of Laprarie, Chambly and Verchères? If so, will there be a sufficient amount set down in the Estimates for the prosecution of these works during the next season?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation.) In reply to the hon. gentleman I may say that the Government must have employed the services of some experts on this question, but that we are not, at present, in a position to state what decision the Government will arrive at in the matter.

KINGSTON DEPUTY POSTMASTER.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, 1. Whether the deputy postmaster of Kingston, William Shannon, was detected by the deputy inspector, or by any other officer, in the act of opening certain letters? 2. Why said deputy postmaster was not forthwith arrested? 3. Why the said deputy postmaster was allowed to depart to Cape Vincent, the succeeding day, without any interference? 4. Why no attempt was made by the Post Office authorities to arrest the said deputy postmaster, on his return to Kingston, one days since?

Mr. McLELAN. It has been reported to me that the deputy postmaster was detected in treating letters improperly; and when that report was made to me, it was also reported he had left the country. As soon as I saw this notice intimating that he had returned, I gave orders that he be proceeded against.

ONTARIO COUNTY JUDGES' SALARIES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to propose any addition to the salaries of the County Judges of the Province of Ontario?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is not their intention.

DUTY ON BOOKS FOR MECHANICS' INSTITUTES.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Is it the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to remove the duties on books imported for use by Mechanics' Institutes?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not.

RICHARD MONCK, OF CHATHAM.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. LISTER) asked, When did Mr. Richard Monck, of Chatham, cease to be in the employ of the Government, and what is the total sum paid to him during the past year for services and disbursements?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the absence of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, I would say that Mr. Monck ceased to be in the employ of the Government in 1886; the exact date I have not got. There has been no money paid to him for services during the past year.

W. F. O'DONOGHUE.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked, 1. When was Mr. W. F. O'Donoghue engaged as extra clerk in the Department of Agriculture? 2. When did he obtain leave to engage as Tory canvasser in the county of Russell? 3. Is his salary as extra clerk assured to him during his absence?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. O'Donoghue was engaged as extra clerk in the Department of Agriculture in November last, and he is still receiving salary as such. He did not obtain any leave to engage as Tory canvasser in the county of Russell.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then he went of his own accord.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And drew his pay.

CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS.

Mr. DOYON (Translation) moved for:

Copies of all letters, telegrams and petitions forwarded by Indians of the Caughnawaga Reserve to the Minister of the Interior, asking for an election of Chiefs, in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Act; also, of all correspondence on the subject between the said Indians, the Minister of the Interior, and the Agent of the Reserve.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I beg to offer some explanations in connection with this motion, which I will do as briefly as possible. In the month of December, 1887, I received from the Indians of the Caughnawaga reserve a petition bearing fifty-four signatures. I forwarded it to the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. White) with a letter commending it to his earnest consideration. As the grievances of the Indians are fully stated in the petition, I will read it to this House. It is written in English and I will read it in that language:

"To the Honorable
"The Superintendent General of Indian Affairs,
"Ottawa.

"Sir,—At a general meeting held this day, fourteenth of November, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven,

"We the undersigned members, braves of the Caughnawaga Reserve, solicit to be granted us to represent to you most respectfully:

"That from time immemorial, and since the establishment of our settlement here, in all occasions where our common interests are involved, and that the want is felt to be redressed, it is customary with us to implore your interposition as father and protector of our community, who is always willing to comply with our desires, being, as one should say, the representative of our noble mother, 'Queen Victoria,' for whom we have the profoundest veneration, and the Crown of whom our ancestors have so oftentimes defended;

"That in this instance the motive of our urgent prayer is of the most eminent character, which is the alteration in the Council of Chiefs; that is to say, a general election of a suitable number of chiefs, if not for the term of three years, as provided by law hereinafter mentioned, at least temporarily. The actual council is defective on account of its quorum being insufficient;

"That we deem it unnecessary to state in detail the extent of our grievances towards our chiefs; in a word, be it given us the humble expectation that the benefit of 'section 72 of the Indian Act of 1880' be applied to us;

"And your petitioners will ever pray.

"Ohas Kanatase,
"Martin Theahiashe,
"J. B. Anonawenrate,
"J. B. Absentonni,
"Peter Shoketowane,
"Thomas Ahiewate,
"Ignace Tiahokathe,
"Louis Tharonhatie,
"Louis Karonhiontie,
"Ohas Tekanitariakwen,
"Matias Shatekarenhes,
"Louis Tekahonwake,
"James Karenhoton,
"Thomas Tekarenhonte,
"Thomas Kahiaba,
"Ignace Tehonatsamhen,
"John Shakowihe,
"Toussaint Tionkwaronni,
"Francis Kaneratiioh,
"Louis Shoniatarowane,
"Louis Wisekowa,
"Louis Thairi,
"Joseph Thiaweron,
"Louis Tekentashen,
"Ignace Aronhiakens,
"Peter Warenhiaki,
"Francis Thanonsokotha,

"(Signed)

Moses Niwennitaa,
John Thawenrate,
Francis Sakohentetha,
Joseph Thaonthakete,
Joseph Ariwaken,
Jean Tehonwatase,
Peter Katsitakeron,
Lazar Tharonhiorens,
Peter Shakorewatha,
Joseph Thanonsokotha,
Peter Thawennoken,
Peter Takatsitakenen,
Joseph Shorakowane,
Joseph Onetotako,
Moses Mailloux,
Felix Thonitai,
Joseph Karontasa,
Matias Tsatakenha,
Wm. Shaonwentsowane,
Peter Niioherasa,
Francis Anonshihatha,
René Shatekaronhies,
Francis Shawentaaen,
Louis Thawennaienton,
Ignace Kanento,
Ignace Thaseraren,
Louis Aronhiensere."

As can be seen, the Caughnawaga Indians pray, in their petition to the Minister of the Interior, that they be allowed an election of chiefs for their tribe. They state that since seven years they have not had such an election; that several chiefs, who managed the affairs of the tribe, are dead or unfit to act as such, and that, therefore, there presently remains to them but two chiefs at Caughnawaga. This is the ground on which they stand to ask from the Government that they be allowed, as stated in the above petition, an election of chiefs. I will also quote section 75 of the Indian Act, which reads as follows:—

"Whenever the Governor in Council deems it advisable, for the good government of a band, to introduce the system of election of chiefs, he may provide that the chiefs of any band of Indians shall be elected as hereinafter provided, at such time and place as the Superintendent General directs; and they shall, in such case, be elected for a term of three years, but may be deposed by the Governor in Council for dishonesty, intemperance, immorality or incompetency; and they may be in the proportion of one head chief and two second chiefs or councillors for every 200 Indians."

Particulars are nothing in this case. Therefore in their petition they do not ask for a special law; but they ask that the law which has been passed in 1880, for their benefit, be carried out. In January, 1888, they forwarded another petition bearing 160 signatures. It is as follows:—

"To the Honorable THOS. WHITE,
Minister of the Interior,
Ottawa.

"We, the undersigned members of this tribe, humbly request the Indian Department to be allowed an election of chiefs while pending Mr. DORON.

the decision of the Government to grant us the Indian Advancement Act.

"Signed,

"KANADA KE, Jan. 21st 1888.

"I ge ne onkde on de se ra kde kon se iats te ris ta Ottawa ts sa te ri on te

"Kda ne ken ni as kda ri on ta ia kden ni tio kda ken ni a on sa ia ki ia ta ra ko (chiefs) ra ti ko da nens a hon ten tia te na o ten io ri da ien ne ken to.

"Tsi ni io re ias kda ri on na ia ki ia ta ra ko ne (Councillors)

"Da a kda tats hen na ren ne ia kda non des.

"Ro8i Tha8eikenra, Tier Katsitsiakera, Sose Anenarotonk8as, Tosen x Athienk8anonni, Sose x Aonontsakare, Tier Sakore8atha, Sose T8iorakh8isen, Sa8atis x Soronia, Ennias Skaetati, Ro8i Senniserio, Saksarie Kanentoton, Ennias x Karoniaratie, Marten Tiaiashe, Ro8i x Tha8ennaienton, Rasar x Tekaratemseltre, Sose x Thanonsoneo8a, Arene x Satekaronies, Ennias x Kament, Sa8athies O8erokon, Tiev Karoniare, Ennias Otsinek8ar, Sak Karakontie, Tisian Ari8a-kenha, Sose Anetotake, Sishe x Kavonioare, Aton8a Taronko8a, Sentehon8a x Tase, Sishe x Tajorionote, Ro8i x Thajorionote, Tier Karatohon, Aton8a x Nikana8aa, Ro8i x Nonrakete, Sishe x A8enra-thon, William Shaonont8io8ane, Tier x Onakharakete Ennias x Kentok8ake, Marten x Kaneratoare, Aton8a x Te8ennitashen, Sa8atis x Nonsa8enrate, Ennias x Te8ateron8aronko8a, Marten x Rak8atiron, Sa8atis x Atsitsiaks, Sose x Orite, Ennias Arhotonk8as, Ro8i Tekanevataneken, Savo x Tekanhiatarek8en, Ennias x Aronhiakens, Ro8i Thaientaneken, Tiev x Kanatoave, Sathias x Thatokentha, Vo8i x Shoniatavo8ane, Sathias Sat8ekavenes, Sak x Kanatsiakaiton, Tiev x Kentiokhon, Saksavie x Saennatie, Sose x Nikavontasa, Tien x AKhidirahes, Sadati8 x Oondateken, Wi8he Non8anoven, SaK-Savie x KatsivaKevon, Vodi x Di8eKoda, Sadatis x SaKodie, SaKSavie x Sadantenen, Tien x Kanatiio, Tien x Aienta8, Di8he x AvidaKenha, Ennias x Nikavonta8a, Di8he x SadennaKati, Ennias x OSKenontona, Ie8-ent x TeKavataneken, Di8he x KanetaKon, SaKSavie x TioateKden, So8e x TaiovaKavon, So8e Teniatie, Ennias Saatie, Tiev x Thiveta, Ennias x TeKanadateKden, Sadati8 Sative, T8ian x Vai8, So8e x Saiodi8aKevon, SaKSavie x SaKoKennonKda8, Vodi x Darlave, Sadati8 x Kava8atishon, Ennias x Kontitle, Ra8ar x Thavoniovon8, Sadati8 x Vaienton-ri8, Vodi x Thavondatie, Ennias x AtadaKhon, Atonda Avata8, SaK-Savie, x ATKdivoton, SaKSavie x Sontaviiakhon, Sadati8 x Adennaci-enta8, Sadati8 x Odi8ateken, Ennias x Aonont8iaKeryo, Vodi x Anu-ia, SaK x TeKanon8oKen, Di8he, x KavoniaKevon, SaK8avie Te8ona-venion, SavoKanen x VaKe, So8e x ThaotaKenva, SaK x Kavhatoon, Sadati8 x OnasaKenva, Atonda x TeKavenonta, Atonda x Kachias, SaK x Anavovna, AveK x Anavovton, Di8he x Kadenio, SaKSavie x Thiadentonte, Ennias x Atevhiton, SaKSavie x Niade8ace, Atonda x Avonioti8, Vodi SaKodennenadi, So8e x AKhienentonko, Atonda x TaKevitontie, Sadati8, Thaeenvate, Soce x TaentaKenva, Sadatis x IovaKdenton, So8e x Thiadevion, Vodi x TeKentava8hen, Di8he x Sothionton, SaKSavie x Kanevatitio, Sadati8 x Adennanion, SaK x SKa-nehKovhaKsen, Vodi x Kent8ioKoda, So8e x Anenvi8eve, Ennias x SKennetati, Atonda x Athiatavonne, Tiev x Kanata8e, Entden x Tio-nataKdente, Di8he x Tha8ennontie, Sadatis x Atedennavikhon, Di8he x Tedata8haviaKe, Ennias x TeKeniatu8ken, Vodi x Sholstrenodane, Marten x Ovoniakete, Di8he x Tekanadatek-ken, Aveksent x Teon8akanere, Ennias x Tsiseveken, Sava x Sakahese, Tiev x Tekatsitaneken, Vodi x Onuonkoton, Savo x T8ioniat, Marten x Sakovaiatakda, Saksavie x Anon8iatha, Saksavie x Thavoniakethon, Ennias x Thasevaven, Tiev x Katinontie, Di8he x Kanentakevone, Sose x Karoniakavon, Vodi x Avihon, Marten x Tekatsitaheseve, Atonda x Thawnvishon, Dominik x Tioakdente, Sose x Sovakodane, Sose x Thontakete, Saksavie x Non Sakent8eake, Aton8a x Anenvente, Tiev x Daveniaki, Sose x Katavativon, Tiev x Sokete8ane.

Caughnawaga, Jan 21st 1888, P. Q.

They waited for two weeks for an answer from the hon. the Minister of the Interior, but all in vain. Believing or presuming that their humble petition had been lost sight of, they telegraphed to him, and here is what they enquired from the hon. Minister:

"CAUGHNAWAGA, Feb. 10th, 1888.

"To Hon. THOS. WHITE,
"Ottawa.

"Is petition received demanding election of chiefs.

"(Signed) JOSEPH FOSTER.

"OTTAWA, Feb. 10th, 1888.

Here is the answer made by the department:—

"JOSEPH FOSTER,
"CAUGHNAWAGA, Quebec.

"Petition received, and agent will be written to.

(Signed) R. SINOLAIR.

On the 11th of February, they forwarded the following new telegram to the hon. the Minister of the Interior:—

"CAUGHNAWAGA, Feb. 11th, 1888.

"To Hon. THOS. WHITE,
"Ottawa.

"When shall we expect a definite answer to our petition.

"(Signed) JOS. FOSTER."

Here is the answer:—

" JOS. FOSTER,
" Caughnawaga, Que,
" Will write Agent on Monday about proposed election.
" (Signed) L. VANKOUGHNET."

Later on, on the 1st of March, another telegram was sent to the hon. the Minister of the Interior, which read as follows:—

" HON. THOS. WHITE, &c.,
" Ottawa.
" Anxious for an answer to our petition.
" (Signed) JOS. FOSTER."

Let us see the answer:—

" To Jos. FOSTER.
" Ottawa, March 1st, 1888.
" Telegram received. Department taking no action.
" (Signed) THOS. WHITE."

So that, after forwarding two petitions, one of which in December last, and the other in January, stating the reasons for their humble request, the Caughnawaga Indians were in an anxious mood; and having waited for two weeks and still receiving no answer, they telegraphed to the hon. the Minister of the Interior. The first answer they got from the Government implied that the agent of the Indians at Caughnawaga was to be communicated with. That is to say, they were to come to an understanding with the agent and see what was to be done. And later on, on the 1st of March, after a new exchange of telegrams, comes the definite answer: "Department taking no action." That is to say, not minding about it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand that under section 75 of the Indian Act, which I have quoted, the Indians are not vested with the absolute right of electing their chiefs, they must apply to the Department to be granted that right; but I am surprised to find in the Statute-book an Act passed in 1880, setting forth that whenever the Governor in Council shall deem the Indians sufficiently advanced or enlightened, they shall be allowed electing their chiefs. I had several interviews with the hon. the Minister of the Interior on that matter, and the answers he gave me were so very unsatisfactory that I felt it my duty, or rather I should feel to be wanting to my duty if I did not address this House with a view to knowing whether that which is recorded in the Consolidated Statutes is a mockery or an earnest work. What seems strange to me is the very answers of the Department stating that the agent is to be communicated with; and later on, the hon. the Minister of the Interior—with whom I had several conversations on that subject—said to me: I will enquire from the agent of the Caughnawaga Indians whether they are sufficiently advanced to be applied the municipal law such as it exists in the other parts of the province or country; that is to say, to be allowed electing councillors; and if not they shall be allowed electing chiefs. I must state that three years ago, these good citizens of Caughnawaga were given to understand the same thing. What seems most strange to me is the answer I received from the hon. the Minister of the Interior, that the agent was to be conferred with by him in order to know whether these Indians were sufficiently advanced to be applied the system of municipal laws. When, in 1885, the Government were passing the Franchise Act, giving a right to vote to a good many of the Indian tribes of the Dominion, I hoped they had been conferring with the agents of these tribes; but it is not on the strength of the answers they received from these agents, their employees, that they granted a right to vote to the several Indian tribes of the Dominion. And it seems very strange to me, if not intended as a sinister mockery, that they should

come and say: "Before allowing these citizens of Caughnawaga or anywhere else, to elect chiefs or councillors, our agent will be conferred with in order to know whether they are sufficiently advanced." Why! Can the Government earnestly say, who have placed those Indians on the same footing as the other inhabitants of the Dominion, that they have not got sufficient information to know whether they are fit to be left their own cooking? I do not blame the Government for having given the Indians the right to vote, for having granted to the Indian tribes of the Dominion the whole amount of civic rights. I am not speaking of all the Dominion tribes, I shall confine myself to speaking especially of the Caughnawaga tribes, which I have the honor to represent and with which I am more particularly acquainted. I say that the Government, in granting them a right to vote, have been doing not only an act of generosity, but an act of justice; and they would do likewise in allowing them to elect chiefs or councillors, when these are needed. These good citizens are not claiming a favor, but an act of justice. And if I say that I speak more especially with reference to the Indians of the Caughnawaga reserve, it is because I am more intimately acquainted with them; because for many years I have watched them through their daily dealings with the good inhabitants of the counties of Laprairie and Chateauguay and of the town of Lachine. I am satisfied by experience that they have inherited their morals and habits, and, therefore, they should be allowed the beneficial enjoyment of the laws that govern the rest of the Dominion people. For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Government will not only feel it their duty to lay on the table of this House the papers mentioned in my motion, but that they will satisfactorily answer these several petitions and take into their consideration the statements I have just made. I make that request not only as the representative of the Caughnawaga Indians, but in the name of equity, right and justice.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In the absence of my colleague, the Minister of the Interior, who I regret to say, is gravely indisposed, I will give a few words of reply to the representations just offered by the hon. gentleman. There is no objection to accede to his demands, that is, to lay on the Table of the House the documents specified in his motion. I am not up in the matter of the election of chief and councillors of Indian tribes. The hon. gentleman seems to know as much about it, and even a little more, than I do myself, having all the papers in his hands. Still, I think, he was right in asking for these papers, because thus the other members of the House may take cognisance of them. I am certain that if the hon. Minister of the Interior were present, he would have good reasons to allege for not having come to a decision on the matter as yet. The fact that, on two occasions, the Indian Department replied to despatches sent by telegraph, that the Department would have to consult the agent, and the last reply to the effect that the Government would not take action for the time being, led me to the belief that the Department has referred the question to the agent for information. It is impossible for the Minister of the Interior to know in what condition are the Indians of Caughnawaga or of any other tribe, without consulting the agents. We may know in a general way, that some Indians are quite advanced, very intelligent, and some of them well educated. I know some of them who might not be taken for Indians, because as white as any whites, and who, by their intelligence, could hold their own with any pale faces. But this does not signify that all the tribes should be free and authorised to elect their chief and councillors. The hon. gentleman having drawn the attention of the Government to the matter, I am convinced that the Minister of the Interior will take it up as soon as he can possibly do so.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend has succeeded in pricking what may be called the sloth of the Government on this topic he will have reached the point that he set out for. It is plain that my hon. friend had in view, not only the object of obtaining the papers set down in his motion—because I believe that he has already these documents in hand—but he wanted to know why a petition which appeared so reasonable, whereby the Indians asked the right of choosing their own chiefs and councillors, according to law, had not yet been granted? There is a strange anomaly in the law with respect to our Indians. They have the right of franchise without being forced to consult the agent, by an Act of Parliament, as my hon. friend has observed. They have, as a corollary, the right of stating their views on all subjects touching the interests of the country in general, and yet, as my hon. friend stated, in his amazed manner, when there is a question of managing their own kitchen, and of electing their chiefs and councillors, the Government are not prepared to grant them this right of themselves, but must needs consult the agent. I suspect that there may be a leaven of ill-will at the bottom of this matter on the part of the agent, and the trouble possibly comes either from the agent or from the Government. It is well known that if there are Indians who have reached a certain stage of civilisation in the land it is surely the Caughnawagas, and I imagine you will not find aborigines further advanced in any respect in either Ontario or Quebec. My hon. friend made this demand because the petitions of the Indians received no answer. They petition and are told that they must apply to the agent; they petition again and are met by the same reply. My friend's object is to ascertain the facts, inasmuch as there are grounds for belief in some ill-will on the part of that official.

NOEL FORTIN.

Mr. Fiset. (Translation.) moved for :

A Copy of the correspondence between J. O. Pottinger, Esq., Superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, and Mr. Noël Fortin, of the parish of St. Fabien, concerning the accident and damages caused the latter in consequence of the bad state of the level crossings of the railway.

Mr. Speaker, I shall say a word on this motion and I think it will suffice to draw the attention of the Government and prevent a repetition of similar accidents. The petitioner, Mr. Fortin, complains of the crossings on the Intercolonial. Indeed, almost every year, in the County of Rimouski, where there is much snow, accidents happen. I am of opinion that the section men do not keep those crossings in good order, and are content with keeping the line open, without clearing the snow from the track on both sides. The accident that Mr. Fortin complains of, took place last year. This year there were several more mishaps, to such parties as Cyrias Dastores, Aug. Berger, Philip Coulombe and others whose names are not in the letter which I hold in my hand. I fancy that the mere mention of this to the Government will be sufficient to lead them to see that these things are remedied.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I would observe to the hon. gentleman that his motion should stop at the words: "Concerning the accident and the damage caused the latter." As it stands we are made to say that the accident happened on account of the defective condition of the railway crossings. We are not aware of that. But the first part of the motion, that is, the correspondence exchanged on the event—and I presume that is about all the hon. gentleman would like to know—there can be no objection to bringing down.

Mr. Fiset. (Translation.) I will remark to the hon. Minister that my motion seems to me to be well draughted :
Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

"Concerning the accident and damages caused the latter in consequence of the bad state of the level crossings of the railway."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman did not catch my meaning. The first part of the motion ending with these words: "Accident and damages caused the latter" is all right. Then he makes us state the cause of the accident, and to that I object, because thus we should admit a thing which, possibly, may not be borne out by the documents in the files of the department. Hence I should ask him to cancel the words: "in consequence of the bad state of the level crossings of the railway." In this way the same end will be reached and we shall not run the risk of admitting what we know nothing about.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) I think the hon. Minister of Public Works is right. My learned friend is probably of the opinion that the accident was due to the level crossing in question, and perhaps the Government holds the contrary view. At all events the papers are what my hon. friend wants, and he will obtain them equally well if he suppresses those words. If later he thinks fit to make another motion about this crossing he will be at liberty to do so.

EASTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY.

Mr. KIRK moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between the Government, or any member thereof, and the municipal councils of the counties of Pictou, Antigonish and Guysboro', N.S., and any other persons; together with copies of resolutions passed by the said municipal councils relative to the repayment by the Government of moneys paid by the said municipal counties for the right of way for the Eastern Extension Railway, now owned and in possession of the Government.

He said: This is a question in which, as the resolution indicates, three counties, embracing four municipalities, are interested. The law in Nova Scotia provides that, wherever a company or the Government build a railway, the municipality, or the inhabitants of the municipality through which the railway is built, must supply the right of way, and they do that as well as making grants to the companies. That is a law which existed, I believe, long previous to Confederation, and, as far as I am aware, it is still on the Statute-book. The Cape Breton and Halifax Railway Company, under a contract with the Local Government, built a line of railway from New Glasgow to Port Mulgrave, on the Strait of Canso, being a distance of about eighty miles. The company afterwards transferred that to the Local Government. The company, however, had built the road on the condition of receiving a subsidy in money from the Local Government and the transfer from this Government of the Pictou and Truro Branch Railway. Before the Pictou and Truro Branch was transferred, the company transferred its right in the road to the Local Government, and the Local Government, in consequence of some difficulty between themselves and this Government, in reference to the transfer of the Pictou and Truro Branch, compromised the matter and sold their right to this Government at Ottawa, which thus became the owners of the whole line to the Strait of Canso, which is now operated as a part of the Intercolonial. The terms of the compromise with this Government do not secure for the municipalities the amount of money which was paid by the people for the right of way. The people feel a deep interest in the matter, and the municipalities in the different counties have moved in the matter, and I believe have had some communication with the Government in regard to it. I notice that the municipality of Pictou passed the following resolution :

"Whereas this county has been for some years paying, and there is still a large amount due, for the right of way for the Eastern

Extension Railway, which latter amount, although the proprietors have been paid, is still a liability of the county, as county debentures have been issued for the same; and whereas the Dominion Government have become the proprietors of this railway and it is part of the I. O. R.; and whereas in all other cases of Government railways in the Dominion it is the policy of the Dominion Government to pay the cost of the right of way; therefore resolved, that the members of the county in the Dominion Parliament be requested to represent our case to the Dominion Government and request that Government to refund to this county such amounts as we have paid for that purpose and also assume the balance that this county is responsible for."

I believe this resolution was passed unanimously by the municipal council, of which I believe the senior member for Picton is a member. I have no doubt that the hon. gentlemen who so worthily represent the county of Picton in this House, have been pressing upon the Government to refund this money in accordance with the resolution which I have read. I understand that the municipal councils of the other municipalities have passed resolutions somewhat similar in purport. I have not seen them, and this came to me by accident, as someone happened to send me the minutes and proceedings of the Picton Municipal Council. I believe the other municipal councils have been pressing upon this Government the necessity of their refunding the money which has been paid for the right of way, inasmuch as it is and has been the policy of this Government wherever it has built branch railways, to buy the right of way, and not to require the municipalities through which the railway passes to pay anything for it. I feel that it is only necessary to bring this matter before the Government, as not only are the hon. gentlemen who represent Picton interested in this matter, but the Minister of Justice himself represents one of the counties which has been taxed very fully for the right of way.

Motion agreed to.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH JAMAICA.

Gen. LAURIE moved for:

Copies of correspondence and proposals connected with the visit of the delegates from the Island of Jamaica to Ottawa, in 1885, and of proposed delegations from other West India Islands, whether for the purpose of considering closer political relations or solely with a view to closer commercial relations. Also correspondence from the Imperial authorities on the same subject.

He said: In reference to this motion I would say that whilst all parties in this country are desirous of obtaining a market for the surplus products of our manufactures, I think we hardly give sufficient attention to a proposal that appears to have been made for closer commercial relations with us, if not actual political relations, by a very important portion of Her Majesty's dominions, at least important to us, because we already trade largely with them—I refer to the West Indies. I hold in my hand the proceedings of the Legislative Council of Jamaica for 1884, in which I find that the question was submitted for more intimate and closer political relations between Canada and the West Indies. That subject was discussed, but it did not receive the approval of the Legislative Council to any great extent. But the matter was also discussed by a very influential body of property-holders in Jamaica, the Jamaica Planters' Association in London, and they highly approved of the scheme for the entrance of Jamaica as a Province into the Canadian Confederation. They desired that it might be brought before the Jamaica Legislature, and this was done as stated. But the following year it was again brought up in the Legislative Council of Jamaica in another shape, expressive of a desire for closer commercial relations with the Dominion of Canada. Then the scheme met with hearty approval, and I find that in discussing the sending of a delegation to Canada, strong expressions were made in its favor. One of the members of the Legislative Council said that he was satisfied the day would come when they would burn ben-

fires at the prospect of having closer commercial relations with us than they have now. Every member expressed the same view, practically, and the resolution passed unanimously. In 1885, accordingly, a delegation visited Canada, but from various causes the matter appears not to have met with much encouragement in Canada. I conceive, Sir, that at the present time when we are desirous of developing our trade relations, we might reasonably consider this proposition. It is well, at any rate, that we should ascertain the position in which we stand, and the proposal that Jamaica has made to us. Now, Sir, I find that although a delegation from Jamaica only visited Canada, a delegation from the Leeward Islands were also prepared to come here, but the intimation was given, I understand, from the Colonial Office, that Her Majesty's Government would not view with approval any proposition for the admission of a portion only of the West Indies into the Canadian Confederation, or into closer commercial relations with Canada, but that if any proposal was made, it should include the West Indies as a whole. Now, to show that the Home Government do not disapprove of the idea, I may say that Lord Derby, then Colonial Secretary, stated that:

"It was difficult to conceive of any arrangement between Canada and the West Indies to which the British Government could raise an objection."

Other than, of course, that the West Indies should make separate and isolated arrangements. Now, Sir, without taking the House through all the details of the trade of the whole of the West Indies, I may refer more particularly to the Island of Jamaica, and we may enquire whether its trade offers any prospect that would render it desirable for us to encourage them in their proposal for closer trade relations. The population of the Island of Jamaica is about 580,000; of the Leeward Islands, 120,000.

Mr. DAVIES. How many whites in that 580,000?

Gen. LAURIE. I can ascertain by the census, but I have it not before me. I am at present discussing the trade question; I am not discussing Confederation with the West Indies. I suppose a black man's money is as good as a white man's.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman said that the population was 580,000. I merely desired to know how many of those are whites, and he has not answered me.

Gen. LAURIE. No, because I do not think it bears particularly on the point I am discussing. But at the same time, if the hon. member desires it, and if the House will not object to my detaining them, I shall be happy to furnish the information. But, at the present moment, I am only discussing the trade relations, and I am dealing more particularly with the imports and exports of Jamaica. I suppose it is immaterial to us, when we are seeking in all quarters markets for our goods, what color the people are with whom we trade. I do not think that we enquired, in a former discussion in this House, whether the population was white or black among the 60,000,000 that have been talked about. Now, I take Jamaican trade as an illustration of the trade of the West Indies. The imports of Jamaica are \$6,500,000. The imports from the British Possessions are \$871,000, and from the United States, \$2,301,000. Now, Sir, analysing this trade to ascertain what articles we could supply, I will give you a few items. I find that the total amount of breadstuffs imported into Jamaica is \$2,695,000; of this amount they import from the British Possessions only \$800,000, and from the United States \$1,599,000. Of liquors—as long as we manufacture them, and until prohibition comes into force, we may discuss that item—they import \$235,000; of these the British Provinces furnish only \$873, and the United States \$5,515. Of tobacco they import \$55,000, of which the United States furnish \$48,000, and we furnish none. Of furniture

they import \$105,000, of which the British Possessions, who certainly manufacture furniture in abundance, only furnish \$40, while the United States furnish \$28,610. Of clothing Jamaica imports \$1,755,000, of which the British Possessions furnish \$6,000, and the United States \$57,235. Of hardware they import \$340,000, of which the British Possessions furnish only \$2,560, and the United States \$71,635. Of building materials they import \$240,000, of which we furnish only \$34,000, and the United States \$172,000. Machinery and tools, \$195,000, of which only \$7,555 worth came from British Possessions, as compared with \$58,000 from the United States. Coals and coke, \$190,000. Of this sum only \$825 worth came from British Possessions, and \$3,075 from the United States. Books, \$48,000; from British Possessions, \$1,700, United States, \$6,000. The next item is miscellaneous, a portion of which we might not be able to furnish; but I claim that all the preceding items we could furnish. The value of miscellaneous goods was \$750,000, of which the British Possessions sent only \$20,000 and the United States \$250,000. I have thus shown that out of total imports of \$6,500,000 we send in far less than \$1,000,000 worth, while the United States sends in nearly \$2,500,000. I will not detain the House by giving comparative statements, and entering more fully into details, but I may mention that of cotton goods—and the West Indies form a desirable market for them—we send in only \$10,000 worth, while the United States send in \$930,000 worth. Of flour we send 14 barrels, whilst the United States send in 133,702 barrels. In dealing with this question it will be asked: What are we to take in return? Every article we desire to take, I maintain. They produce what we want just as we produce what they want. It is commonly believed, too commonly, that the business of Jamaica is mainly sugar and that sugar is the main export. But the sugar export of Jamaica is really only one-sixth of the total export, the remaining five-sixths being largely made up of logwood and other articles of commerce, so that Jamaica would not alone overload our market with its sugar. Our consumption of sugar is 100,000 tons a year, while their production is only about 25,000 tons; so we have to go outside Jamaica to obtain the sugar we require. The total exports, of course, from the whole West Indies aggregate much more than our present consumption; but if we entered into commercial relations with them the duty on sugar would be taken off, and our sugar consumption would be very largely increased. This would no doubt be the case if sugar was as cheap as it is in England, where the consumption is nearly double what it is in Canada under our present system by which a large revenue is collected from sugar, and as a luxury it is considered an article from which it is considered reasonable to collect a revenue. But the consumption is increasing very largely—but this has only taken place within the last year, the increase having been no less than 20,000 tons. This shows that with our increasing population and with our increased prosperity, should such commercial relations be entered into as is proposed in the resolution, the consumption of sugar would be very largely increased. I do not say we could take the whole production of the West Indies for some time to come, but we could approach it, and they would retain the facilities for marketing their product in those markets they possess now, so that the objection raised that we could not consume the whole sugar of the West Indies I conceive falls to the ground. There is a serious question involved, and that is the question of the duty on sugar, this being such an important part of our revenue, and the further question as to how that amount should be made up. I do not hesitate to recognise the fact, and face the difficulty that is involved in this question. I believe, however, that is practically the principal difficulty in connection with the entering into commercial relations with the West Indies. Difficulties there may be in connection with having closer political relations, difficulties that have been

Gen. LAURIE.

pointed out by the hon. member for Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), but I believe we have statesmanship in this country, as in the country to the south of us, to deal with that difficulty. I believe we might most reasonably enter into closer commercial relations with those Islands. I hold that as a large amount of money has been spent to develop the country to the west of the Provinces which first formed the Dominion, which expenditure has given great impetus to the trade of the western Provinces, it is highly desirable that we in the east should have an impetus given to our trade, and I conceive nothing would give it greater impetus than bringing the West Indies into closer commercial relations with ourselves. I believe it would stimulate our commerce and stir our heart's blood, it would stir up commercial enterprise, and I believe far greater life would pervade the eastern Provinces than we now find there. There is plenty of room for it, and we desire this result to be brought about, and, therefore, I have not hesitated to bring this matter before the House, especially because I know that the products in which we are chiefly interested are the products that the West Indies largely consume. But while I believe that is of great material, of momentous importance to the Maritime Provinces, I conceive it is also a matter of very great importance to the upper Provinces. I believe, moreover, that one of the great causes of success to the country to the south is that they possess within themselves the products of the temperate and practically of the tropical zone, and if we could bring the West Indies into closer commercial relations with ourselves, which they themselves have proposed—for remember we are not going after them, but they have come to us and made this proposition—it would materially advance the interests and prosperity of the Dominion as a whole.

Mr. BROWN. I think both the House and the country are under a debt of gratitude to the hon. gentleman for bringing this important subject before the House. I do not intend at this time to enter into any discussion of the subject, but as one engaged in commerce I think we cannot over-estimate the importance of the question which the hon. gentleman has presented. I know it is surrounded with many difficulties and would require to be closely investigated; at the same time the requirements of the West Indies are to so very large an extent for articles the product of Canada, that I feel satisfied arrangements might be made for trade relations greatly to the advantage of both countries.

Mr. SKINNER. As seconder of the resolution I hope the result of the statements placed before the House and the country by the hon. gentleman, and the resolution moved by him, will be that the Government will turn their attention towards that portion of the British Dominion, with a view to opening free commercial relations between them and us. Whilst I favor free unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, I cannot forget that trade should be opened up with the British West Indies and British Possessions in America, and that this would be of paramount importance to the interests of the whole Dominion; and, as has been intimated, we on the seaboard feel that if we could have a fair share of that trade, which we certainly could have if we had free commercial relations with them, it would not only benefit us on the seaboard, but it would place us in a position to have more advantageous trade with the western portion of Canada as well. At the present time Ontario and Quebec have to be paid for the products they send to us largely, by money rather than by interchange of goods, though, of course, we send a good deal from the Maritime Provinces to western Ontario; but if trade with the West Indies was opened up their purchasing power would materially increase, and the increase of that power would enure to the benefit of Canada. Therefore, it is not an isolated nor a local question, but it is one of the greatest importance to the interests of

the whole Dominion. I am very much gratified that this question has been brought up, and I have pleasure in seconding the resolution. I hope the Government will pay attention to what has been said with reference to it, and that we may look forward to speedy action on their part, having in view the opening up of commercial relations in the reciprocal sense with the West Indies particularly, and with the whole of the British Possessions in America.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I desire to express my own gratification at the action taken by the member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), in bringing this matter to the attention of the House and the country. I regard a motion of this kind with regard to more intimate trade relations between the West Indies, or even any outside country, and Canada as the natural outcome of the efforts of the Conservative party in this country in the direction of the National Policy. It was my pleasure to visit a portion of Central America last fall, and in British Honduras and Guatemala, where the climatic conditions are somewhat similar to those of the West India Islands, I found that the Americans were making large advances in promoting their commercial interests in that direction. It did occur to me while there that something might be done by the Government of this country in seeking and acquiring more intimate trade relations with that portion of the world. I believe that of all the outside countries that purchase the surplus products of this country, the West India Islands rank fourth. That being the case the subject cannot be overestimated as to the importance of encouraging trade with those countries which are so anxious apparently to trade with us. Another thing already referred to is, that in those countries it must not be supposed that because a small percentage of the population is white, that therefore the rest of the population are useless, so far as being producers and useful members of the community is concerned. On the contrary, Sir, a large proportion of the colored population of those countries are energetic, hard-working, intelligent business men, and that fact being taken into consideration, as is shown indeed by the trade statistics quoted by the member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), I repeat again that the importance of this subject is one which cannot be overestimated. I regard it as the natural outcome of our support of the National Policy in this country, that it is our duty to extend our outside market as much as possible, and I think if we do extend our outside market as much as possible, the manufacturers of this country will not manifest any desire for extended trade relations with the United States, although it is possible, if we do not take some steps in that direction, some manufacturers themselves may desire to see that outside market extended in that direction. I wish to express my own views individually upon the Government that this matter is of very great importance. I took occasion to write to the Government, on my return from Central America last fall, as to the importance of this subject, and I was glad to receive in reply a letter which told me that already steps had been taken, and that Mr. Jones, a gentleman well fitted for that purpose, had been sent from St. John to the Argentine Republic. I may say, furthermore, that I think the manufacturers of this country, and those largely engaged in commerce, might of their own accord show a little more enterprise than they have yet displayed in encouraging our trade with that portion of the country. Those countries produce many things that we require, and in all articles of woodenware particularly I do not see, with the facilities which we have in the way of shipping, why we cannot, at all events, compete with our neighbors to the south.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The subject brought to the attention of the House by the member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) is of a very interesting character but one that

involves very heavy responsibilities on our fiscal policy, which the Government of the country would have to take charge of and be responsible for. This subject of trade with the British West Indies is not a new one. It has been discussed in this House on previous occasions, and it was discussed in 1884 when delegates were sent from the Island of Jamaica to confer with the Government of this Dominion. On that occasion I had the opportunity of meeting those gentlemen, with all of whom I am well acquainted, and they returned to Jamaica with the feeling that they had not received from the Government of the Dominion that courtesy which they thought they had a right to expect. It appeared from their representations that the Government of Jamaica had received communications from the Government of this country intimating that this Government would be prepared to discuss with the delegates, any question relating to an exchange of products, or the larger question of trade generally between the two countries. When those delegates arrived at Ottawa they were put off from day to day by the Government and had to return to Jamaica without ever having elicited from the Government of this country any opinion as to the course they were prepared to adopt on the subject. It was a regrettable affair, because I know those gentlemen returned to Jamaica very much disappointed, and they did not hesitate to express, at public meetings in various places where they addressed the merchants, their great disappointment in that matter. It must not be forgotten in this connection that the Government had a rather difficult question before them. On that occasion I took the ground that the Government had to consider the matter very seriously, because any action looking to a free exchange of products with the West India Islands involved a very large loss of revenue, as would be the case if the Government admitted sugar into this country duty free. Of course the delegates from the West Indies would only open negotiations on that basis, and nothing but the free admission of their products into this country would be of any service to them. Therefore, they were naturally anxious to know at once whether the Government were disposed to entertain a proposition on that basis. One can very easily see that the Government would hesitate a long time before they would adopt a policy under which they were going to lose a large amount of revenue on sugar. The product of the Island of Jamaica, taken alone, is about 40,000 tons a year, and if such arrangements were adopted that would only supply one-half the consumption of the Dominion. Therefore, under those circumstances, the planters of Jamaica would have a benefit of the duty which we now levy on sugar, because we would be driven outside to make up the balance, and the Government I presume naturally looked at it in that light and made up their minds that they could not, under those circumstances, afford to lose the revenue. I do not blame them for it because they were responsible for the management of the affairs of this country, and they had to look at the question in all its aspects. But the people of Jamaica were not so very anxious for union with Canada as they were for a union with the United States. They, in fact, voted down a resolution proposed by Mr. Solomon, the leader of that view in their Legislature, for a union with the Dominion, and by a very large majority they voted a resolution in favor of opening up negotiations with the United States. They go on to show in a report of some length, which I need not detain the House by reading, but which is signed by Mr. Farquharson, Mr. Walker and Mr. Bennet, three members of the Legislative Council, that in the event of the United States agreeing to their proposal and admitting their products duty free, they would have to admit the products of the United States free to the same extent, and they proceed to show how the loss of revenue could be made up. The imports of Jamaica are about \$6,600,000, and the exports \$7,750,000; the total revenues amount to \$3,000,000, the expenditure to \$2,845,000, and

the debt to \$15,750,000. Its imports from the Dominion of Canada amount to about 11 per cent., from the United States 27 per cent., from England 58 per cent., and from other countries 3 per cent. The people of Jamaica considered this question, and they were quite willing that a proposal of that kind should be made, provided their products were admitted free into the country with which they should negotiate. With reference to the observations of the hon. gentleman who spoke last, looking to the shipment of our manufactured articles not only to Jamaica but to all of the West Indies, under our present fiscal policy it is utterly impossible for the manufacturers of this country to attempt to compete in Jamaica with the English manufacturers. If it requires from 25 to 50 per cent. of duty to keep English goods out of the Canadian market, hon. gentlemen, I think, will see, without much explanation, under what disadvantages our manufacturers would have to compete with goods manufactured under the free trade policy of Great Britain. Therefore, however desirable it may be—and I do not deny that it is desirable—that we should increase the exports of our manufacturers, it is utterly impossible that they can compete with the manufacturers of Great Britain in those markets when we have to put on such a high tariff to keep them out of our own. With regard to exports in natural products, there are no doubt many articles which might find a market in the West Indies at certain times of the year; but our chief product along the coast, which is fish, now finds a market there to as large an extent as the needs of those countries require; and when the hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution said that it was a matter of vital importance to the people of the Maritime Provinces, he was perhaps hardly aware that that trade was developed at present to its fullest extent. If the consumption increased, we should find merchants with sufficient enterprise and knowledge of trade to take advantage of it, and they were only sorry that those markets do not take our products to a larger extent than they do. I should like to see our trade increased with the West Indies if it could be done in any legitimate way; but any trade that is forced, must necessarily be forced at the expense of the community, and I do not think that is a fiscal policy in accordance with the spirit of the age. In relation to the admission of sugar from the West Indies, the Government sent a delegate to the West Indies the year before last, and his report was submitted to this House last year, but it has never elicited any public notice, and has not been referred to by any of the gentlemen who have spoken on that subject in the House. I say nothing about the suitability of the gentleman who made that report for the undertaking, but he was not able to show that there was any field there for the development of our trade beyond the gradual development that was already going forward, because everything that we were producing applicable to the wants of those people was being supplied to them in a regular, expeditious and economical manner, and meeting all the wants of the people. Therefore, no further action was taken in regard to that. A great deal is said nowadays about fostering this trade, and no one would like to see it increased more than I; but the wants of a people are the test of the extent to which trade can be developed; and if the country cannot receive more than it now receives in a regular way, any money expended for such a purpose would only be a waste of the public revenues of the country. I presume the Government will have to consider any proposition of this kind with very great care, because if it is carried out it will entail the loss of a very large amount of revenue. At the same time, judging from the reports which I hold in my hand, and the proceedings in the Legislature of Jamaica, the people there appear to be looking to the United States rather than to us, because the United States furnishes a market which will take all

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

their products, while we can take only a portion of them. All their fruits, spices, logwood, lignum vitæ and rum would find a market in the United States, while we could only take their fruits to a small extent. Therefore, if they could get their sugar free into the United States, it would be of much greater advantage for them to send the whole of their products there, and that is the direction in which they are looking at the present time.

Mr. McNEILL. I am quite sure that the House, and, I think, the country, will thank the hon. gentleman who has introduced this resolution for the course he has taken here to-day. I am sure we all admired the practical and able manner in which he laid his views before the House with reference to a subject the importance of which to the people of this country, I think, can scarcely be exaggerated. I confess that I was surprised when I found that the consensus of approval which seemed to exist in the House, as to what the hon. gentleman had said, was broken by the observations which have fallen from the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. I am very sorry indeed to find an hon. gentleman on that side of the House set about deliberately to throw cold water on a movement in this direction. I think a movement which has for its object the drawing closer of the bonds which unite the various parts of this Empire together, ought to be one which would commend itself to the approval of the members of this House. The hon. gentleman seemed very much oppressed with the difficulties that would arise in connection with the loss of revenue which might accrue from the adoption of the policy suggested by the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution. I perceived that he was not so tremulous about the loss of revenue a few days ago when a very much greater loss of revenue was imperilled by the proposition he then supported. I very much regret to find that, so soon as a policy of this kind is brought before us, there should be a party in this House who are prepared to belittle it and stunt it and prevent its development. When I say a party, I do not refer to the Reform party; but there are individuals connected with that party who seem to take a special pride and pleasure in doing all they can to prevent that unity which we desire to see maintained and strengthened in the Empire to which we are proud to belong. My hon. friend who moved the resolution pointed out that there was a great deal of trade which might be fostered between Canada and the West Indies. He pointed out that this trade had fallen into the hands of our natural commercial rivals, and the hon. gentleman in reply spoke of the competition of Great Britain. My hon. friend did not refer to the competition of Great Britain; he referred to the competition of the United States, and he pointed out the requirements of the people of Jamaica which were being filled by the United States, and which we ourselves could supply. I am glad to find that, at all events, there was one gentleman on that side prepared to support the resolution. He said it would benefit the people of the Maritime Provinces, and that he believed it would also benefit the people of western Canada. I am quite sure that anything which would benefit the people of the Maritime Provinces would be hailed with pleasure and approbation by the people of the west. We are one people and one Dominion as we are one Empire, and I am satisfied that the policy my hon. friend has suggested is a policy which will be approved of by the people of this country. I sincerely hope that the Government will do all that they can to promote that policy, and thus develop the natural trade which ought to exist between Canada and our near neighbors and fellow-countrymen in the West Indies.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has referred to the cold water thrown on this movement, but in doing so he laid the blame on the wrong quarter. The hon. gentleman ought to know that the cold

water was thrown by the Government he follows. I was a member of the Board of Trade of St. John when these delegates came to St. John, fresh and warm from Ottawa, and it is impossible to give any idea of the indignation they felt at their reception by the Government. Whether the Government was right or wrong I do not say, but I say that such was the feeling these gentlemen had when they came to St. John.

Mr. McNEILL. The more necessary then the hon. gentleman should move his resolution.

Mr. ELLIS. Precisely; but I do not think my hon. friend ought to be so very unfair as he is with regard to a matter of this kind, and should have informed himself of the exact facts before making the statement he did.

Mr. KENNY. I regret exceedingly I was not in the House when this discussion began with reference to the trade relations between the Dominion of Canada and the West Indies. This is a matter, the importance of which has been frequently recognised in this Legislature. I have simply this opinion to express upon it, that, in endeavoring to secure this important outlet for our products, we must be in a position to compete on equally favorable terms with our neighbors of the United States. Formerly the commerce with the West Indies was conducted exclusively by sailing vessels, and it is still conducted in that manner in the Province of Nova Scotia. Now, I hold strongly to the opinion which I expressed last Session that it is impossible for us to compete on advantageous terms for that valuable trade unless we employ steamers as the Americans can. Last year, in my place in Parliament, I urged the Government, to the best of my ability, to subsidise a line of steamers to open and develop trade with the West Indies. I was told then that no line of steamers then plying between the United States and the West Indies was subsidised. I do not know that to-day even any such line is subsidised. But I do know that when the Atlas line of steamers first began to ply between Jamaica and New York, it was subsidised by the Government of the Island of Jamaica to the extent of £5,000 a year, which was afterwards reduced to £2,000, and which finally, when the trade increased and developed to such an extent as to become self-supporting, was withdrawn. I contend that a subsidy would be advantageous; I contend that a line of steamers plying between the Province of Nova Scotia and the West Indies would be very largely advantageous to our fishermen. I think we recognise to-day that all business must be conducted with despatch and regularity, and that we cannot hope to secure regular and expeditious traffic without employing steam. To-day business is very largely done by cable with the West Indies. When a cargo is shipped, or prepared to be shipped to the West Indies, the merchant who sells the goods there knows of it, and it is that knowledge which regulates the price of fish in the West India market. The price is regulated, in other words, by supply and demand. We had at one time steamers plying between Halifax and Jamaica; but, unfortunately for Halifax and for the trade of the Dominion at large, they were withdrawn in 1886. They only commenced running in 1880 and they ceased to run in 1886, so that steam communication between the West Indies and the Dominion has not had a fair trial. In discussing this matter, I labor under the very great disadvantage of not having heard what hon. gentlemen who have spoken before me said on this question. I simply rise to say that in my opinion, at least, if we are to conduct this business advantageously for the Dominion and for fishermen, we must conduct it by steam. Already a large portion of the fish exports from Halifax which formerly went by sailing vessels or by the steamers to which I have referred, find its way to the markets of the West Indies by steamers

through the port of New York. I find that between the 1st January, 1887, and the 31st December, 1887:

Oasks, dry fish.....	6,295 or 24,900 quintals.
Boxes " "	13,682 or 13,000 "
Drums " "	61,343 or 61,343 "
Total.....	99,243 "

were exported from Halifax to Boston and New York, and that we also sent 40,850 barrels of mackerel and 21,055 barrels herring to those cities. The larger portion of that dry fish and a portion of that pickled fish ultimately found a market in the West Indies. I notice that before the Labor Commission, in a recent sitting at Halifax, some evidence with reference to this important trade was taken, and that a gentleman, who is conversant with the business, testified that a large amount of this fish trade went by way of New York. Not knowing that this discussion was coming on this afternoon, I have not the papers referred to, but in the course of his evidence, this gentleman mentioned that the rate per barrel from New York was something under 15 cents, while from Halifax it was over 50 cents. We all know that it is exceedingly difficult to get goods shipped from Halifax to the West Indies. The merchants who are engaged in that trade use vessels of small tonnage for their own individual business, and they want all the space for their particular trade, and are not prepared to accept cargoes from outsiders, or from those who are engaged in other branches of business. Consequently, not only has fish had to be sent to these West India markets through New York, but many articles of manufacture have had to be sent the same way. It may be said that this very low rate of freight per barrel which exists between New York and the West Indies would be difficult for us to compete with, and that must be admitted; but are the merchants of Montreal prepared to say that, because freight between Liverpool and New York may be lower than it is between Liverpool and Montreal, they do not want steamers to come to Montreal, but are prepared to do their business in sailing vessels? We have this advantage in competing with American ports, that we are nearer the fishing grounds, and can secure our fish on better terms and at cheaper rates than they do, and therefore we can afford to pay a trifle more for freight. During the discussion which took place on the very important reciprocity resolution, great stress was laid, especially by hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches, on the great advantages which reciprocal trade with the United States would be to Canada by giving us a larger market for our exports. We want new outlets for our surplus products, and there is a market in the West Indies which requires the very articles we produce. I do not know whether this afternoon any reference has been made to the large amount of flour which is shipped from the United States to the West Indies. I forget the exact figures, but I know that to Brazil and South America, there are nearly three quarters of a million barrels of flour shipped from the United States, besides a very large amount to the West India Islands. I contend that we could do a share of that business from western Canada, and it would be in the interests of the whole Dominion that we should seek to find new markets for all our products. Our whole energy should be turned to improve the markets and increase the facilities for transporting our exports. In reference to this matter, an article appeared in a recent number of a Halifax paper, which deals with this West Indies question, and it reads as follows:—

" The serious blunder made by some of our merchants in petitioning the Imperial authorities to withdraw the subsidy of the Cunard line of West India steamships, is daily more apparent. Instead of benefiting the trade of our vessels, the fish now largely finds its way to the West Indies by United States steamers *via* Boston and New York. Enquiries in the Dominion Senate have elicited the facts that fish to the value of \$1,250,000 annually were exported from the Maritime Provin-

ces to South America through the medium of American middlemen, 'who make huge profits thereby.' Mr. Abbott said: 'The Government recognised the importance of direct steamship communication with the West Indies and South America, and had now under consideration, &c.' A few of our merchants by their insane action deprived us of the benefits of a direct steamship line to the West Indies, which was subsidised by the Imperial Government, and now the Dominion authorities will have to rectify the mistake at the expense of our own exchequer. The stoppage of the Cunard line entailed heavy loss on the part of Halifax, and the movers in the petition are deserving of severe censure.'

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What paper is that?

Mr. KENNY. The *Critic*. This is a matter which concerns us very much in the lower Provinces. The last occasion on which I had to address the House was on the debate on the Fishery Treaty. I thought that was a matter in which we in the Maritime Provinces were specially concerned, and in which the constituency which I have the honor to represent had very much at stake. My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), addressed the House on that matter, and it is true that I followed him. It happens—it may be unfortunately for the House—that Halifax is represented by one gentleman on the opposite side of the House and by one gentleman on this side. The hon. gentleman on the other side of the House is a man of long parliamentary experience and of recognised debating power, while the gentleman on this side, unfortunately, has none of those qualifications; but, such as they may be, I consider it my duty, when my hon. colleague expresses views in opposition to those which I entertain and which I believe the majority of those whom I represent entertain, to give expression, no matter how imperfectly or how feebly I may do so, and to what I think are the interests of my constituents on those questions. I was rather surprised, at the close of that day's proceedings, to hear the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) intimate that in doing so I had been guilty of some transgression—I do not know whether it was of parliamentary etiquette or that I had done something unusual. I think I was within the strict line of my parliamentary duty. It was a question, like the present one, in which we in the lower Provinces are especially interested. It vitally concerns us. And I have no apology to offer to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) or any one else for following any hon. gentleman with whom I may differ in the views he places before Parliament.

Mr. EISENHAUER. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has addressed the House in favor of the resolution, but I think it is quite evident that in many points he does not understand what he has been talking about, and that he would probably be a better authority on dry goods than on fish. He has endeavored to lead the House to believe that the large quantity of fish exported to the United States by steam has found its way to the West Indies.

Mr. KENNY. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not desire to misrepresent me. What I said was that a large proportion of the dried fish, I believed—I would be sorry to say all—found its way to the West Indies, and that a portion of the pickled fish did so also, but I did not say all.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I think it is easy to show that only a portion of the dried fish, and a very small portion of the pickled fish, finds its way to the West Indies by that route. The hon. gentleman has also referred to the great loss that Halifax and the Maritime Provinces have sustained by the withdrawal of that steamer, but he has failed to tell us why the steamer was withdrawn. As soon as the subsidy was withdrawn the steamer was withdrawn, because she could not get freight enough outwards and homewards to pay. Very often the steamer on the outward voyage took but half a cargo, also on the home voyage the cargo was sometimes almost nothing. Does not that go to show that it is a waste

Mr. KENNY.

of public money to subsidise a steamer to the West Indies? Now, I cannot see why these manufacturers and other people cannot do as I am obliged to do. I am obliged to build my own vessels and sail them, and ship my fish and other articles that I send to the West Indies. The road is open for every person who feels inclined to trade with the West Indies, to put on their steamers if they choose; but they prefer to wait until the Government will grant them a large amount of money for the purpose of giving them an undue advantage over other people who are obliged to sail their own craft without assistance. The hon. gentleman has also referred to the rate of freight. Now, he is entirely mistaken with regard to the rate of freight from Halifax and New York—I think he said it was 15 cents a barrel. I have shipped a little in that way, and I think the rate is about 50 cents from New York to Cuba, and about 75 cents from Halifax *via* New York, or nearly that. This question was very fully discussed last year, and I think the hon. gentleman told us about the same thing last year that he did to-night. I am inclined to think that some of his friends down in Halifax propose to ask a subsidy from the Government this year. I will just say to the Government, as I said last year, that it will be a complete waste of money.

Mr. WELSH. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) spoke strongly in favor of steamers and in favor of a subsidy. I object to the idea *in toto*. I say that we have got other risks to look after besides steamboat interests. In Nova Scotia we have employed a large fleet of sailing vessels to carry on trade with the West Indies. I have been engaged in that business for the last thirty years, and have a number of ships running between the West Indies and the Maritime Provinces; but I have no subsidy. Do hon. gentlemen want to destroy the marine interests of this country? I say if it will pay men to put on steamers, let them put them on. Let us have a free course, don't let us handicap sailing ships. If you give steamers a subsidy you must give sailing vessels a subsidy. The hon. gentleman has also spoken about withdrawing the subsidy from the Cunard line that was subsidised by the British Government, as I understand. They ran for a number of years, and what good did the subsidy do them? Did any one ever see a steamer of that line take a full cargo out of Halifax and bring a full cargo back to Halifax? Will the hon. member for Halifax tell us that? I object, on principle, to Government subsidies to any steamer, or to any service, except for carrying passengers and mails in connection with the traffic with Government railways; but as for mercantile competition, I say leave the road open, and if steamers can drive sailing vessels out of the route, let them do it; if sailing vessels can drive steamers out of the route, let them do it. My hon. friend must know that Halifax has been the centre of the West Indies trade for the last fifty years. They have got a large fleet of ships, and can carry anything they want from Halifax to the West Indies in fifteen days, or twenty, at the furthest. I shall, in all cases, oppose any subsidy for any steamboat service for commercial purposes. I want to see steamers and sailing vessels try and compete with each other on a free trade basis. I do not want to subsidise one man and leave another out. Now, the hon. member spoke of the freight rate between New York and England. It is very low, and you can get grain carried for one cent a bushel. Sometimes a ship is very anxious to get ballast to take back home, and they will carry grain as ballast at one cent a bushel. Of course, if shippers had to depend upon that alone they would lose money, but these large steamers make their money by carrying the mails and passengers, and they only take the grain for ballast. There is a great deal of competition in that line, which makes the freight rates low. The law of supply and demand rules in that

case, and there is no lack of steamers every year to do the passenger trade. There is a large fleet of steamers running between the United States and the West Indies without any Government subsidy. I think the only steamers that get any subsidy doing West Indies trade are the mail steamers; they do get a subsidy for carrying the mails, and I do not object to that. But I certainly will set my face against mercantile companies coming here and asking the Government to tax the people to pay them subsidies to enable them to compete with the marine interests of the Dominion.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). As representing a maritime constituency, I desire to say that I fear a great many members of Parliament do not realise how important the measure is that is now before the House. The hon. member who has spoken last seems to contemplate, as a necessity, an antagonism between the sailing vessel and the steamer; he speaks as if we were asking the tax-payers to subsidise steamers at the expense of sailing vessels. That is a harsh and unfair way of stating the question. Our real object, by subsidies for these steamers, is to procure and hold for our own people, the trade that is now largely enjoyed by middlemen in the United States. I think it will be found to be a matter of very great importance, and not prejudicial to the owners of sailing vessels; it will be of great importance to St. John and our other maritime cities, that we should have enlarged and new facilities for the West Indies such as my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) says the Americans have. I desire in the strongest way, as representing a county largely interested in this matter, to urge the importance of this traffic upon the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The inference to be drawn by the hon. gentleman's statement is, that the line of steamers which carry on the traffic between the West Indies and the United States are subsidised in some way by the Government. Such is not the fact. The line of steamers between the United States and the West Indies are run on purely commercial principles, and are owned by private citizens, and receive no bonus or subsidy from the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They were started by subsidies, were they not?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think not. I shall read to the hon. gentleman a statement which practically supports the opinion I have given.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I think I was right in my statement, that these companies were first aided by Government subsidies from the United States.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman is wrong. I was reading, a short time ago, Mr. Froude's book upon the West Indies; I only speak from memory, but I think, from his statement, that the hon. gentleman is wrong. These steamers were put on for an increasing and ever growing trade. During the past few years the trade between the United States and the West Indies has been rapidly increasing, and the people of the West Indies, if Mr. Froude is to be taken as an authority, are yearly looking more and more, not only for closer commercial relations, but for political relations with the United States. The difficulty is that the United States do not want to receive them politically, although they are perfectly willing to deal commercially with them. The hon. and gallant gentleman who moved this resolution seems to think that I had some desire of impeding his speech by interpolating the question I did. I had no such desire. I listened with great interest to the hon. gentleman's speech, and was very glad to hear him give his views to the House. I have not the slightest desire to quarrel with him. He mentioned the population of Jamaica as being 580,000, and I supposed he mentioned it for the purpose of impressing upon his listeners the idea that it would be a desirable thing to traffic with half a mil-

lion of people. Very well; I recollect that the white population of Jamaica is about 14,000. The hon. gentleman knows quite well that it does not matter very much whether a man is white or colored for the purpose of trade; still, he knows that a colored population, as a rule, do not consume such goods as we export to the same extent as a white population. So far as the position before the House is concerned, my hon. friend knows that the Government sent a commissioner about two years ago to visit the West Indies, and that gentleman made a report, and so far as one can ascertain from reading the report, about the only recommendation he had to make, as is generally the case I find in these attempts to force artificial trade, was that we should put our hands into the public exchequer and grant a subsidy to some line of steamships. There is always a call to be made upon the Government. I do not belong to that class of politicians who believe that trade could be obtained by granting subsidies. I believe that trade, as a rule, follows natural channels, and that the Government best promotes trade by removing any hindrance in the way of trade following its natural course. I believe there could be no better way of promoting trade with the West Indies than by removing some of the artificial barriers we have erected against it. Our trade with the West Indies is not very large. I believe it only amounts to three per cent. of our total imports and exports. But when a Government commissioner went to those Islands and laid before the people a scheme to promote trade with Canada, what answer did they give him? It was that they did not want to join in giving any subsidy. The Colonial Secretary of Barbadoes, Hon. C. C. Knollys, told Mr. Wyld:

"I was informed by Mr. Knollys that the finances of the Island were in such a state that they could give no encouragement whatever as regards the granting of the subsidy; the Government having to practice the utmost retrenchment in order to make ends meet."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is inability.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is only one of the quotations I wish to read; and I say that so far as the Island of Barbadoes is concerned the Colonial Secretary said they were unable to do anything owing to their financial position.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Council of the Jamaica Society of Agriculture and Commerce did not confine itself simply to the statement that they were financially unable to grant any subsidy, but they went further and said they were opposed to granting such subsidies on principle. At all events that is the way I understand the answer they gave. I will read the answer, as showing the view that the commercial people of the West Indies take of this question. It is as follows:—

"SIR,—I am directed by the Council of the Jamaica Society of Agriculture and Commerce to acknowledge the receipt of your statement respecting direct steam communication between Canada and the West Indies, and to inform you that at a meeting of the council held on the 24th inst., the following resolution was, after due consideration of the subject, unanimously adopted:—

"Resolved,—That the Council, having duly considered the proposals made by Mr. Wyld, regret that it cannot recommend the Government to aid by a subsidy the promotion of steam communication between Canada and the West Indies. The council, however, is quite alive to the advantages which such a line as that proposed would confer and would give it its cordial support.

"I am further directed to call your attention to the fact that, at the present moment, there is no subsidised line of steamers running between this Island and the United States, all the lines at present in operation being purely private enterprises; it is the opinion of the council that the commercial community of this Island is adverse to the granting of subsidies, such as that suggested. The council, also, while fully alive to the great advantages to be derived both by the Dominion of Canada and by Jamaica by the establishment of a direct steam service, considers that Canada would derive much greater benefit than Jamaica from such service. In illustration of this it is sufficient to refer to the eleventh paragraph of your statement, in which are named the various articles of export which Canada could furnish Jamaica, which articles are at the present time imported from the United States."

"The council desires me also to remind you that the two principal fruit exports of the Island are bananas and oranges, the former of

which is the larger of the two. Bananas also are admitted free of duty to the United States. In the absence of any statistical information respecting the consumption of fruit in Canada, the council is unable to compute what the value of this trade is likely to be.

"There likewise seem to be to the council two great drawbacks to the increase of the fruit trade with Canada, should the proposed line of steamers take the route suggested in your statement :

"(1) The passage from Jamaica to Halifax would occupy from ten to twelve days, much too long a time for perishable articles.

"(2) If sugar and molasses are to be stowed in the same hold it will be found impossible to carry fruit with any prospect of profit to the shippers.

"The council directs me, in conclusion, to convey to you its sincere thanks for your able statement, and to assure you of its hearty co-operation in aiding the establishment of direct steam communication between Canada and Jamaica.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"J. B. ELLIS,

"Secretary.

"JOHN T. WYLDE, Esq.,

"Commercial agent of the Government of Canada to the West Indies."

Talk about throwing cold water on the proposition. I think that the Council of the Jamaica Society of Agriculture and Commerce threw as much cold water as they possibly could. They said the distance is so great, that the time occupied in the voyage from the West Indies to Halifax is so long that fruit will be spoiled, and that it could not be carried in the same hold with molasses and sugar. The fact is that anybody who reads Mr. Froude's late work on the West Indies, will find that he states that the great export from the West Indies for many years back, namely, sugar, is being grown less and less every year; that a feeling akin to despair has seized the planters and those heretofore engaged in the growing of sugar; and the only hope, in Mr. Froude's opinion—he seems to take rather a pessimistic view of the situation—for the West India Islands lies in their abandoning sugar growing and developing the cultivation of fruit. The best fruit in the world can be grown in those Islands, and there is an abundant market in the United States. He further states in his book, rightly or wrongly, that all the business men of the West Indies look to the United States for their market; and no doubt the great distance we are from the West Indies, even supposing a treaty was entered into, would act greatly to our disadvantage in competing with the United States. Where people send products there they will buy. The United States seems to be their natural market, and if they sell their sugar or fruit there they will buy a return cargo of such articles as they require. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has stated that it is possible to open up a market for our flour in the West Indies. I am not sufficiently well acquainted with the subject to be able to express an opinion, but I have heard from men of experience that our flour will not keep in that climate. I do not know sufficient about that point to be able to express a definite opinion.

Mr. KENNY. With the permission of the House I wish to make a correction. In my remarks I referred to the evidence given before the Labor Commission, at Halifax, as to the rate of freight that prevailed between New York and the West Indies. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), referring to my statement that it was 15 cents a barrel, said that instead of such being the case it was 75 cents a barrel between those points. With the permission of the House I will quote from the evidence taken by Mr. Carney, of James Butler & Co. That gentleman said :

"There are now several large steamers running out of New York, belonging to lines established in later years, which carry fish very cheaply. He instanced the fact that it cost 53 cents to send a barrel of fish from here, while it only cost 12½ cents from New York by these steamers. The decrease in trade was due to no fault of the Government."

Mr DAVIES (P.E.I.)

So, Sir, instead of it being 75 cents it is only 15, and I think I was nearer the mark than my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer).

Mr. EISENHAUER. I can say that they do not give us those rates. They may have rates for favorites in New York, but I have paid 75 cents for even less than a barrel.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Mr. Speaker, I desire to bear a few words of testimony on this matter, as I consider it important to us in the Maritime Provinces. It is no new subject. In my constituency they have especially been anxious about this matter, and the people of Annapolis, in 1882, saw the necessity for some better communication with the West Indies and other portions of the world, and they organised a steamship company. That steamship company to-day is only a company in name, inasmuch as they own no steamships, but it has been a company that has done a great deal for the people of that part of Nova Scotia in the way of increasing, encouraging and promoting trade. That company went so far as to charter a steamer to run to the West Indies, and merchants of the West Indies took shares in the company.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And they lost all their capital.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I beg your pardon, they did not lose all their capital.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I beg yours, I know it.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). And I beg yours again; I know it. I know what I am talking about, and I know perfectly well the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) does not know what he is talking about. I happen to be the secretary and treasurer of that company at the present moment, and I am in a position to know what I am talking about. If, by reason of some past internal mismanagement of that company, there were losses incurred, that is no argument against the fact that there is a trade between the Maritime Provinces and the West Indies, and a very valuable trade to my constituents as well as to the other constituents in the Maritime Provinces. We have in the Maritime Provinces grand facilities for communication with the West Indies, and I see no reason why those facilities should not be taken advantage of in preference to those that obtain between the United States and the West Indies. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) says that the trade between the West Indies and the United States is increasing. To be sure it is. It was first subsidised and it is increasing, because trade has been thus opened up between the two countries; and what are governments for unless for the encouragement of, and the opening up of new avenues of trade? I contend that there will be sufficient trade between the Maritime Provinces and the West Indies to warrant any government in giving a subsidy to a company to develop it. We entered into that trade in Annapolis without any subsidy whatever. The Government gave us some money to build a wharf and warehouse. We have that wharf and warehouse at the present time, and we have facilities for shipping all kinds of merchandise and all kinds of products from Annapolis to the West Indies. Those facilities should be utilised, and they cannot be better utilised than by a line of steamers being put on from Annapolis or St. John or Halifax to the West Indies. I understand that parties are asking the Government for a subsidy for a line of steamers from St. John to the West Indies. I agree with that entirely, but I do not agree that it should entirely be confined to St. John. There are other places in the Maritime Provinces besides St. John, and if they place their steamers to run from St. John let them take in Annapolis and Halifax as well. I see no reason why the Government cannot subsidise such a line of steamers, and I see no reason why that line of steamers should not only pay the parties interested in it directly, but also the country and the Dominion at large.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman said I made a misrepresentation with regard to the Annapolis Company. I wish to explain. The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that they formed the company at Annapolis, and I am also correct in saying that it was a company without money being paid up and merely a company on paper. One gentleman, a friend of my own, was induced to take five hundred pounds sterling in that company and he lost every cent of it and never got a cent to the present moment.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I am in a position to know that there is not one single gentleman who took stock in that company but who paid up every dollar that he took stock for, and there is not one who took stock in that company but who has received and will receive something for that stock. I am interested in that company myself to the small extent of \$1,000 and I paid it all up. I have received something on that stock,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. How much ?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I know perfectly well that the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Jones) himself has taken stock in other companies that have not paid nearly so well as that company.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, with regard to this West India trade, I remember that, in 1878, that it was stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that the want of a National Policy had caused the West India trade to decline. I believe the Finance Minister and the First Minister told the people throughout the country, during the political canvass, that if they got possession of the Treasury benches the West India trade would be revived, and that Halifax would be made the centre of that trade for North America as it had been at a previous period. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that the West Indian trade has declined notwithstanding the promise of those hon. gentlemen, and that the effect they said they could produce by the alteration of the fiscal policy upon the trade between Canada and the West Indies, has not been produced and that trade is in a worse position to-day than it was ten years ago. Then, Sir, we were reminded by the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) that in this matter Canada could successfully compete with the United States if only facilities were furnished to carry on trade between the two countries. He is confident that we could drive the people of the United States out of the West Indian market. I thought the hon. gentleman not very long ago declared that we would not be able to hold our own market against the United States if we were put upon the footing of equality.

Mr. McNEILL. Excuse me a moment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You can explain later on.

Mr. McNEILL. Will the hon. gentleman have the fairness to allow me to put him right ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am right.

Mr. McNEILL. If he will not have the fairness to let me do so, all right.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman can make that correction by-and-bye. He is confident of our ability to beat our neighbors in a market 2,000 miles away, and he is not confident of our ability to compete with them in our own market. I do not take so hopeless a view of our capacity or our enterprise as the hon. gentleman did a little while ago. It would be an extraordinary way of carrying on trade with the West Indies if we were to adopt a sort of communistic principle, for that is what the hon. gentlemen are advocating, and undertake to subsidise, at the expense of the entire country, a trade that can only be of advantage to a very small number. In fact, Sir, it is not in the interests of the trade generally that it is proposed to grant those subsidies. It is simply in the interest of

parties who have property in certain vessels. Those parties would be benefited while those who own ships who are sailing them, and taking risks of all kinds of loss in the enterprise they are engaged in, would be subject to an unfair competition with subsidised lines of steamers. That is what the hon. gentleman proposes. He expects to build up here a great commercial community upon the principle of taxing the people generally for the benefit of these few. Sir, I do not think the people of this country will be disposed long to submit to that policy. I think the Finance Minister has done a very great deal within the past fortnight to destroy it, and I trust he will lend us his powerful assistance to further discountenance it, and to encourage the people of this country to depend on the habits of self-reliance, energy and enterprise to accomplish those advantages for the country which alone can be of a permanent character.

Gen. LAURIE. I should like to say a few words in reply to one or two observations that have been made. My hon. friend, the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), pointed out that the desire of the people of Jamaica was for closer trade relations with the United States, and that a motion was brought up in the Jamaica Legislative Council and was there voted down, in favor of closer political relations with Canada. That is so, and so I stated when I moved for the address. But I wish to say, as I stated before—and I hold in my hand, not merely a newspaper report, but the official report of the proceedings in the Legislative Council for the following year, as reported in the *Royal Gazette*—that a motion was carried, with but one dissentient, asking that negotiations for closer commercial relations between Canada and Jamaica should be opened, and those who had opposed the motion for closer political relations, voted in favor of closer commercial relations.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The United States would not have them.

Gen. LAURIE. I am not discussing that. I am stating what the people of Jamaica desired. I also stated that the sugar product of Jamaica was 25,000 or 26,000 tons. The hon. member for Halifax stated that it was 40,000 tons; but here is the statement made in the Legislative Council of Jamaica that the product is 25,000 or 26,000 tons.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It varies.

Gen. LAURIE. Certainly. With reference to the broader question of a subsidy, and the larger effects upon our trade, which I did not introduce, it is asserted that certain products of our country went by a steamship line from the Dominion of Canada to the United States, and thence to the West Indies. That is disputed. Here are the Jamaica returns of the imports into Jamaica from the United States, which state that £25,000 sterling worth of fish went from the United States to Jamaica, while from Canada there went only £134,000 worth; but according to the United States returns, they did not send much more than one-third of that value to Jamaica. Well, where did the other two-thirds come from? They came from Canada, but because they went by those steamers from the United States, they were credited to the United States. That opens the question, which I did not open, whether it would be desirable that we should have a direct communication with the West Indies. Now, we have heard very often that the United States is the only market we have for our potatoes. It is very extraordinary if that is the case, for I find that while Canada sent to the West Indies and British Guiana 153,000 bushels, the United States sent twice that quantity, 321,000 bushels. It is evident, then, that they buy our potatoes, for the purpose of selling them again. If they do, would it not be in the interest of our shippers that we should sell direct and get the benefit of the handling? I think it certainly would.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that motion is carried, I should like to say one word or two. I recollect, as well as my hon. friend beside me, the very extravagant statements that were made by the First Minister and the Minister of Finance as to the great benefits and the great extension of trade with the West Indies that were going to come to the Maritime Provinces from the National Policy. Here in two words is what it has done: In 1878, our exports to the West Indies amounted to \$3,314,000, and in 1887 they amounted to \$2,075,000, or a loss of a million and a half under the beneficent operation of the National Policy and the wise Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite; and that is the natural result, Sir, of making the production of our articles dearer. So long as you continue to impose these exorbitant taxes, so long as you continue to mass up your debt by hundreds of millions, so long as you continue to put our people at a disadvantage beside the people of the United States, so that to-day our debt is nearly treble the debt of the United States, and our necessary taxes 50 per cent. higher than the necessary taxes of the United States—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, every penny of that, and it will be more if we go on in the same foolish, reckless course that we are taking—so long as we do that it is the idlest folly to talk of opening up new markets. If you want new markets, reduce your taxes and arrest the increase of your debt, and you will not have this result, that at the expiration of ten years of your so-called National Policy, your trade with the West Indies is reduced nearly 50 per cent.

Mr. McLELAN. If the hon. gentleman had taken the column opposite that to which he referred, he would have found that there is a very large increase in the exports to South American countries, of about \$800,000; and taking the West Indies along with these, he will find that there is an increase of about \$1,000,000, notwithstanding what has been shown in this debate, that a very large quantity of our exports go through the United States and are credited to the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And so they were before, and probably in a larger degree.

Mr. GILLMOR. A large part of our exports to the West Indies necessarily go through the United States. The cargoes are made up of a great variety of articles, and it is quite impossible to get a vessel of the smallest capacity loaded sufficiently from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to constitute a cargo. In my own county we put up probably 1,750,000 boxes of smoked herrings which we ship to the West Indies through the United States. The small ports cannot furnish enough articles to make up a cargo; it is only the large ports that can do so. What is meant by these closer commercial relations of which we hear so much? Is it intended to bring the Islands nearer to us? Have we not plenty of opportunities for commerce now? Has not the trade been going on for fifty years between Canada and the West Indies? If you want closer commercial relations, adopt the policy of Great Britain, and then you will have the closest commercial relations with all the world. The hon. member for Annapolis suggests that steamers be subsidised. I grant you that if you will undertake to carry goods for nothing and make the public pay, you will increase the trade. But the hon. gentleman says you must not subsidise steamers to touch at St. John and Halifax alone; they must also touch at Annapolis. Well, I want them to touch at St. Ann's also. If they are to be paid out of the public Treasury for doing the trade, is not my claim a just one? That shows the absurdity of these speeches calling for Government assistance to encourage trade. What we want is free trade. We want a low tariff,

Gen. LAURIE.

and we want to follow the example of that country to which we are all proud to belong and to which we are all so excessively loyal.

Motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

DETROIT RIVER WINTER BRIDGE.

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Detroit River Winter Railway Bridge Company (Mr. Ferguson, Welland) was considered in Committee and reported.

SOUTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the South-Western Railway (Mr. Hall) was considered in Committee and reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. BERGIN. I move that this Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be read the third time this day six months. I make this motion because I believe that the action of the committee yesterday was not one which ought to be approved by this House. It is, I think, in direct violation of the principle established by the Railway Committee last year, and it is interfering with the vested rights of the Montreal and Champlain Railway. It is now known to many members of this House, perhaps to all the members of this House, that the Montreal and Champlain Railway Company have invested a very large sum of money in the construction of that road, a road which has afforded the very best possible service to the people in that section of the country through which it passes. It was stated last year, and not contradicted at the time, that application was made by the people of the country through which the Montreal and Champlain Junction passes, to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for the construction of a line to Beauharnois and Valleyfield, from some point at or near Caughnawaga. That proposition was refused by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and consequently another effort was made by the people of these counties to induce the Montreal and Champlain Railway Company to listen to their request. Finding that the people of that county were really desirous of a railway, that they were in good faith, and were willing to assist in promoting its construction, the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company undertook, with the assistance of the people, to build the line that they required. They came to Parliament and obtained a charter and proceeded with the construction of the road. The Canadian Pacific Railway, under the name of the South-Western Railway Company, came to Parliament last year and asked for a line which practically was parallel to the line of the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway. This the committee refused, and the principle adopted by the committee is one which, I think, ought to have been adopted with regard to this Bill. We affirmed the principle that unless there was a real necessity for a competing line of railway, it was not proper or wise to grant a second charter over the same territory. If it could be shown that there was any possibility of a second line being made to pay in that section of country, if it could be shown that there was really a necessity for it, then I confess that circumstances would be altered, and we might properly be asked to grant a second charter over the same line. But those who know that section of the country, know that it is not at all required there. They have ample railway service for that section of the country, and they do not require this. True, since last year, an-

other reason has been discovered why this road should be constructed, a reason which, I venture to say, has no solid foundation. The reason now given, one which did not occur to the people who last year framed this Bill, is that it is required for the purpose of taking American trade over the Short Line to the Maritime Provinces. Now, Sir, I, for one, do not believe that there will be a ton of American freight attracted over that line to the Maritime Provinces. Let any one look at the map and see for himself, and ask whether it be possible that American trade, or trade for any point but Montreal or Quebec, will be attracted from northern New York in preference to their own seaports, which are so much nearer than the Maritime Provinces. I, for one, place no faith whatever in that proposition, and if I did, I do not think I would be warranted by the facts as they appear and looking at the map in supporting this Bill. For this reason, and for the further reason, that I believe it is a contest between a small railway company and a gigantic railway company, the larger attempting to crush out the smaller one, I feel bound to move that this Bill be read this day six months.

Mr. SHANLY. As the time allowed us for discussing Private Bills is limited, I shall only follow my hon. friend from Cornwall in a few words. I entirely agree with the motion he has made, and I do not think this Bill should pass. And my reasons for so thinking are these: Last year the Canadian Pacific Railway Company came before the Railway Committee of this House, and asked for the passage of a similar Bill. It was very thoroughly canvassed in the committee, and was rejected by a very strong and emphatic vote, and the Bill accordingly was not reported to this House. If the reasons given last year for refusing to pass the Bill were sound and good reasons, they are doubly and trebly so now. Last year when this Bill was before the Railway Committee, the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company pledged themselves to proceed at once with the construction of a line over the same ground as that over which the South-Western Company desired to obtain a charter. The Montreal and Champlain Company have honestly fulfilled their pledges, and hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent since this time last year in constructing that branch of railway, alongside of which it is now asked we should grant a charter to another company. For what purpose? To destroy the investment made by the Montreal and Champlain Junction Company. As I have said already, hundreds of thousands of dollars have been expended in this branch railway, and the capital put into the road is not our money, not Canadian money or public money, in any sense, but it is money that has come from abroad, borrowed money, in fact. If, before there has been time to test whether or not this road will pay as an investment, we grant a charter to another company to build a line alongside of this road, it evidently must prevent the company earning dividends, and in that case I say we are doing great injury not only to those people who have invested their money in the enterprise, but we are doing a great deal to injure this our country, because after money has been honestly invested as this has been on the faith of what was done by Parliament last year, if the same Parliament this year destroys the security it then offered those people, and which Parliament practically did offer—practically saying: "Put your money into this undertaking and you are perfectly safe"—I say if we now give a charter, which would destroy the security, that sort of legislation is wrong legislation, it is wicked legislation and it is legislation that must react injuriously on this country. I know that part of the country thoroughly well. I might say I know every hundred acre lot, and I assert that this second road is not required either for the purpose of local traffic or of through traffic. The country is now splendidly served by the railways already constructed and being

constructed. I repeat that the effect of granting the charter asked for must be to destroy the property which was built upon the good faith of the charter we recognised last year. I have no desire to discuss the matter at any great length, nor do I think after the very clear exposition of the case given by the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Bergin) it is necessary I should speak at much length. I speak what I do speak as a Canadian jealous of the honor of his country, and I say if faith is broken by granting a charter to destroy the road Parliament authorised to be built last year, and in which capital was invested by people abroad on the good faith of this Parliament, we will do an act that will reflect most injuriously upon Canada. I trust, therefore, that the motion of my hon. friend from Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Bergin) will be accepted by this House, and will be passed by a good majority.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). I think this is not a question between the two great railway companies altogether, although it appears so now and would be made to appear so by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. It is a matter that is very important to the merchants and manufacturers of Montreal as well as to Canada. There are two views to be considered apart from the view of the railway companies, and I might be twitted with being a partisan of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I beg to state from my place in this House that I have no sympathy with them in this matter whatever, but that I speak in the interests of the people of the locality as well as in the interests of the people of Montreal, especially the merchants and manufacturers there. I can overlook the interests of the two railway companies, and speak of the matter from the standpoint of the two interests I have named. We have had a great deal of dust thrown in our eyes in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway and the Beauharnois Junction Railway Company, and they wish to unite the two interests in the one issue; but we must divide them. We are told that the Grand Trunk Railway, or the Beauharnois Junction Railway Company, have spent between \$300,000 and \$500,000 in this enterprise since the passing of that charter. Let me correct the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and let me remind the House that this Parliament did not grant the charter under which this company is now operating, and, let me also remind the House that if we grant a charter now we are not stultifying ourselves as regards any action of the House previously. In regard to the matter of expenditure, it should be stated to this House frankly and fairly, and if the hon. gentlemen who have spoken will not do it, some one else must do it, that this money was not spent and has not been spent under the charter referred to and granted last year by the Quebec Legislature for this same Beauharnois Junction Railway Company, but the major portion of it, two-thirds of the \$300,000 or \$500,000 has been spent on the old Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway to connect that system with Fort Covington and Messina Springs, and it has no reference whatever to the small line spur, or branch which comes in from St. Martine to the town of Beauharnois and then to Valleyfield. I can go over this line, because, as the hon. member who last spoke, said he knew every foot of the ground, so I may say that I know every foot of the ground. I am told that the line has been graded from the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway to Beauharnois, a distance of six miles—I will say seven. This line is constructed through a perfectly flat and level country. To say that the road cost \$10,000 a mile is a fair calculation. I grant that seven miles at \$10,000 a mile is \$70,000. I know I am right in stating that the bridge at St. Martine cost the company a sum not exceeding \$50,000. These two items involve an expenditure of \$120,000 on the Beauharnois Junction Railway. If you add three miles of grading at

\$2,000 a mile, you have a total expenditure since last year of \$126,000 upon that railway. Granting that this sum has been expended—I regret very much that I have to rise and speak against this company, but as I said I am not speaking against the Grand Trunk Railway and for the Canadian Pacific Railway, but for the interests of the locality and the interests of the city of Montreal—I hold that if this company expended that money, it has only itself to blame. Why? It has been stated in this House and in the committee that the committee had stultified themselves in view of their action last year. I hold that we have a right to change our opinion, especially when the truth dawns on us, as it has dawned on many hon. gentlemen since the question came before the House last year.

An hon. MEMBER. Passes.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). In connection with the question of expenses and the letter sent by the people of that locality to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I may say that the people went to that company when they first heard of the bridge spanning the St. Lawrence below Lachine. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company refused to entertain the application of the people of that locality then, they did it in good faith and all earnestness. The people of that locality asked a railway for local purposes and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company did not see their way to build a local railway. You cannot blame them for that. If they see at this later day, as they do see, that they will be able to give those people a railway for local purposes and give themselves a line for far greater and more important purposes, hon. gentlemen cannot say, under those circumstances, that they have not treated the people in good faith, or that they were playing with them. The people of the locality have now a perfect right to come and say to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company: Gentlemen, we understand your position now. You want a through line, we want a better connection than the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway or the Beauharnois Junction Railway can ever give us, and we will sustain you in running your line in this locality. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are not only actuated by a desire to afford better Railway accommodation to the people of that locality, but they are moved by the far greater consideration of having a line to the United States border and New York. I would like every hon. gentleman in this House to know that the present line, the Montreal and Champlain Railway and the Beauharnois Junction Railway, is like going round a horseshoe instead of taking the two nearest points from Montreal to Beauharnois. In going to the village of St. Martine and across the Beauharnois Junction Railway the people have to travel a distance of $44\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Montreal or at least 42 miles. Under the line which is proposed to be built by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the people of the town of Beauharnois can reach the city of Montreal by traversing $20\frac{1}{2}$ miles or 21 miles at most. Why will hon. gentlemen compel them to travel double the distance that it can be done in? Have those people no rights? Why should we compel those people for all time to come, for it is not a matter of a year or two, to travel at least double the distance to get to the city of Montreal that they would have to travel if this charter was granted and this railway built. I am sure that if this House considers the position of the people of that locality they will entertain the petition which they have sent in in favor of this Bill, and which is signed by a couple of thousand names from the lower part of Chateauguay county, from the county of Beauharnois and from portions of the county of Huntingdon. Is this House not to listen to the demand of those people, and are they not going to grant this railway, when, remember, it is not going to cost the Government one cent to construct it? They are not going to ask you for any subsidy for this company and why refuse

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil).

them this grant? This branch railway, the Beauharnois Junction Railway, and the little scheme that gave birth to it was like this: In 1886 the people went to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and asked them for a railway. The company refused it. Just at that time the Grand Trunk Railway Company saw the importance of the matter and they said: If we allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to build this railway they will have trade connection with New York city and the northern portions of the State of New York, and we must checkmate them. It was a very simple matter to go to the Quebec Legislature previous to this House being called together, and to get a charter to run a separate railway to Beauharnois and from there to Valleyfield. That railway will never pay, and it would not pay the shovelling of the snow in winter. The people are deceived because this Beauharnois Junction Railway Company is an independent railway company, and it will only run in connection with the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway; they will have to get out of their cars at St. Martine and take the Montreal and Champlain Railway to come to Montreal. Now, the Beauharnois Junction Railway Company comes before this House and claims the sympathy of the members on the ground that they should not grant a charter for two parallel lines. Gentlemen, it is a fallacy to imagine that they are parallel lines. The point where this railway starts from the river at Caughnawaga is seven miles from the Montreal and Champlain Railway, and as it passes up the river it still remains seven miles apart. From Beauharnois to Valleyfield it will be parallel between these points. That is only a distance of fourteen miles, but the Beauharnois Junction Railway ends in the town of Valleyfield, 55 miles from the city of Montreal, whereas this company asks for a charter to run to the boundary line of the Province, and to a connection with the Rome, Watertown and Ogdensburg Railway, which is 74 miles from Montreal. The argument of its being a parallel line must fall to the ground, because it only parallels a little junction railway for a distance of 14 miles. It does not parallel the Montreal and Champlain Railway. It only runs to the same point, and it would be as well to use the argument that the Grand Trunk parallels the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to Toronto. They both start in Montreal and end in Toronto. Those two companies start in Montreal and end in Fort Covington or Dundee. But the greater question is this: Are we, the merchants and manufacturers of the city of Montreal, to be deprived of further connection with the city of New York because the Grand Trunk Railway wants to hold the whole trade between those two cities? Is it not known by the hon. gentlemen that the Grand Trunk controls the traffic over the Delaware and Hudson Railway? Is it not well known also that the same company controls the traffic over the Central Vermont Railway Company, and where is the other railway company that runs between New York and Montreal? Shall we have no competing lines between the cities of New York and Montreal? I say it would not only be a hardship on this locality but a hardship on the city of Montreal, and upon the merchants and manufacturers of that city, who import their raw material and their merchandise if we refuse to grant this charter asked for.

Mr. HALL. Whether or not the House will adopt the very unusual course of giving the six months' hoist to a Bill reported on by the Committee of Railways rests with the House to decide. As the member in charge of the Bill I must oppose any such action as strenuously as lies in my power. The remarks made in supporting the motion by the hon. members on the other side lead me to make a reference to the matter before the House which is somewhat of a repetition to the members who heard the discussion in another place. I will make those remarks as briefly as possible so as not to weary the House. They referred, in

the first place, to a petition that was brought up last year; that is that the application of the present promoters of this road is not in earnest so far as an ultimate design of constructing the railway is concerned, but that it is rather for the purpose of obstructing a company that has already made an expenditure in that direction. To that the answer already made is correct, and probably complete. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company were approached two years ago to build a local railway for the purpose of reaching Beauharnois and Valleyfield. They declined then, and I may say that so far as a local road at present is concerned they would again decline to build it. They have no motive to build a railway in that section of the country for local purposes simply. Since that application was declined by them their larger schemes have been completed or nearly completed; their construction in the west has been finished; their bridge across the St. Lawrence has been built; their short line to the Atlantic sea ports is nearly completed, and they were approached by powerful railway companies in Northern New York to know if they would establish a through line which would enable the freight that comes from New York City and State to Montreal to reach that latter city under much more favorable circumstances than at present. The company looked upon that application as a very much more important one than the one previously made for local purposes, and, therefore, they applied to the House last year for the right to construct such a railway. They were opposed, and the objection I am sure which induced the committee to throw out that Bill was the impression that they were not serious in their application. As I have previously stated in another place, there could be no greater confirmation of their sincerity in their desire to build a through line of railway than their application again this year, after the Grand Trunk Railway have obtained their subsidies from the municipalities, and have actually constructed their road. It can no longer be said that they only desire to obstruct the Grand Trunk. Their desire is to construct a more direct line in the public interest, and they ask the House for the authority to do so. The only other point which has been raised is the question of existing rights, and that point has been very ably dealt with by the hon. member who has preceded me. This Bill brings before this House a principle which is to me very much more important than any of the details which have been referred to, that is, the principle whether the right of this House, to give competing railway facilities in different sections of the country, is to be restricted in any way. On the north shore of the St. Lawrence there are two important lines of railway which run so close together that a stone can be thrown from one to the other. Is there any reason why the same thing should not exist on the south side of the St. Lawrence, especially when we consider that this line would shorten the distance fourteen miles, and that the people interested have petitioned in favor of the road? It seems to me it would be a retrograde step for the House to decide that because a railway already existed, no other should go through the country. I think we should desire to see in every settled portion of this country a healthy active railway competition, and I am sure this House will not adopt the principle that because a railway already exists, therefore they are going to refuse the application of another railway company, which is presenting its application in good faith, and proposes to carry out the work without asking for any Government assistance whatever.

Mr. WATSON. It may seem strange that one who is so much in favor of free trade in railways should oppose this Bill; but I do so as representing a class of people who are greatly in need of railway accommodation which has been promised them for years by the promoters of this Bill, and many of whom have to haul their grain from

50 to 100 miles for the want of railway accommodation. Deputation after deputation has waited on the general manager of this company and asked that they should fulfil the pledges that they made years ago, and the reply has always been that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have no money with which to build those branch lines; and yet we are told that they want to parallel an existing road in the east. Therefore, on principle, and in the interests of those people to whom these promises were made, I oppose this Bill. I believe that a company that has received such large assistance from the Dominion of Canada for the purpose of opening up the North-West, ought to fulfil the pledges they have made to construct branch lines in the North-West, before they take the money which has been granted by this Parliament to parallel lines of railway for opening up and developing, as has been said, the State of New York. Now, we are told by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson) that the expenditure on the existing road has only been some \$126,000. The railway committee was informed, and it is not disputed, that the Grand Trunk or this local company has spent something in the neighborhood of \$400,000 on that piece of railway; and I feel as others feel who have spoken, that if we granted this charter we should be breaking faith with men who have put their money into this enterprise. This House gave these people assurances a year ago that their investments would be protected. They claim that it is against the settled principle of this House to allow parallel lines of railway to be built. That principle has been carried out during the present Session. It is only a week or two since a charter was asked for a railway to traverse the same ground as a railway which was chartered some three years ago from Calgary in the North-West, and the committee refused to grant that charter on the ground that the people who controlled the other railway charter have certain rights that should be protected, although the only evidence given to the committee was that they had graded one mile of railway. There was no evidence that they had spent \$500. As one who opposed this Bill last year, I feel that I have equal reason for opposing it to-day.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, on rising to support the motion of the hon. member for Stormont and Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), I should like to give my reasons for the position which I am to take upon it. The reasons given in English by those who have previously spoken against the measure are so strong to my mind that those who support it have not replied thereto. The strongest argument is certainly the one that is founded on the precedent of last year. When the two companies, who are at present before the House, are opposing this Bill and the other arguing its passage, came up before the Railway Committee last year, the Bill then asked for was thrown out by a large majority of the committee and the reason which induced the committee to reject it still stands. This reason was that the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company was petitioning the Local Legislature for the passage of a law authorising it to build the branch which the company has since begun to build, and for this sole reason the Railway Committee last year rejected a Bill similar to that now under consideration. Acting in good faith the Montreal and Champlain Railway Company obtained from the Legislature the necessary powers, began the work and spent considerable amounts to construct that branch demanded by the localities specially interested in the building of that railway. Now that the company has spent these large sums—how much is a matter of doubt, some saying \$300,000 and others \$125,000, but I prefer to take the authority of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) who is a man of experience in railways and who believes that the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Com-

pany, because it says it did so—I ask whether it is just and reasonable to give a rival company the powers which were refused it last year?—

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. The time for Private Bills is expired.

Mr. SPEAKER. The time for Private Bills having expired, the House will pass to Public Bills.

DEFECTIVE LETTERS PATENT.

Bill (No. 4) to amend the Act respecting Defective Letters Patent and the Discharge of Securities to the Crown, was considered in Committee and reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. THOMPSON. As the Bill interferes to some extent with the rights of the Crown, and has been considered by the Executive, I am authorised to state that it has received the assent of the Crown.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed

PROTECTION OF RAILWAY EMPLOYÉS.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion for second reading of Bill (No. 5) for the protection of Railway Employés.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand, from reading the discussion that took place when this Bill was before the House on Thursday last, that the hon. the Minister of Finance proposed it should stand over until the Railway Bill in the hands of the Minister of Railways should be brought down and discussed. I do not object at all to that course, but I desire to have it understood that if this is the course which the House approves of, an opportunity will then be afforded of taking the opinion of the House on the provisions of this Bill. I do not desire that it should be left in the hands almost entirely of my hon. friend to say whether or not the Government will incorporate the provisions of this measure in the Government Railway Bill. I desire to press the Bill, or, at all events, some of its provisions, and I believe they ought to be passed, though perhaps not exactly in the form in which they are to be found in the Bill I have had the honor to introduce. This Bill deals with three matters. It deals with the packing of frogs, as it is called; and from the discussion that took place, I understand there is no serious objection on either side of the House against that provision. On the contrary, it was thought by one hon. member at all events, who I see spoke on that occasion, that in that regard the Bill did not go quite far enough, and I may say that I would be quite prepared to accept or to propose an amendment embodying the provision which that hon. member suggested as to the packing of the wing rails, as it is called, so, as far as possible, to give protection to the employés in whose interest this Bill is intended. There is another provision which I do not think ought to meet with very serious opposition. That is contained in the 5th clause, and is that the oil cups used for oiling the valves of the locomotive shall not be placed outside. It is possible that that may be the only method to attain the desired end. That may be amended by saying that this should be done by that means or by some other means which would be equally effective in order to obtain the end which it is desired to attain. I am not at all wedded to the exact provisions of the Bill. I have taken it, as hon. gentlemen must have observed, mainly from the statute of the Province of Ontario, where it has been in force for five or six years; but since that time there have been improvements, and other suggestions are now made, and I think the proper way to deal with the subject would be to say

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.

that the end we seek should be attained, but the means should be left to each and every railway company, that this Parliament should enact that the company should so oil the machinery that it should not be necessary to oil it in motion, and that steps should be taken to prevent danger to the employés in the discharge of their duty. There is a provision of the Bill, however, in regard to which there is more difficulty, that is in regard to the running boards on the roof of the freight cars. While this Parliament is, of course, quite competent to enact that all the freight cars belonging to the railways of Canada shall have these running boards, we have no control over the freight cars, which I fancy are a majority of those which pass through the country, which pass over our roads in the carriage of freight and come from the United States, and we cannot say that they shall be built in any particular form or that they shall give any particular protection; but it is quite plain that some of the States on the other side are moving in this direction, and I think, on the whole, perhaps, the better plan would be to have this Bill sent to a small select committee to consider its various provisions, and I have here dozens of suggestions which have been made since the Bill was placed before the country. Then, these might be embodied in the report of the committee, and the House might afterwards put as many of them as they saw fit into the Bill of which the Government has charge. I quite agree with the view that whatever we do should be put into the Government Bill. We should have only one Railway Bill, which, if possible, should embrace all these provisions. If the Minister of Finance will agree to that suggestion, and the House approves of it, I will ask the House to read the Bill a second time and then refer it to a committee, and then, when it emerges from the committee, the House can amend it, as I have no doubt it may, in several particulars, and especially in making the enactments general instead of particular in regard to the forms which are to be used. I may say that we do not occupy, in Canada, a very enviable position if I am to judge from certain statistics which I have seen in regard to the management of our railways, both in regard to the carriage of our passengers, and the number of employés who are killed and wounded yearly. That number is very large indeed, and is much larger in Canada in proportion to the number of persons carried than it is in any of the neighboring States of the Union. I am not going to say that the railway companies are specially to blame for that, but I do not think they have been very active or diligent in adopting means for the protection of their employés. It was stated here by an hon. gentleman of great experience in railway matters that there was a certain parliament dealing with this question which was more competent than this House could possibly be to deal with it, and we ought to await the result of the deliberations of that body. I do not quite agree with that proposition. I think perhaps we may speed that body, and we may speed the motions of the railway companies which have the power to deal with these matters if we take steps, not at once, and not at all in disregard of the interests of the railway companies, but in a reasonable time to call upon them to put as much of these improvements in force on their cars as may to a large extent limit the danger to which railway employés are necessarily exposed in their hazardous occupation. Let me point out some of the matters which are being dealt with in the neighboring States. There is, first, and I believe it is at this moment in use, what is known as a power brake on freight cars. I understand that at this moment that power brake is in use on the Pacific roads, on the Denver and Rio Grande, on the Pittsburg, Cincinnati and St. Louis, on the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, and on the Topeka and Santa Fe. If it is in force on these railways now, it is not impossible that in time it might be put on our railways. At the same time the automatic couplers are gradually coming into use

under the legislation of different States of the Union, and those are of the greatest importance. I know, of course, that we ought not to move too speedily in this direction. We ought not to insist upon cars which are in use being altered or changed, but we might say that within a limited time any cars which may be constructed or repaired should have these reasonable and necessary appliances. At present in the States of Connecticut, New York, Michigan and Massachusetts, these automatic couplers are required to be put on all cars under a penalty after a given date. We would be going somewhat in that direction, and would be insisting upon the carrying out of what we must all desire, if we were to enact similarly that the railway companies in this country which are subject to this Parliament should also apply these improvements within a certain time. I am very glad to hear from what an hon. gentleman said the other day that possibly the necessity which I think we must all feel of affording some protection to the brakemen—those unfortunate men who have at great danger and at all seasons of the year to run on the top of the freight cars—is likely to be done away with, and certainly it is not before it was necessary. Still, perhaps the greatest danger exists in the coupling of cars. I find that in this country, in 1885, 285 men were killed in coupling cars, and in 1886, 222.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that in Canada alone?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, in Canada alone. Then there were those who were killed by falling from engines or cars in 1885, 117; and I am glad to say that there is a great reduction in 1886, when the number was 67. I am deducting the number of passengers who were reported to have been killed in that way, the number of whom was reported in each year to be eight. I think, therefore, that the subject of this Bill is worthy the consideration of the House, and that it cannot be said that we are moving too hastily, or are proposing to act in any unfair manner towards the companies. I perfectly recognise that we ought not to do anything of that kind, and that we might interfere very seriously with their traffic if we made an arbitrary provision that no car should run through Canada except under the enactments which we might make here; but I think it is worthy of the careful consideration of a committee to which I ask the House to refer this Bill, and afterwards the House could, under the direction of the Government, take such action as they pleased on that report.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There can be no objection at all to the second reading of the Bill, but I would suggest that, instead of sending it to a special committee, it should be referred to a Committee of the Whole House, and should be brought up at the time when the Bill which has already been introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways comes under consideration. I will say to my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, and who takes such a deep interest in this matter, and has so long taken such an interest in this important question, that every opportunity will be given for the discussion of the matter, and that, when the Government Bill comes to be considered, every provision of this Bill will be taken as a notice of motion, so that any of the provisions of this Bill can be introduced as an amendment. If they are not included in the Government Bill, they can be taken as a notice, and I hope that will be acceptable to the hon. gentleman, and I think it would be better than to send the Bill to a select committee.

Mr. LAURIER. I would be disposed to agree with the suggestion of the Minister of Finance, and I think the hon. gentleman should accept it. I believe that a large number of members on both sides of the House are disposed to favor the Bill of the hon. gentleman, and I can see no reason for

referring it to a special committee. If there were a large difference of opinion in regard to it, there might be some reason for referring it to a committee, but in view of the consensus of opinion, I might say the almost unanimous consensus of opinion, I think the suggestion of the Minister of Finance is a reasonable one.

Mr. McCARTHY. After what has fallen from the hon. the Minister of Finance and the hon. the leader of the Opposition, I will not press what I thought was the best course to adopt. It was not because of any difference of opinion in the House that I proposed to refer this Bill to a special committee, but in order that it might give consideration to the various suggestions which have been made. I have a large bundle of them here, principally from the owners of patents, who desire to put forward their particular panaceas for these evils, and I thought that in a special committee we could perhaps deal with them more conveniently than we could in the Committee of the Whole. Of course the Bill has to come before the Committee of the Whole when it comes from the special committee, but if both my hon. friends think this is the better course to adopt I will not press my view further.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

WRECKING IN CANADIAN WATERS.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion for second reading of Bill (No. 7), to permit American vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government have very carefully considered this measure, and there is a great deal in it. The general principle and the general features of the measure entirely commend themselves to the Government as wise and desirable, but at the same time the Government feel that this is connected with a larger and a still more important question, which would probably be prejudiced by the adoption of this Bill. It is very well known that there is a great desire on the part of the Congress of the United States that a measure of this kind should be adopted. On the other hand, the policy of the Government of Canada has been, when gentlemen opposite were in power, as also under the present Government, to use every possible means of obtaining the common registration of vessels between the two countries, and the common enjoyment of reciprocity in the coasting trade of the two countries. Now, Sir, there is, perhaps, no immediate prospect of our being able to obtain the larger measure embracing the whole coasting trade between the United States and Canada, but I think there is very good reason to believe that if we do not accept this measure at the present moment, which is greatly desired by the Congress of the United States, they will be prepared to go a step further, and, at all events, adopt the coasting trade as far as the inland waters of Canada are concerned. I think, under these circumstances, we may fairly ask the House to pause in the consideration of this measure, and allow us to ascertain if it is not possible to get the larger measure which would absorb this, and which would give all the advantages this measure proposes to give, and upon terms which would be more fair and equal between the two countries. I hope, under the present circumstances, this measure will not be pressed, and that we shall have an opportunity of seeing whether we cannot obtain the same principle of reciprocity in the coasting trade, or at all events, the inland waters of Canada.

Mr. LAURIER. I would have been disposed, for my part, to urge the hon. member to go on with his Bill, but since, as the hon. Minister suggests, by pausing we may have before us the prospect of an enlarged measure of reciprocity, I think that is an adequate reason why we should

pause. It is evident that reciprocity is in the air, it is moving all the time. We have been making progress this very Session, we have obtained reciprocity in seeds, in trees, in shrubs and fruit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have sown the seed.

Mr. LAURIER. And it will bear fruit by-and-by. We may not get it all at once, but we will get it piecemeal.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am very sorry to hear the decision of the Minister of Finance that he does not think this Bill should pass at the present time. I must say that I cannot agree with his reasoning. I do not think that if we want reciprocity in wrecking, we should decline to enjoy the advantages and privileges of that reciprocity, in order that we may try and get a larger measure of reciprocity in some other matters. I believe that if we pass this measure and meet the United States Government in a friendly spirit, showing them that where they held out the hand of fellowship, where they offered reciprocity in any one or more subjects, we are ready to meet them in the same spirit, I believe it would lead to reciprocity in coasting and to further reciprocal trading rights hereafter, more easily than if we say: We will not trade with you at all, we will not meet you half way, we will not meet you even in this little matter of wrecking. I think a very large number of people throughout the country are earnestly desirous of seeing this Bill pass. I do not think my hon. friend who comes from down by the sea, fully realises the extent of that interest, the number of ships that we have trading upon our inland lakes, the number of men that are there employed, the capital invested in it. All these men are deeply interested in this Bill; they are anxious to have greater facilities to render aid to vessels wrecked or in distress, greater privileges to assist in the saving of life and property. The hon. members of this House, I think, have had communication from every part of the Province of Ontario, the Province which is chiefly interested in this Bill, urging that it should become law. To-night, the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) came to me and said he was very sorry he had to go away by the train, but he desired me to say that he had received a letter from the mayor of Owen Sound, stating that he had been communicating with the shipping men and people interested in marine in that town and neighborhood, and that they all urged him to support the Bill, and hoped that it would pass. He gave me a telegram from Mr. Simpson, managing director of the Owen Sound Dry Dock and Ship Building Navigation Company, in which he says:

"Am decidedly in favor of the Act. The want of such an Act, to my own knowledge, has been the cause of much inconvenience and delay to vessel owners, and of times of loss of life and property. The only advantage has been to a few tug-owners who will be fully compensated, in my opinion, if equal rights are accorded to them in American waters as to our vessels in Canadian waters. It is not so much, however, a matter of sentiment and advantage as of humanity."

Sir, another ground upon which this Bill has been opposed is that taken by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who opposes it because it will interfere with the wreckers. Who are these wreckers? One or two companies that own some inferior wrecking appliances, men who are unable to render the assistance which wreckers ought to be able to give. But the want of reciprocity is injurious to our wrecking men; our own people do not come forward and invest money in better plant because they have such a limited field for their operations. But if this Bill was to pass and reciprocity in this matter was granted, I know, as a fact, that considerable capital would be invested in wrecking apparatus, that money would be invested by Canadians in wrecking, not only in our Canadian waters, but also in American waters. Sir, I state as a fact that the largest number of wrecks, by far the largest number, have been in American waters, and also the greatest value of wrecks has been in

Mr. LAURIER.

American waters. If that is the case, it is very important to our own wreckers that they should get American waters to operate in. My hon. friend from North Norfolk made a long speech the other night during which he read from papers that had been brought down to this House to show that when application had been made for permission to use American tugs and American vessels in Canadian waters on our side, it had been granted by our Minister of Customs, and he defended the Minister of Customs for granting this permission for allowing these wreckers to come in. He stated that in no case when application had been made to the Minister of Customs, had it been denied. Sir, if that is the case, and if the Americans can come into our waters, why not pass this Bill and get the reciprocal right to go into their waters? The hon. member said that when application was made by our shipowners to Washington to have the right of going into American waters with our tugs, the answer came: "No;" and he instanced the case of the *Algoma*, wrecked near Thunder Bay, where they had to get a tug and wrecking apparatus from 600 miles away to render assistance to that vessel, although the Canadian owners had vessels of their own to do it, but they were refused the privilege. That is what I contend, that in every case when we have a wreck in their waters and we apply to them for permission to use our Canadian tugs or wrecking apparatus, they refuse it; but if application is made to our humane, courteous and affable Minister of Customs, he immediately says: "Yes;" or, if he does not say so, he ought to. He ought to allow the first wrecking vessel that offers to render assistance, and he does so, I believe. Sir, I say that we do not want to ask, as a matter of favor, permission to go into American waters, but as a matter of right. We ought to have a law upon our Statute-book, such as has been placed upon the Statute-book of the United States, that there should be reciprocal rights in this matter. The cause of humanity demands it, the interests of our shipowners and of insurance men demand it. I hope the Government will allow this Bill to pass, and show that the opinion of this House and this country is that we are ready to meet the United States Government, so far as necessary, in all such reciprocal matters. We have shown it by our readiness in putting seeds, trees and shrubs on the free list. Why should we not meet them in this matter also? Why do the Government withhold reciprocity of wrecking in order to try and draw something greater with it? If that is the policy of the Government, I would ask why they did not withhold reciprocity in trees, and seeds, and shrubs, in order to try and get reciprocity in all natural products? Why did they grant the one until they had the larger measure granted too? I do not think the reason for the refusal is correct, and I hope the House will pass the Bill through its second reading.

Mr. EDGAR. I was very much surprised to hear the Finance Minister put the veto of the Government on this Bill, because I thought if there was one question the House might be allowed to deal with without being influenced by party considerations, or considerations affecting the Government or the Opposition, this was the question. I thought too this was a question, and I have looked at it rather carefully, respecting which I do not blame the executive of the country. I frankly say I do not blame the Government of the day, or the former Government, for their conduct in this matter, and I think this Parliament is to blame, if any one is to blame. Every hon. member who had a right to introduce a Bill to meet the American Act of 1878 in the spirit in which this Bill meets it, is to blame, and not any member of the Government in particular. I find that, in 1878, when a circular was issued by the former Government drawing the attention of the officers of the department to the law on the subject of wrecking, the American law had not been passed then, and I find that when the American

Act of 1878 offering reciprocal privileges was passed, the present Government took an early opportunity to inform their officers that they desired that no harsh measures be enforced under the law. On 12th June, 1879, a report was made by the Minister of Customs to the Privy Council on this subject, which was adopted, in which it stated :

"With respect to the circular of March, 1878, that no Canadian officer ever interpreted the circular or the law, as justifying interference with the efforts of vessels of any nationality to succor vessels in distress and save human life or property, while there was a possibility of preventing their loss, nor has any such case of interference ever occurred."

I accept that as the opinion of the Government, and I ask, when they stated this to be their view, why Parliament should not pass an Act placing it on the Statute-book. I can see no reason why this should not be done. They go on further, and in a circular issued in September, 1879—a departmental circular of the Minister of Customs—they instructed their officers as follows :—

"It is not to be understood that the circular of March, 1878, has any application to cases wherein life may be in danger or where property may be jeopardised by delay, such, for instance, as the grounding of a vessel in circumstances in which immediate assistance would prevent a wreck ; nor is there any possible case in which vessels of any nationality should be prevented from going to the rescue of persons in peril of their lives, or of vessels in danger of being lost."

I say again, when the Government went so far as that in September, 1879, what objection can there be to passing this Bill, which proposes merely to place upon the Statute-book the interpretation which the Government themselves very properly chose to put upon the customs law? Then again, on 15th November, 1880, commenting on some complaint by the Americans as to the refusal of our authorities to permit their wreckers to go to the assistance of vessels in distress, the present Minister of Customs says :

"The above statement of facts the Minister admits clearly establishes the fact that there was not, at any time, the least obstruction placed in the way of Mr. Evans, nor of his tug to perform such part of the work as it was fitted for, but, on the contrary, the evidence shows that his interests were carefully considered, and every facility offered by the Collector Barrett, of Port Dover, Ontario, to protect his property."

Why, then, did not the Government bring in a Bill asking Parliament to accept the American terms? What is the only reason put forward by the Government against accepting this Bill? It is that by refusing it we may perhaps obtain coasting privileges which would be very valuable. Did not the Government have some experience in trying to force reciprocity upon the Americans; did they not try, during a great many years, to force it on them; did they not especially try in 1886 to force the Americans to make concessions to us in the direction of admitting our fish free by making reprisals on their vessels, and surely hon. gentlemen opposite know full well that those efforts will have no effect on our neighbors, and that our resisting this law will not make them more likely to grant us additional concessions. Another reason was urged by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the other evening against this House adopting the Bill. The hon. gentleman used these words :

"I say that the advantage which we enjoy in the matter of wrecking is very great."

I wonder who enjoy this advantage? Surely they are not the owners of the commercial marine of Canada, surely not the owners of the cargoes, and surely not Canadian underwriters who enjoy any advantage from the present condition of the law. They can only be the owners of wrecking craft on the lakes, and surely the interests of a small class like that cannot be considered to be the interests of the whole people. I have no doubt that the wrecking business is a very honest and proper calling and a very necessary one, but surely the country cannot be called upon to feed them with wrecks in order to enable them to make a living. If this matter were left to the simple, honest, open, untrammelled vote of this House to-night, no doubt this Bill would

be carried by a large majority. This is not an executive matter in which the Government has announced any policy on any former occasion or taken any ground except in this very direction, and this is a case where the House should be left to exercise its legislative functions without the interference of the Executive. If there ever was a case in which the House should be allowed to be free surely this is a case, and I add my appeal to that of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) to the Minister of Finance representing the Government on this occasion, and I ask him to let the House have a free vote on the matter.

Mr. BOWELL. Before the question is put to the House I desire to offer a few remarks. I do not know particularly what the leader of the Opposition meant when he said he could "smell reciprocity in the air." It was quite evident, at least to my mind, that he was unaware of the fact that on this question of reciprocity in wrecking and coasting there has been a law on the Statute-book since 1867 offering the United States the freest possible intercourse in those matters. More than that. If the hon. gentleman who has just spoken had taken the trouble to read a little further on in the despatch to which he referred, he would there have ascertained that in the despatch sent from our Government, emanating from the Customs Department, that we pointed out, as long ago as 1879, that this Government was prepared to enter into wider commercial relations, in so far as the coasting trade and wrecking were concerned. He might also have informed the House that an order was issued by the Government of which he was a supporter, but not until repeated refusals had been made by the American Government to allow a Canadian vessel or tug to enter its waters and render assistance to any Canadian wreck. It was for these reasons that the late Government issued their order to prevent American tugs and wreckers from coming into Canadian waters to save wrecked property. Under that regulation, which was issued by the late Government, many persons in Canada vested their means in wrecking and tug plant for saving not only life, but all property of wrecks of our own country and of others that take place on the north side of the great lakes, or on our rivers. I do not know what the hon. gentleman meant, nor to whom he referred, nor do I propose to enquire, when he insinuated that wrecks had to be supplied in order to keep alive certain parties in this country who own wrecking plant. This I do know, from my experience in the department, that until the order was issued by the late Government, and enforced by the present Government, that we had no wrecking plant of any consequence in Canada. Now that we have wrecking plant and are prepared to do all work in our waters, we find that the American Government, as they do upon all occasions where their own interests are at stake, pass a law offering reciprocity in this particular subject alone. But they studiously refuse to extend it any further where it would by any possibility interfere with any interest of their own. It is a question for this House to say whether we should upon all occasions, whenever any particular subject or act of theirs will give to them the advantage over those which are possessed by Canadians, that we should at once accept it, whether it is to our own interest or not. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) says it is in our own interest. It may be in the particular locality in which he lives. It is not so in the west. If this is passed now without our asking for further concessions to our marine, we shall destroy a large amount of capital which our people have in this industry, and in which they were induced to invest their money only after the refusal on the part of the Government of Canada to allow American vessels to come into our waters. So late ago as 1878, when this question first came under the notice of the Government, and when complaints were made at the Canadian Government enforcing the pro-

visions of the order which was issued by my predecessor, I find it was scarcely a month after we had assumed office, when, in reply to a despatch from Washington, we said :

"The undersigned has carefully considered the suggestion of Mr. Everts in his despatch of the 13th June, in which he suggests a modification of the instructions given in the circular of the 5th March, 1878, relating to wrecking in Canadian waters, and finds that said orders were not issued until after repeated refusals on the part of United States officials to allow Canadian tugs to assist or interfere with British vessels wrecked in United States waters and not until instructions were sent from Washington preventing said aid being rendered by British tugs of which the following is a copy :—

"WASHINGTON, 14th June, 1877.

"Vessels ashore in American waters pass into hands of United States customs authorities, cannot be taken possession of by alien wreckers."

"H. F. FRENCH,

"Assistant Secretary."

These orders having been continually enforced the Canadian Government deemed it in the interests of their own property holders and of that particular trade in this country to enforce the law as it stood on the Statute-book. The present Government have upon all occasions extended the fullest privilege to American tugs and American wreckers available; and even where those tugs may have been available, when Canadian tugs and wreckers were not, when there was danger of immediate loss of property or of life—in no cases have those privileges been denied, except where vessels have not been in danger of destruction, that a refusal has been extended to the Americans. Such liberality has not been extended by the American Government to Canadian tug owners or to Canadian wreckers, and I see good reason for adopting the suggestion made by the Finance Minister that we should not give this privilege without some return, particularly in a case of this kind where it is in our interest, as I believe it to be in the interest of the American shipowners as well, that we should have the freest possible intercourse in coasting trade in inland waters at least, and if it is possible on the sea coast. It was only last January, if I may refer to it, that in sending a despatch to the department of Washington on this very subject, on the charges which are imposed upon vessels in making entries inward and outward that the Government called the attention of the American Government to the existence of the provision in our present law. The law was quoted, and they were asked to extend to us the rights and privileges which we were prepared to extend to them in the coasting and wrecking trade. Now, if we adopt the reciprocity as suggested by the Bill before the House, they will have attained all that they want and all that they ask; together with the destruction of our wrecking industry, and, most certainly, refusal will follow in respect to reciprocity in the coasting trade of the country. I am rather sorry that my friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has taken up this subject so warmly and thinks it so absolutely necessary in the interests of the country, and more particularly the interests of the neighborhood of the outlet of Lake Ontario that we should accept the proposition which has been made. I believe it to be in the interests of the wrecking industry, in the interests of the country and in the interests of the coasting trade that we should hold the position we are in at present. I could refer to three or four instances, within these last six or seven years, in which the Americans legislated directly against the trade of this country; and when we adopted the same policy, and they found that it affected their immediate interests, they at once passed Bills repealing the clauses in their Acts which prevented certain trade with this country, and asked us to accede to their request to do likewise. If we did that in one or two cases to which I might call the attention of the House, the result would be the destruction of certain industries in this country. I find no fault with the action of the American Government in this matter. They have acted as I believe every Government should act; whenever they found it to their interest to repeal a law or a portion

Mr. BOWELL.

of law which affected the trade of their own people, they at once repealed it. But I do not believe, neither does it follow, that we should adopt a policy when we know it would injure our own trade and destroy certain interests which we have built up under this and other systems.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Why do you injure the seeds and small fruits?

Mr. BOWELL. We should not have done it had not there been a law upon the Statute-book which made it incumbent upon us to do so.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). It seems to me that the wise and statesmanlike policy, enunciated by the hon. Minister of Finance, is one that should commend itself to the good sense of this House. We who are not taken into the inner confidence of the Executive are not in a position to dabble in legislation of this kind wisely. While the generous and disinterested speech of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), may command our sympathy, I do not think it commands our reason. He is proceeding entirely on false premises. Somebody has led him to believe that this a question in which humanity is involved, and that these wrecking regulations affect the lives and properties of those engaged in our inland marine. It has been pointed out again and again to-night very ably by the hon. Minister of Customs, and also by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that that is a fallacious idea; and I trust that no member of this House will vote on this Bill should it come to a vote, under the impression that there is any question of humanity involved. The late Mackenzie Administration were compelled, under the pressure of circumstances, brought about by the action of the American Government, to pass certain Orders in Council which now govern our wrecking system. Before these Orders in Council were enforced, the wrecking business in Canadian waters was almost exclusively in the hands of American tugmen; but after they were passed, our tugmen at various points in our inland waters, invested their money in wrecking tugs, hydraulic pumps and other wrecking appliances, and trained a class of men who have become skilled in that work, and who will be useful citizens to the Dominion in other directions should their services be required; and having established this system, we are now asked, for an empty sentiment which has no foundation in fact, to repeal our own policy, and throw these men out of employment and give the business in which they are engaged to our American cousins. If we are to adopt this policy, I believe in going the whole length. I do not believe in giving our neighbors one little item of privilege which they desire, and thereby entirely place ourselves in their hands. If we have anything to exchange, let us give them something which will be worthy of their acceptance so that it may bring about the reciprocity which I believe we all desire. I think if we had that reciprocity which the hon. Minister of Finance has spoken of in our inland waters at least, all those engaged in the wrecking business in our Canadian trade would be well able to hold their own with their American competitors; but while our neighbors offer us reciprocity in wrecking they at the same time withhold from us the small privilege of the coasting business—the one small item of being permitted to tow into an American port a wreck which has been saved by a Canadian tug. I would ask my hon. friend who has distinguished himself in the cause of humanity not to quarrel with his best friends, but to submit to their superior wisdom; but if the Bill is to be pressed to a second reading, I propose to move a rider to the first clause to this effect: As soon as the Government of the United States shall accept the statutory offer respecting the coasting trade, contained in chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada so far as the same may apply to the inland waters of Canada.

contiguous to the United States." If the Bill with this provision is allowed to pass, we shall then see whether the American Government and shipowners are sincere in their desire to meet us in this matter, or whether they are throwing dust into the eyes of Canadians in pretending to give us something which is valueless to us in order that they may get something from us which is valuable to them. I live in a part of the country where there is a great deal of wrecking done and where there are several wrecking companies, and I have never known a case of the Minister of Customs of Canada refusing the privilege to an American tug to wreck in Canadian waters, not merely where life and property were in imminent danger, but where there were not, on its being proven that a Canadian tug was not at hand and immediately available. I myself have applied a dozen times within the last ten years on behalf of American wrecking tugs, and obtained for them permission to wreck in Canadian waters where life and property were not in imminent danger, because at the time Canadian tugs were engaged at a distance, either in Lake Huron or the Georgian Bay. The policy of the Canadian Government in this matter has been humane, liberal and generous, while that of our American neighbors has been inhuman, illiberal and ungenerous. Their conduct to us in these matters has been of a character to rouse the indignation of those who live on the borders, and who see the petty way in which Canadians are harassed, not merely in this matter, but in every matter in which United States officials can harass Canadian citizens. I do not say that this is done by the United States Government. I think many of these things are done without the knowledge of the United States Government, to affect local interests; but it is in my personal knowledge, and almost in my daily experience that the Canadian Government and Canadian officials, in all their dealings with Americans, set an example for courtesy and kindness that would be well worthy of their imitation; and to talk to-night of this being a generous offer on the part of the Americans is only an assertion made by one who has not studied the subject with his head, but has only given to it the warm impulses of his heart. It was only yesterday that I received a letter from a gentleman who has lived many years on the Detroit River, and who is familiar with the wrecking business, in which letter he says:

"When I wrote you some time ago regarding the wrecking business and stated that a much larger number of disasters occurred in Canadian waters than in American waters, I meant in the waters of this vicinity.

"I have spoken to all parties interested in navigation in this part of the country and they all agree that it would be much better to let the wrecking laws remain as they are, for the very sound reason that the Americans will benefit much more than the Canadians by the change.

"The talk of inhumanity regarding the present wrecking laws is all nonsense. In my twenty years' experience in this business I have never known the customs authorities to refuse a permit to American steamers to render assistance when life and property were in imminent danger.

"The only occasions that permits were refused were when Americans wanted to do the work themselves instead of employing Canadians. I hope Mr. Kirkpatrick will withdraw his Bill, for you may be sure that the Americans would not be so willing to give reciprocity in wrecking if they were not sure that it would be more to their advantage than to the Canadians. Do you not think that it is pretty cheeky on the part of the Americans to include in their Bill the Welland Canal? I presume they would also take in Georgian Bay and all Canadian inland waters. I see that quite a number of petitions favoring this measure, but I am very strong in my opinion that it would be better for Canada to let the wrecking laws remain as they are."

I trust my hon. friend having achieved his object in bringing his Bill before the House and the country, will allow it to stand and mature for future legislation, when the seeds which he has planted, and which have been referred to more than once to-night, will bear fruit; later on he will recognise the wisdom of this action, and will find that when the Government advise him to take a certain course, there is more in it than meets his ear and appears on the surface, and next year the hon. gentleman will be glad he took the advice of the Minister of Finance and thus gained

on a larger scale the objects which he desired and retained for himself the confidence and respect of his colleagues.

Mr. CURRAN. I desire to say but a very few words on this subject. The hon. gentleman who spoke last told us that it is merely a question of sentiment or humanity which is involved in this matter. I may say that I have received from persons in whom I have very great confidence letters urging me to support the Bill and to do my utmost to make it become the law of the land, and they pointed out to me that there was a great deal more than mere sentimental interest at stake. In fact, they said that persons who have large interests in this country are very much in favor of the passing of such a law as that proposed by my hon. friend from Frontenac. However much these people may be interested in a pecuniary sense, I know that each and every one of them is a patriotic Canadian citizen, and that although their own interests may suffer for the time being, the reasons of public policy given by the members of the Administration who have spoken to-night will cause them to approve of the vote I am about to give. I am satisfied that they will take into consideration the fact that the motives which induce the Government to call upon their friends to withdraw their support from the Bill, are motives worthy of the consideration of every patriotic Canadian, and for that reason, and for that reason alone, I will have to vote against the proposition of my hon. friend.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire, Sir, to add a few words—

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The hon. gentleman has spoken on the motion for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to make a personal explanation.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I object to the hon. gentleman making a speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman wishes to make a personal explanation.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will leave you, Sir, to decide whether it is strictly a personal explanation or not.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I object to another speech from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

The House divided on motion for second reading.

YEAH :

Messieurs

Amoyot,
Armstrong,
Bain (Wentworth),
Bécharé,
Bell,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),
Cassgrain,
Choquette,
Cook,
Coulombe,
Desaulniers,
Dessaint,
Doyon,
Edgar,
Ellis,

Fiset,
Fisher,
Gauthier,
Gillmor,
Girouard,
Godbout,
Guay,
Hale,
Holton,
Kirk,
Kirkpatrick,
Labelle,
Lang,
Laurier,
Lovitt,
Macdonald (Huron),
McIntyre,
McMillan (Huron),
McMullen,
Meigs,

Mitchell,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Platt,
Préfontaine,
Rinfret,
Robertson,
Rowand,
Ste. Marie,
Scriver,
Semple,
Shanly,
Smith, (Sir Donald)
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Thérien,
Trow,
Turcot,
Watson,
Wilson (Elgin).—81.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bain (Soulangee),
Baird,
Baker,
Bowell,
Boyle,

Foster,
Freeman,
Gigault,
Gordon,
Grandbois,

Moncreiff,
Montague,
O'Brien,
Patterson (Essex),
Porter,

Brown,	Guillet,	Robillard,
Bryson,	Henderson,	Roeme,
Cameron,	Hesson,	Ryker,
Cargill,	Hickey,	Skinner,
Carling,	Hudspeth,	Small,
Carpenter,	Ives,	Smith (Ontario),
Caron (Sir Adolphe)	Jamieson,	Sproule,
Chapleau,	Kenny,	Stevenson,
Charlton,	Langevin (Sir Hector)	Taylor,
Oimon,	Laurie,	Thompson,
Cockburn,	McCuila,	Tisdale,
Colby,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Coughlin,	McDougald (Pictou),	Tupper (Pictou),
Couture,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	McKay,	Vanasse,
Davin,	McKee,	Wallace,
Davis,	McLelan,	Ward,
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Weldon (Albert),
Denison,	McNeill,	Wilmot,
Dickinson,	Madill,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dupont,	Marshall,	Wilson (Lennox),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gr.),	Mills (Annapolis),	Wood (Brockville),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Moffat,	Wright.—84.

Motion negatived.

Mr. FISET. (Translation.) The hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) has not voted.

Mr. GEOFFRION. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have paired with the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel) so that I have no right to vote on this question.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence, statements, petitions and other documents received by the Government, or any department thereof, with reference to the assumption by the Government of the cost of deepening the channel of the River St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec, and with reference to the return of moneys expended in respect thereof, from out of the revenues of the port of Montreal, to a corresponding provision for the improvement of that port.—(Sir Donald A. Smith.)

Correspondence and petitions regarding a grant of public money to aid in the construction of a bridge over the Bay of Quinté at Belleville.—(Mr. Platt.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do the Government propose to take up to-morrow?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We propose to take up the business on the Order Paper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do they propose to go into Supply?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not likely.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to mention to the Government that to-morrow, in the way of a motion, either a motion with respect to a matter of privilege or a motion of adjournment, I proposed to call the attention of the House to certain facts affecting the conduct of the returning officer for the county of Haldimand.

Mr. JAMIESON. I would very much prefer if we could dispose of the next Order on the list of Private Bills to-night. We reached the other day the same stage as to-night, and it was then suggested to me by a member of the Government that it would be better to allow it to stand until to-night. I do not wish that this matter should stand over any longer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think I would meet the wishes of the large majority of the members of this House by moving the adjournment of the House. It is nearly eleven o'clock, and we may expect that to-morrow and the next day, being Government days, we will have to sit late. I have no doubt my hon. friend will have more than two or three opportunities to have his Bill considered by the House. He need not be uneasy about that, for we will see that the opportunity is given him.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to put a question to the hon. the Minister of Finance, though I am not quite sure if

he will give me an explicit answer or not. Several enquiries have been made to me, which, not being in the confidence of the Government, I could not answer, as to whether or not the Government intend to continue the lavish expenditure made for railway purposes during the current season.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid my hon. friend will have to wait for the Estimates for that answer.

Mr. FISHER. I think in view of the fact that this is the second time the next Order on the Paper has been reached and the Government have taken upon themselves to prevent discussion on it, they should promise some definite day on which that Order may be reached and thoroughly discussed. It has been frequently asserted that the temperance people have not brought this question up sufficiently early in the Session to have it thoroughly discussed and passed by this House; and if the House adjourns at this early hour to-night, just as this Order is reached, I cannot refrain from throwing upon the Government the responsibility of thus blocking amendments to the Scott Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am certain the hon. gentleman did not hear the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, in which he stated to my hon. friend behind me that he proposed to adjourn because the House was greatly fatigued by late sittings, but that he would take care a full opportunity would be given to bring this question before the House.

Mr. FISHER. If that is the promise of the Government, it is quite sufficient, but I would like to know when it is likely we will have that opportunity? The Government should fix a day.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 19th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. THOMPSON (for Mr. White, Cardwell) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 106) further to amend "The Indian Act," chapter 43 of the Revised Statutes. He said: The object of the Bill is to make some stringent provisions as to the commission of half-breeds to treaty privileges, and the retirement of half-breeds from treaty privileges; also to make Indian lands in the different Provinces amenable to assessments for municipal taxes, and to enable them to be sold and conveyed by tax deeds; likewise to make more stringent provisions with reference to the sale of intoxicating liquors to Indians, and to make provision in British Columbia for authority for the Governor in Council to appropriate to the provincial authorities the proceeds of fines for the sale of intoxicating liquors.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DEPUTY RETURNING OFFICER FOR HALDIMAND.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to invite the attention of the House to a matter of which I gave notice last night; and I may say that I propose to close my remarks with a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. What motion does the hon. gentleman propose to make ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A motion for adjournment. I dare say the House will recollect that a few days ago I addressed a question to the Government in these words :

"Whether Government are aware that one Charles Young, one of the deputy returning officers at the two elections held in the county of Haldimand, in February and November, 1887, and one of the parties at whose polls certain irregularities are alleged to have occurred, has served a term of imprisonment for theft in the gaol of the county of Brant, prior to being appointed deputy returning officer as aforesaid ?"

To which the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Thompson) gave the following reply :—

"The Government are not aware that Charles Young served a term of imprisonment for theft in the gaol of the county of Brant prior to being appointed deputy returning officer. They are informed that he has not. Mr. Charles Young, as deputy returning officer, was not in any sense an officer of the Government; but we are informed that he is a respectable man, who has held several offices of trust and honor in the county of Haldimand, and that he was recommended for this office by several persons of credit, including a prominent Grit politician. The only charge with regard to irregularities at his polling place was investigated and dismissed."

I will call the attention of the House to some remarkable features of that reply before I get through. In the meantime I would like to submit a few statements bearing on the question. The first of these is the sheriff's certificate, dated from the sheriff's office, county of Brant :

"BRANTFORD, April 4th, 1888.

"This is to certify that from the regular gaol books kept for the county of Brant, it appears that one Charles Young, of the county of Haldimand, farmer, was sentenced by Her Majesty's regular court of Assize, on the 2nd of May, A.D. 1879, for the offence of stealing wheat, to six months imprisonment in the common gaol of the county of Brant, and duly served his term of imprisonment in accordance with the said sentence, and at and during the said period he was sentenced by the county judge's criminal court to a similar period of imprisonment on another charge, both sentences being concurrent.

"H. J. SCARFE, Sheriff of the county of Brant.
"ALFRED KITCHEN, Gaoler."

It will be observed this merely establishes that a certain Mr. Charles Young has served a certain term of imprisonment in the county gaol. I have here also a statutory declaration, as follows :—

"I, Charles, Wesley Colter, of the town of Cayuga, county of Haldimand, Barrister-at-law, do solemnly declare that, in or about the month of March, A. D. 1887, I had a conversation with John A. Langrill, Esq., M. D. (who was returning officer for the electoral district of Haldimand at the Dominion elections, held severally on the 22nd day of February, A. D. 1887, and on the 12th day of November, A. D. 1887) at the office of James Mitchell, Esq., and in the presence of James Mitchell aforesaid, in the court house, in the village of Cayuga, in the county of Haldimand aforesaid, and during such conversation, I censured said John A. Langrill for appointing improper and unfit men to act as deputy returning officers at said elections.

"The said John A. Langrill asked me to name any improper appointments made by him, and I then and there named Charles Young, who I then informed him had been convicted of stealing wheat, and had served a term of imprisonment therefor.

"The said John A. Langrill professed to be surprised at my information, and pretended he had no knowledge of this, but subsequently he appointed said Charles Young as deputy returning officer in November last.

"And I make this solemn declaration believing the same to be true, &c.

"C. W. COLTER."

It will be noticed that affidavit No. 2 pretty well establishes the identity of Charles Young; but, for fear of any possible accidents, I have here a third affidavit made by a certain Timothy McMonagle, of the township of Oneida, in the county of Haldimand, who says :

"I well know Charles Young who was imprisoned in the Brantford gaol for the larceny of wheat in or about the month of May, A. D. 1879. In conversation with the said Charles Young on the 14th day of April, 1888, as to his imprisonment in the Brantford gaol for the larceny of wheat, aforesaid, the said Charles Young informed me that he had been imprisoned in the gaol at Brantford for the larceny of wheat for a term of six months. That the said Charles Young so imprisoned in the gaol at Brantford as aforesaid is the same Charles Young who acted as

deputy returning officer at No. 4 polling sub-division in the township of Oneida, at the Dominion election held on the 15th day of November, A. D. 1887. I have lived in the township of Oneida, a near neighbor of the said Charles Young ever since the said Charles Young resided in the said township of Oneida, and I know of no other Charles Young. The said Charles Young never held any office of trust or responsibility in the said township of Oneida since he was imprisoned as aforesaid in the Brantford gaol.

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the 'Act for the suppression of extrajudicial oaths.'

"TIMOTHY McMONAGLE."

Now, I have one or two things to say with respect to the answer I have received. It appears to me that there is no loophole of escape from these affidavits, and that it is as clear and certain as anything well can be that Mr. Charles Young had served a term of imprisonment in the Brantford gaol for theft, prior to his being appointed as returning officer, first of all in February, and secondly in November.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman state the time of his imprisonment ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have already stated it three times. It was in May or June, 1879. I think, when evidence of this sort is placed before the Minister of Justice, he might take the trouble to enquire or to communicate with the keeper of the gaol or the sheriff, or any other parties he sees fit, in order to find out the state of affairs, and if the hon. gentleman had done so, he would not be in the position he now occupies when he stated that due enquiry had been made (because no other deduction can be taken from his answer) and that this Charles Young had not served a term of imprisonment for theft. Moreover, I take issue in the strongest possible manner with the Minister of Justice in regard to this other point. He states that Charles Young, as deputy returning officer, was not in any sense an officer of the Government. I say that is altogether an unworthy equivocation. The Government of this country, for their own purposes, for purposes which I am not going to characterise now but which the House can imagine, took the power of appointing the returning officers into their own hands. They took those offices away from men who had discharged the duties fairly and well, men who were known to the people and were responsible to the people; and are we to be told that the Government can appoint returning officers at their own will and pleasure, and can then repudiate any responsibility for the action of the deputy returning officers who are appointed by those returning officers? *Qui facit per alium facit per se* applies here, at all events. The Government are responsible in the highest degree for the conduct of the returning officers and the deputy returning officers whom they may appoint. That is a doctrine which must commend itself to the common sense of every one in this House, and it is a doctrine upon which they must be judged. The affidavit of Mr. Colter, the affidavit of the sheriff and the affidavit of a neighbor of Charles Young contradict the statements of the hon. gentleman in every particular except one. They do not contradict his statement as to the fact that Mr. Young was recommended by persons of credit, including a prominent Grit politician. I should like to know, and I think the House would like to know, and I am sure the electors of Haldimand would like to know, who was the prominent Grit politician who recommended an ex-convict as a deputy returning officer in that county. Perhaps he was a humorist, and wanted to play a practical joke on the returning officer, and those who appointed the returning officer, for the county of Haldimand. Perhaps he was a cynical party, and, having seen the previous practice in the county of Haldimand, he thought that an ex-convict would necessarily be a good deputy returning officer for that county. But, as I do not know who he is, perhaps the hon. gentleman will give us his name, and then there may be

other affidavits in store for us. I shall not pursue that part of the subject any further. We call the attention of the Government to the facts which have been disclosed as to the conduct of the returning officer. We have Mr. Colter's sworn affidavit that he went to the returning officer and remonstrated with him on his appointing a person of this class to a semi-judicial office. We find that the returning officer, according to Mr. Colter's affidavit, pleaded ignorance, and intimated that he would not do it again, and we find that, when November came, Mr. Charles Young was there as large as life discharging the duties of deputy returning officer. It appears to me that a returning officer who has so little regard for the deficiencies affecting his position, ought to be taken to task by this House and by the Government who appointed him, and I think there will be a failure in the plain duty of the Government and especially in the duty of their judicial adviser, the Minister of Justice, unless steps are taken to teach this returning officer that this House does not entirely endorse his action in appointing a man with the antecedents of Mr. Young to the responsible position to which he was appointed. I understand further that Dr. Langrill has also been an applicant for office, that he applied for the position of physician to an Indian reserve which has been vacated by the death of Dr. McKinnon. Why has there been this delay in rewarding a gentleman who has been such a faithful servant of the Government? Is it possible that it is because there is danger of a third election taking place in the county of Haldimand, and that Mr. Langrill and Mr. Charles Young are too important and too useful in their offices to be so soon dispensed with? I suggest to the Minister of Justice, as I understand he has some amendment to the Election Act under consideration, to introduce a new clause providing that where two parties are applying for a position of deputy returning officer, both being equally competent on other grounds, the preference should be given hereafter to ex-convicts, or, at all events, that ex-convict deputy returning officers should be allowed to rank next to returning officers who have been ex-secretaries of Conservative associations of the pattern of Mr. Dunn. Perhaps, Sir, it may be their intention to institute some new decoration, some badge or other, to distinguish these worthy persons. I recollect my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) suggesting, when Mr. Dunn's case was before us, that they might receive, with some propriety, a coat of arms, equal parts tar and feathers, in recognition of their services. Now, I would be sorry to have it supposed that I think Mr. Charles Young very much worse than his employers; for all I know to the contrary, Mr. Young may be a true penitent, and he is quite as likely to be a true penitent as many other persons much more highly placed. Sir, Government are now seized of the facts, Government now know, if they did not know before—and I am surprised that they were so very ill-informed—they now know—for I think there is hardly any escape from these affidavits which I have read to the House—Government now know that a gentleman who, whatever his present state of penitence may be, had at one period of his existence so far forgot himself as to serve six months in a common jail, was appointed twice over deputy returning officer for the county of Haldimand, in a very closely contested election, where it was known that the manipulation of a single vote might change the whole contest. And Sir, this was done by the returning officer, Dr. Langrill, who, be it remembered, as I am informed, is an applicant for office under this Government; it was done by him after formal remonstrance. If we were very charitable, we might suppose that it may have occurred once in ignorance, but it is clear from these facts to which I have called attention, that it was done after formal and repeated warning—warning in the presence of witnesses. Now, Sir, it is in the power of the Government—they have ample power, they lead this House,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

they have a large majority in this House—it is in their power to purge themselves from all accusation of complicity with their returning officer, if they so see fit. If they choose, on this statement of facts, to inflict some proper punishment on the returning officer, such as I think he deserves for appointing such persons, why, Sir, no more need be said; if they fail to do that, Sir, we will know the reason why, and the country will know the reason why. For myself I await the explanations, such as they may be, of the Minister of Justice. I reserve my right of further action, and I will now bring my remarks to a close by moving the adjournment of the House.

Mr. THOMPSON. The statement which the hon. gentleman has read in the *Hansard* of the 9th April, is a correct statement of what I said on that occasion, with the exception of a single word. I am not correctly reported in the expression that this gentleman was recommended by a prominent "Grit" politician; the expression I used was "a prominent Liberal politician." Now, Sir, I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman in the criticism which he made upon the Government generally, with respect to these returning officers. I presume he expects from me a statement of how far the facts which he has laid before the House this afternoon—or, rather, I hesitate to call them facts at present—the allegations which he has laid before the House this afternoon, were within my knowledge on April 9th, when I made the reply which seems to have given the hon. gentleman umbrage. I may say, in the first place, as the hon. gentleman has been told before, that with reference to his general attack upon the returning officers in this country, with respect to his insinuations that convicts will be proper returning officers under the system that prevails to-day with regard to elections in this country, the statement is a somewhat extraordinary one, in view of the fact that although an unusual number of petitions controverting the elections which took place a year ago, have been filed in the courts of this country, and have been investigated, out of the very few, if any, charges that have been made against returning officers, not one, so far as my memory serves me, has been sustained. That, of course, does not deprive the hon. gentleman of the right which he exercises here, on every opportunity, of attacking the Government, and insisting that they appoint unworthy persons to that position, and that they appoint partisans to that position, and that the persons whom they appoint exercise their powers unscrupulously on behalf of the Government of Canada; but it will convince the country that unless hon. gentlemen opposite are able to show in some case which has been adjudicated on, in which they have had the courage to make a charge, and they have had the proof to sustain it—it will convince the country that these charges are not quite worthy of the hon. gentleman from whom they come.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As in the case of Mr. Dunn.

Mr. THOMPSON. As in the case of Mr. Dunn, whom the hon. gentleman and his friends had at the Bar of this House, and against whom, after they had attacked him week after week, they had not the courage to offer a resolution of censure. Now, I may be entirely mistaken as to the duties and responsibilities which attach to the Government with respect to deputy returning officers in this country, but it does seem to me that neither under any principle of the constitution, nor under any enactment on our Statute-book, has the Government any control with respect to the appointment of these officers, or any responsibility with regard to them. The Government, it is true, have the choice of returning officers, but when the returning officers have been appointed, the choice of something like eight or ten thousand deputy returning officers, not one hundredth part of whose names ever reach the Govern-

ment, and over whom the Government have not the slightest control—the responsibility with regard to these officers, I claim, rests entirely upon the returning officer who has appointed them, and not upon the Government that has appointed him. The remedy that is given, either to the candidate aggrieved or to any elector that is aggrieved, is simple and plain. Any public officer, returning officer, or deputy, is liable to indictment if he violates the statute or violates his duty, and every charge that can be made against him may be investigated under a petition in which the accused shall have the advantage, that the hon. gentleman has taken good care this officer should not have this afternoon—the advantage of answering himself all charges that are formulated and prepared for him to answer. Now, Sir, while I claim with respect to these eight or ten thousand officers that we have no responsibility, we can have none—as to their fitness or the reasons for their choice. I disclaim responsibility likewise for the information which may be given to any gentleman in this House who asks information as to their antecedents. When an hon. gentleman puts a question which the Government require me to answer, I am bound to give him the best information that I have. I gave, on April 9th, the full information which I had with regard to this deputy returning officer. I did not state that I had made an elaborate enquiry, I did not feel bound to make such. If no information had reached me with regard to this officer I would have told the hon. gentleman that we had no information on the subject; as certain information had reached me, I communicated it to the House. I gave the hon. gentleman all the information that I had, conceiving at the same time that it was as much out of place for the hon. gentleman—I say it, of course, with deference to his superior parliamentary knowledge and experience—as much out of place for the hon. gentleman to ask the Government if they knew that one James Young had served a term of imprisonment for theft, as if he had asked that question about any other private citizen of the country who was not an officer of the Government at all and for whom we had no responsibility. Now, I do not propose to say anything this afternoon with regard to the affidavits which the hon. gentleman has read. His own sound sense and his sense of fair play will surely indicate to him that in so far as they are imputations against the returning officer, who was an officer of the Government, that officer ought to have an opportunity to reply to them, and I shall be very much surprised, after the information I have received, and after the information that has been laid before the House this afternoon, if the returning officer will not be able to give the hon. gentleman an answer that will make him feel he has been a little unjust in the statement he has made to the House this afternoon both as regards that officer and as regards the general attack which has been made on the Government. As regards the question which I answered on April 9th, the hon. gentleman has not this afternoon called the attention of the House, if my memory serves me, to any ground at all for the imputation conveyed in that question. The House will remember that this person was a deputy returning officer, as the hon. gentleman has stated, in the elections in February and November of last year. The ground, and the only ground surely, upon which the hon. gentleman could fairly put a question upon the paper reviving a charge of theft against this person, ten years old and for which he served the full penalty that was put upon him, the only ground surely actuating any person of ordinary humanity and with any ordinary sense of justice was this, that the deputy returning officer had committed some wrong in the conduct of the election which justified the reproach of his former misfortune being called up against him and misconduct imputed to the Government even for its indirect connection with his appointment as returning officer. But I failed to hear this afternoon, although the imputation was

conveyed in the hon. gentleman's question the other day—because he intimated in the question that at this officer's poll certain irregularities had occurred—vigorously as the returning officer was attacked and the deputy returning officer, I failed to hear the slightest justification for the hon. gentleman's attack upon the character of either of those men or upon the Government that appointed the returning officer, arising from any alleged irregularities in the course of the conduct of those elections. I need not remind the House that if any irregularity occurs the amplest opportunity exists for redress, and I suppose I need hardly remind the House that the hon. gentleman has made this impetuous attack and this unscrupulous insinuation at the very time when he gives us to understand these matters are *sub judice* and when the conduct of these persons is being investigated in the courts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will answer the last remark made by the hon. gentleman. I am informed that irregularities occurred; I am informed that ballots were improperly rejected at that poll; I am informed that the county judge, on the recount, restored to Mr. Coulter the votes of which Charles Young had deprived him.

Mr. LAURIER. The Government cannot get rid of the responsibility which properly belongs to them and which is charged against them to-day by my hon. friend. The fact, the shameful fact we have to-day that an ex-convict has been appointed the representative of the majesty of law and justice in an important election, is altogether in keeping with the system that has been adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite of selecting returning officers at their own sweet will and selecting irresponsible persons for the position. Common sense and common justice alike would require that those returning officers, those who by the nature of their office are to hold the scales of justice between contending parties, who are to give their *fiat* at the election, should be permanent officers of the law, sheriff's registrars, or such like persons who have characters to maintain and positions to uphold. But the Government have acted otherwise. Such, indeed, was the practice at one time; but in 1880 it was a feature of the Gerrymander Act that the Government should repeal that system and take to themselves the power to select their own men, their own creatures and their own favorites as the persons to stand fire between the contending parties. We have had that system in operation, and now have the result in the occurrences that have taken place. If we had permanent responsible officers of the law as returning officers, then the answer given by the Minister of Justice would apply; then he would say: The responsibility does not rest with the Government, but it rests upon the officers of the law who filled the position. But if the Government insists upon choosing their own creatures as returning officers they must be held responsible for the appointments made and for the result of those appointments. This is the true doctrine which my hon friend has laid down to-day, and the Government stand convicted of having had as one of their officers a man who at one time was an ex-convict, and he it was who was selected to stand fire between contending parties in a hotly contended election. If we desire to have a proper system prevail, we must revert to the system that prevailed at one time, and have permanent officers of the law as returning officers. What was the reason the old practice was abandoned? We had an explanation given at the time when the law was amended, we had an explanation given during the present Session. The reason given on both occasions has been that Conservative candidates would fail to receive justice at the hands of registrars and sheriffs, because they would be appointed by the Provincial Government, who might be men not favorable to the Dominion Government. The First Minister stated the reason several times. He

said that if returning officers were to be registrars and sheriffs appointed by the Grits of Ontario, Conservative candidates would have a scanty measure of justice. We can see what measure of justice is to be obtained by Liberals when returning officers are appointed—by whom? Not by the Dominion Government, but actually by ministerial candidates. We had this proved to be the case last year; Mr. Dunn was appointed returning officer at the instance of the ministerial candidate for Queen's, N.B. Mr. Dunn applied to the ministerial candidate for the office, the candidate applied to the Government, and Mr. Dunn was appointed, and we saw the result. We have heard the statement of the Minister of Justice, that, had Mr. Dunn been here, we would not have dared to attack him. Even if we did not dare to attack him, it did not follow that he was not guilty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. LAURIER. So guilty was he that the man who sat in this House by virtue of his warrant did not dare to come to Parliament a second time on that warrant, but went to his constituents again. Under such circumstances, so long as we have the present system prevailing, and so long as the Government will insist on appointing their returning officers, we are bound, we are justified in holding them responsible for whatever appointments are made under those circumstances. Since the Minister of Justice did not care to justify the acts of the returning officer, the Government stand responsible for the charges made against those officers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government accept the full responsibility for the alteration of the law and for that provision of the law by which returning officers are selected by the Government of the day, on their responsibility and subject to their responsibility to Parliament for the appointments being proper appointments. That charge was forced upon us by our experience. We found that the Conservative party had no fair play in the Province of Ontario.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; the Government found in the selection of the returning officers, at all events in the Province of Ontario, that the screws were put by the Provincial Government on their officers, and that in the choice of a returning officer they were compelled to select the sheriff or registrar with very few exceptions, and this, in their view, justified an alteration of the law. Those officers were chosen for their political antecedents and political proclivities. The deputy returning officers were selected as if for the purpose of defeating the Conservative candidate. We had this experience of 1878 and 1882, and we were obliged, in self-defence, to alter the law. We are responsible to the people of Canada, we are responsible to this House for making improper appointments, and as my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, has stated, the proof that we have not made improper appointments is shown by the fact that although every kind of charge has been brought against the Conservative members and against other gentlemen interested in elections, for corrupt practices, and that though they tried to make out irregularities of every possible kind, yet in those petitions no charge has been brought against the returning officers who were selected by the Government. Can there be a more conclusive proof of the correctness and the propriety of the selection of the returning officers than that fact? Surely amidst all these improper appointments as hon. gentlemen opposite allege; surely if the returning officers were selected for the purpose of favoring the Conservative candidate, one returning officer might have been found who had committed wrong. Surely the hon. gentlemen opposite who have raked up those who they say were opposed to their candidates, some would have found some returning officer in whose conduct

Mr. LAURIER.

there was a fault and against whom there could be brought a charge. Sir, consider for one moment, foresooth, that the Dominion Government are to have no choice in the returning officer and that the returning officers are to be instead the appointees of the Provincial Government. Now, there was a good ground for appointing registrars under the old system in Ontario and Upper Canada, when the registrar held office during good behavior, but that does not apply to the present case. The registrars are not appointed during good behaviour now. They are the mere tools of the Government, or they may be made mere tools of a Government of strange political feelings who are resolved to exercise those feelings against those opposed to them. The sheriffs and registrars of Ontario are at the present time mere officers at the pleasure of the Provincial Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a check in Provincial elections against the impropriety of the conduct of those men in their capacity as returning officers, for the Provincial members, if there is any impropriety, can complain, and the Government of the day are responsible to the Provincial Legislature. But the Provincial Government are perfectly irresponsible in any action that may be taken or any instructions that may be given to any returning officer, be he sheriff or registrar. They are not responsible to this House. We can arraign a returning officer, but we cannot arraign at the bar of this House the Government of a Province, if they use their power over those officers while holding office during pleasure by saying: You must appoint Reform deputy returning officers, you must do this and you must do that. They cannot be held up to the bar of public opinion; they can be held up to a responsibility before this House. As servants of the Local Legislature, they are not responsible to us; and I say there are gentlemen behind me who have felt in their own constituency the injustice they have suffered by this fact of the returning officers being politically opposed to them and as being under a Government and holding office at the will of a Provincial Government also opposed to them. I say we are perfectly justified in self-defence in making that provision, and until it is shown that the choice of the Government has been improperly used; that the returning officers have acted illegally; that they have acted unfairly; that they are liable to any one of the charges that can be brought against them; if they have acted unfairly, until that is shown our justification is complete. I state here in my place that the Government are aware, from the reports received from constituencies in previous elections, that the screw was put on by the Provincial Government and by members of the Provincial Government upon their own officers, as to the appointment of deputy returning officers, and that it was merely in self-defence that the Government have acted as they have done in applying to Parliament. They have got the sanction of Parliament—of a previous Parliament to this—and if the Government have acted improperly I have no doubt that this Parliament representing the people will repeal that law. Until that is done and so long as the law remains as it is now the Government are perfectly justified. They must do it, they must make the selection of a returning officer, and as long as they make that selection with so little objection as to the *personnel* of the returning officers and the conduct of the returning officers, I do not think the representatives of the people in the Dominion Parliament will hand over that power to the Provincial Government who are quite irresponsible as respects their action towards returning officers if appointed from Provincial nominees.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The right hon. gentleman, like an old parliamentarian, in making his rather impassioned address to the House, has been exceedingly astute and careful to avoid the special matter before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I answered the speech made by your leader.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.). He has not referred even directly to the charge made by the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and he has not attempted to justify the Government for having sanctioned the appointment of this convict as deputy returning officer by Dr. Langrill. What has the hon. gentleman said? In his answer he has said that no charges were prosecuted in the courts against the returning officers, and therefore the system would be supposed to be a good one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say anything about courts.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.). That in none of the petitions filed by members relating to the elections have any charges been brought against returning officers, and the hon. gentleman asked us to conclude from that that the system which prevails at the present time is an excellent one. The hon. gentleman knows that he did not change the old system whereby the officers of the Legislature were appointed as returning officers, because of any charges filed in the courts against those officers. No charges were filed in the courts against those officers under the old system.

An hon. MEMBER. In 1878.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) None were successful. The hon. gentleman cannot point out one where it was proven where there was any wrongdoing on the part of the returning officer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not so sure of that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman turns round and he justifies the change he made in those appointments because he did not believe they were fair. How does he know?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman will find that in the case of the election of Mr. Laflamme, the returning officer was complained of.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That was not a returning officer. If you allow me, the hon. gentleman will see that it was not a returning officer at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes.

An hon. MEMBER. He was a deputy returning officer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He was a deputy returning officer, and the hon. gentleman will see that he was appointed to his official position as deputy returning officer by a Government favorable to himself.

Mr. GIROUARD. No.

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

Mr. GIROUARD. The returning officer in that case was not the one designated by law, but he was the one selected by the ministerial candidate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Which shows conclusively, if it proves anything positively, that the system of allowing members to nominate returning officers is a bad system. I accept the explanation given by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier as the most convincing condemnation of the present system. But, Sir, the hon. First Minister sought to bolster up his rather weak argument by a statement which I regretted to hear him make. He tried to lead his followers to believe that he had to change the whole system of appointment of returning officers because he could not bring them to the bar of this House and punish them if they had done wrong. The hon. gentleman knows well that if a sheriff or other officer is appointed as returning officer, he is under our law and is amenable to the jurisdiction of this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that. What I said was that we could not bring the Government of Ontario.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Of course I am bound to accept the explanation of the hon. gentleman, but I wish to tell him that he was universally understood on this side of the House—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I could not be so understood.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On this side of the House he was universally understood, and my ears entirely deceived me if he did not expressly say that one of the reasons why he had to change the law was that under the old system the returning officer could not be brought to the bar of the House and punished.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; *Hansard* will prove it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman says—and in that he follows the line of argument taken by the hon. Minister of Justice—that we ought to be satisfied with the present system because as a matter of fact, in the petitions which have been filed, no charges have been made against the returning officers; but the hon. gentleman knows right well that the partisanship which a returning officer can exercise and the injustice which he can inflict on one of the candidates, can be very great and very reprehensible and still may not be such as to bring him within the provisions of the criminal law. The hon. gentleman knows right well that returning officers were censurable and censured, one after another, for improperly returning or withholding returns for partisan purposes. The hon. gentleman knows that days and days were taken up by hon. gentlemen of this House complaining of the injustice with which they were treated. The deputy returning officer is not a semi-judicial officer, but he is a judicial officer, and is very often much more important than the returning officer, because he decides what votes shall be accepted and what rejected, and his decisions cannot be appealed from except to the county judge. But this is to some extent a departure from the main question before the House. I think there was one universal feeling of regret when the hon. Minister of Justice resumed his seat because he refused to condemn the appointment of this returning officer or to express regret that such a man had been appointed. It is surely desirable, in the interest of good government and common decency and justice, that those who have been punished as common rogues should not be appointed to positions of honor and credit; and when such a deplorable thing takes place, and no language that can be construed into condemnation and censure falls from ministerial lips, what will the public believe, and what will that man himself believe? He will believe, as Dunn believes, that his conduct is such as meets with the approval of the Government. The hon. First Minister asked us, when Dunn was brought before the bar of this House, why did you not move a motion of censure upon him? Because the hon. Minister of Justice told us beforehand what would be the fate of any resolution that we should move. He told us that the case was *sub judice*, and when we challenged the correctness of his decision, our motion was voted down. There has been no public scandal or disgrace in the history of Canada for twenty-five years which has sunk so deep as that scandal of that man Dunn, who, in defiance of all law and decency, returned a man to this House who was 75 votes below the other candidate; and the conduct of that returning officer, if it was not openly justified, was palliated and excused when he was brought before the bar of this House. What would have been the use of our moving a vote of censure? He was condemned by every man who wants to see fair play and justice. The newspapers everywhere have condemned him; and it remained for the hon.

Minister of Justice alone to palliate and exonerate such conduct in this House. There has been no answer, or attempt at an answer, to the charges brought by my hon. friend. The only apology the hon. gentleman made to the House was that the reporter had reported him as having stated that this man was recommended by a "Grit politician," while he had used the expression, "Liberal politician." The hon. gentleman was challenged to name him, and he has not named him yet; although having made the statement he did, I think he was bound to give the name to the House, in order that the party with which we have the honor to be connected may know whether this man was recommended as the hon. gentleman says, or whether the hon. gentleman was misled in his statement, and is misleading the House in making it.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend has said that it was left to the hon. Minister of Justice alone to defend the conduct of returning officer Dunn who was at the bar of this House. I think it was not left to the hon. Minister of Justice alone, but it was left to the people of the constituency who have defended him in the verdict they have since rendered. My hon. friend said further that hon. gentlemen opposite had bitterly complained of the conduct of returning officers for not sending in the returns of candidates, and because on that account the returns were not registered as they ought to have been. Why, Sir, we heard hon. gentlemen opposite get up one after another and denounce the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery because he withheld the returns which they alleged the returning officers had sent in. It is very difficult to know what would be satisfactory to those hon. gentlemen. I happen to know that in the case of my own election contest, the Government went out of the constituency and selected the sheriff of the county as the returning officer. One would suppose from what hon. gentlemen have said that would have been eminently satisfactory to the Reform party; but what did we find? We found the members of the Reform party in my constituency solemnly meeting in convention and passing a resolution denouncing the partiality of the sheriff. So that it is absolutely impossible to imagine what is to be done to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. The appointment of the sheriff, which they say ought to be done, is not satisfactory to them. Perhaps some hon. gentleman will now rise in his place and tell us exactly what the Government ought to do.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I should like the friends of the Opposition in the Province of Quebec to hear the fiery denunciations in this House of anything that is not strictly correct, for we see in the bye-elections that are now going on that the Local Government, although bound to appoint returning officers according to the law, are going behind the returning officers, and forcing them by threats to change every one of their deputy returning officers who are not of the stamp they need to carry the elections. I could cite precisely what has happened yesterday. A very respectable man in Sault au Recollet had been appointed deputy returning officer, but was notified by the returning officer that he could not continue him in office because the Liberals were not satisfied with his political creed.

Mr. LAURIER. Who was the returning officer?

Mr. DESJARDINS. Mr. Philiatreault, and the deputy returning officer who was forced out was Mr. Cyprien Corbier.

Mr. LAURIER. What is Mr. Philiatreault?

Mr. DESJARDINS. He is the registrar of the county, and he was forced by the Liberals to appoint their own tools. This is the way hon. gentlemen opposite act, who are so ready to denounce the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. MADILL. I regret very much that the names of people should be brought up here when no proof is brought that they are guilty of wrong-doing. They do things differently in Ontario. Let hon. gentlemen opposite examine the record of the Government of Ontario, and they will find that they not only appoint returning officers who have been convicts, but also appoint justices of the peace who have been inmates of the penitentiary. It is all very well for a man to have the power to take money out of your pocket, but these men, occupying quasi-judicial positions, have the power of depriving a man of his personal liberty. No men should be selected to administer the law who are not men of honor and capability. In addressing a meeting in my county, I made the statement that the Government of Ontario had not only appointed as justices of the peace men who could not write their own names, but they appointed men who had been inmates of the prison and the penitentiary. I was interrupted by a man at the meeting who complained to the chairman that I had no right to expose him, because he was a justice of the peace and had been an inmate of the penitentiary. He said that happened years ago and that I should not have exposed him. His case only confirmed the statement I made. Hon. gentlemen opposite are supporting this motion for the purpose of exposing a man who may have at one time in his life been unfortunate and yet be a good man to-day—and I believe these men the Government appointed to these positions were not the worst appointments the Ontario Government made.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is one point to which I desire to call attention in connection with this matter. I do not wish to follow in the wide range that has been taken, but simply to call the attention of the House to this fact. It is evident that in the matter now under discussion, the House and the country were, at a previous date, misled by the answer the hon. the Minister of Justice gave to the question then put. I thought to-day that the hon. gentleman would have stated he had been misinformed, as he practically, I think, accepted the statement set forth in the affidavit. I thought he would have regretted having led the House and the country to believe, from the information he had received, something which was not strictly in accord with the facts; but I regret to find he took the line of rather seeming to justify his answer. I think the House is entitled to know from whom the hon. gentleman received his information. Of course, it was open to him at the time to have taken the ground that the question was not a proper one to be asked, and have declined to answer; but he answered it, and answered in such a way as to lead the country to believe that the hon. member for South Oxford, who put the question, had been misinformed. Now we find that the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford is supported by affidavits, the correctness of which the hon. the Minister of Justice does not pretend to deny, but expresses his willingness for the time being to accept. We are therefore entitled to know on what information he based his answer. Was it the returning officer for Haldimand who gave it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will answer the hon. gentleman when he sits down.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The answer which the hon. gentleman gave leads me to believe that there must be some misapprehension in the whole matter. When he told us that he was informed Charles Young had not served any term of imprisonment, and that he was further informed he had held several offices of trust and honor and was recommended for that office of deputy returning officer by several persons of influence, including a Liberal, he must have received his information from some one. That person should have been careful to give the correct information, and we cannot but regret

that he did not do so. The hon. gentleman will have to be more careful the next time as to whom he addresses for information. I do not wish to enter into the charges made with reference to the action of the Ontario Government with regard to appointments of magistrates or with reference to other questions that came up. I do not think the hon. the Minister of Justice will take that line. We are dealing with a certain question that ought to be decided on its merits; and if wrong has been done in any other case, that does not make this right. The hon. the Minister of Justice will hardly venture frankly to say what the answer he gave would imply; he would hardly attempt to justify the conduct of the returning officer for the county of Queen's. I do not believe there is a respectable gentleman in this House who will justify, in his heart of hearts, the conduct of that returning officer. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Cargill) tells us we changed our base. He tells us we first complained that the returning officers did not do their duty, and then that the returning officers did do their duty but that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery did not. Well, both charges were made. We claim that the writs were delayed by the returning officers in many cases, and then we charged the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery with delaying the publication of these writs. The hon. gentleman then says that we are never satisfied, and that there is no way of pleasing us, and would lead the House to believe that we were finding fault when there was none to be found. He asked what would please these hon. gentlemen. Well, Sir, nothing less will please us than that justice and fair play should be done. That is what they ask, and if they are not enabled to secure that by reason of a majority on the other side, prepared to vote down what is right and just and fair, they can at any rate maintain their rights as members of Parliament and rise in their place and protest against the unfairness which is manifested, against the injustice which is done to them severally and collectively, as has been done by this Government. The Government, as we have it here, in view of the numbers supporting them, ought to be able to do right, they ought to be able to discharge their duties in a proper way; and, if it is correct that this returning officer was notified prior to the appointment of this individual, before the last general election, and, as it appears, agreed that, if the charges which were made against him were true, he was not a fit person to be appointed, the Government must see that they appointed a gentleman whose appointment it is admitted was not in the public interest. I do not desire to say anything more on this question. I did not know that my hon. friend had any affidavits in reference to this matter, but, in common with other members, I have heard the testimony which has been adduced, I have heard the answer of the Minister of Justice, and I think, in the light of the affidavits which have been produced, it would be right for the Minister of Justice to say that he accepts them or that he does not accept them, and if he does accept them, that he should express his regret that he was misinformed, and that he consequently misled the House in regard to this matter, if the facts which have been recited are correct.

Mr. FREEMAN. I would not have risen to say one word on this subject but for the accusation which these gentlemen have thrown out to this side of the House. The hon. gentleman says that a majority on this side of the House are prepared to vote against justice and right. I am one of that majority. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I am prepared to vote and that I do vote for justice and right just as often as he does, and that these accusations are not only ungentlemanly but are unwise, and should not be thrown across to this side of the House, that we should not be told that we are prepared to vote against

justice and right. Let us examine the record, and it will be found that we uphold justice and right as much as they do on the other side. Last Session I listened with some amazement to the accusations which were thrown against us, and against the Government especially, as to their conduct in the election of February, 1887. I presumed, as a matter of course, that those hon. gentlemen had some grounds for those accusations, and I thought that, when they got the opportunity, they would substantiate those accusations. They declared that all they wanted was the opportunity. They said: Give us the opportunity, and we will show you how you have behaved, we will show you that the constituencies have been deceived and that they are now waiting for the opportunity to return members to support the Opposition in place of the members now supporting the Government. They got the opportunity in many cases, and how many more have they now than they had last Session? Have they one more? On the contrary they have less. Did they get any more voters in the constituencies in which they returned the same members as they had before? Were any more votes recorded in favor of the Opposition than there were in favor of the Government? No, Sir, it was on the contrary. Wherever an opportunity was offered to the people, there was a larger number of voters who recorded their votes for those sitting on this side of the House, and I may say also that in every case those hon. gentlemen have failed to substantiate their charges or their contentions. Does that show that they have justice and right on their side? It is just the opposite. When they brought up the returning officer from Queen's, N. B., they made a spectacle of themselves when they had that man before the House. With all the legal power and legal knowledge and legal wisdom which they had arrayed against him, they showed themselves to be perfectly imbecile in regard to that charge. I contend that, with all these facts before them, it is unwise and it is improper and it is insulting for them to throw their charges against us, and to say that we vote for what we know to be wrong and unjust. What is the charge which is brought against this deputy returning officer? It is that at one time of his life he did wrong, and he was punished for it. Perhaps if every hon. member on that side of the House had been dealt with according to his deserts, many might have been punished. At any rate, if this man was guilty, he paid the penalty, he paid it to the public and to the law, and there has been no charge that he did not do right since that, there is no charge that he did not discharge his duties properly as a deputy returning officer. What do the hon. gentlemen assert that the Government should do? The last speaker said that he wished the Minister of Justice to say, I have done wrong, and I am sorry. Did he suppose that the Minister of Justice would take that course? For several years I was returning officer, and I made my own appointments, and I never asked the Government whom they were pleased or displeased with as regards deputy returning officers. All I studied was to see that I had deputy returning officers who would do my work well. That is what I looked after. I never asked what the man had done before, but was he prepared at that time to do my work well, so that the Government would bring no charge against me, and the candidates would bring no charge against me, and the public would bring no charge against me. That was the object I had in view, and I venture to say that this returning officer who has been referred to in this case had the same object in view, and, if this man who was appointed as a deputy returning officer did his work well, the returning officer was justified in appointing him, and these hon. gentlemen have nothing to complain of. If the deputy returning officer has done wrong, let him be brought to the proper tribunal, and no man would be more desirous than myself to see that he was punished if he did not faithfully perform his duty.

These deputy returning officers should always do their duty, and should be punished if they do not. I think this discussion is a thorough waste of the time of the House. If this man, at some time or other, stole anything or committed any other crime for which he was punished, he paid the penalty; but, if he has done any wrong in this particular case, bring him before the proper tribunal and punish him. The cause of my rising to-day, however, was the continual throwing out from that side of the House of statements that we are frauds on this side, that we support injustice in place of justice. Dare hon. gentlemen tell me that outside of this House? They dare not do it, and what they dare not do outside of the House, as gentlemen they ought not to do inside of this House.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman opposite has asked me a question. He has said in effect that he expected me to state to the House that I had been misled in the statement which I made and that I had accepted the statement which was put before the House this afternoon. If he had followed my remarks, he would have observed that I expressly reserved myself from accepting the statements which were put before the House this afternoon, and which was sprung upon the House by the hon. gentleman, because I think the persons who are referred to ought to have an opportunity of answering those statements. I do not want to be misrepresented as to anything I may have said, and I may therefore state that I gave the best information to the House which was in my possession at the time. I do not think the question which the hon. gentleman put is one that should have been asked. I think it is not a question in regard to which the Government has any responsibility, but, notwithstanding that, I should be very sorry to have misled the House, but if the statements which have been put before the House now are correct, I was misled myself. Still, I think that these people should have an opportunity of replying to them before we come to any conclusion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With the permission of the House I will lay on the Table these three affidavits so that hon. gentlemen may inspect them.

Mr. RYKERT. You had better keep them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; I leave them for the information of the Minister of Justice, who desires, as I understood him, to investigate the matter.

Mr. RYKERT. They don't amount to much.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They simply amount to this, in my opinion, that they are the clearest possible proof that a man whom it was a disgrace to place in a position of justice, has been placed there. With regard to some remarks that have been made on the other side, particularly by the last speaker or two, I will just simply say, that they are tantamount to a declaration within the minds of those hon. gentlemen that ex-convicts are fit and proper returning officers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, they do not think ex-convicts are fit and proper persons for returning officers; then let the Government deal with this returning officer who has appointed such. The First Minister, however, asked a question of this House to which I will venture to offer a suggestion. The First Minister declared that Provincial Governments were not fit persons to be intrusted with the selection of men to act as returning officers, that they put pressure on returning officers to appoint proper deputies—that, I think, was his contention;—that therefore, in self-defence, he had taken it into his own hands, which is the same as saying that he had assigned to the ministerial candidates the task of selecting the returning officers who were to sit in judgment on them, and that was his pro-

Mr. FREEMAN.

ference. He asked the House, what is the alternative? Well, I say there are several alternatives. It would be possible, I think, although, I do not desire to mix up our judges too much with these things—it would be possible to allow officers of the judiciary to select the returning officers; it would be possible to allow such a court as this: a court composed of the warden, representing the people of the county; a judge, representing the Dominion Government; and the sheriff of the county, or the registrar of the county, an appointee of the local Government, to select a returning officer; with either of such reasonable impartiality would be obtained. That impartiality will be obtained under the present system, no human being believes.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to make a personal explanation. I wish to say with regard to the remark of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), that I never heard until to-day, neither did any hon. members sitting near me hear until to-day, the charge against returning officers that they had withheld returns. On the contrary, we understood that the chief charge against the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery had been that the returns had not been sent in, and that he had withheld them.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Justice has risen twice in his place and addressed the House, since the charge was made by the hon. member for South Oxford, and he has not, so far as I have heard, nor has any member of the Government expressed the slightest regret, that a returning officer of the Government, after he had been formally notified of the character of this deputy returning officer, should have appointed him again. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is all very well to say that we must wait till the other side is heard. But surely when an hon. gentleman of the position and standing of the hon. member for South Oxford in this House, makes a statement of that kind, in his place—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And he knows it.

Mr. EDGAR. And when, more than that, he brings affidavits and shows a *prima facie* case, surely the Minister of Justice who holds that high position in which he has great responsibility before the people of the country, surely he ought at least to be able to say. Well, if that be true, I exceedingly regret it. But we have not had one word of that kind from the hon. gentleman or from any of his followers in this House. The First Minister has seemed to justify the whole thing from beginning to end, his followers have done the same. The hon. gentleman from Nova Scotia, who made such a warlike speech a moment ago, states that he would not find fault with any returning officer, and he could not be found fault with, so long as he did his work well. Of course, this man in Haldimand did his work well, therefore he should not be found fault with. But the debate took a little wider range, and the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Madill) told us about some appointments to office made by the Ontario Government in his county. Well, Sir, perhaps hon. members may have observed that in the Province of Ontario, when the Treasurer was making his budget speech the other day, he announced that certain defalcations had been discovered in the Treasury, and he was pressed urgently by the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Meredith, in that House, to say what he had done upon discovering the defalcation, and when he was pressed he said, without giving names—I do not know the names myself—that an officer had been dismissed from the service on account of that defalcation, and he had since been taken into the service of the Dominion Government.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). My hon. friend has referred to the remark of the First Minister. He forgets that my hon. friend from Oxford made a certain charge, which was in reply to the Minister of Justice. They both confined themselves to a specific case. Then the leader of the Opposition got up; he did not touch on that case, but he

went into generalities, enlarging on that subject, and the First Minister, in reply to the leader of the Opposition, confined himself to that reply. Now, I do not know about the other Provinces, but I challenge any member of the Opposition from the Province of Ontario to stand up in his place and name the appointment of a returning officer at the last general election that he considers objectionable. I would like him to get up and enumerate a case where the present Government did not select officers who were worthy to be selected. I recollect, in the debate in 1882, when the law was changed, that the First Minister stated then that it was not his intention to exclude the sheriffs and the registrars, except in cases where these men, appointees of the Local Government, had proved themselves unworthy partisans. And they have not been excluded. In my part of the country they are invariably chosen, and I shall not sit here and allow to go to the country these general statements, without getting up and contradicting them. As an illustration, there are two by-elections pending to-day in the Province of Ontario, and I ask, Who is the returning officer in the riding of Kent? Who is the returning officer for Russell? In Kent, it is the sheriff of the county, and in Russell, it is the registrar, and these men are appointed, not because they are Ontario officials, but because their moral character and standing in the community justify this Government in selecting them for the position. That is the true ground upon which the Government are acting, and I believe they are thoroughly justified.

Motion to adjourn the House withdrawn.

THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that resolution respecting salary of Auditor General be concurred in. He said: As I stated to the House, the Government held very strongly, indeed, the necessity of the Auditor General occupying an entirely independent position. He was a parliamentary officer, and did not occupy the position that other officers occupied, and the moment my attention was drawn to the fact, that, in bringing him under the operation of the Superannuation Act, it appeared to have the effect of placing a certain amount of governmental control over that officer, I felt that it was a matter that required further consideration. It was suggested, subsequently, that in the meantime we should ascertain what measures were necessary in order to remove entirely any such objection, and I suggested that the object would entirely be accomplished by placing the officer under the operation of the Superannuation Act, except as regards two clauses which appear to give a certain amount of governmental control. But I was greatly surprised to find, on referring to the discussion that had taken place in this House, that hon. gentlemen opposite and not this Government were entirely responsible for having placed the Auditor General under the operation of the Superannuation Act. I hold in my hand the original Act passed in regard to the Auditor General. The Act is to be found in the Acts of 1878, page 47:

"The Acts 33 Vic., c. 4, and 36 Vic., c. 32, and 38 Vic., c. 9, providing for the superannuation of officers employed in the public service of the Dominion, shall apply to the Auditor General and officers, clerks and other persons employed in his office."

So there was no necessity, so far as the present Auditor General was concerned, for any Bill. He had the benefit of the Superannuation Act, and under the authority of the Act placed on the Statute-book by hon. gentlemen opposite when he was appointed, he has been paying regularly his contribution; but it was in relation to his successor, as this Act had been dropped out of the Revised Statutes, that it became necessary to re-enact it. I now propose to meet the difficulty by providing in this Bill that the Superannuation Act shall apply to the Auditor General, except to two

clauses which seem to give the Government a certain amount of control over officers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that is decidedly desirable. Of course it is very desirable that the Auditor General should have the benefit of the Superannuation Act, but care should be taken to provide that occasion could not be seized by any Government to deprive that officer of his position; it is very important, I am bound to say, that this care should be exercised.

Mr. EDGAR. I am sure the Finance Minister must admit that when explanations were made with respect to the provisions of this Bill neither he nor any of his colleagues were able to give the explanation he has just made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is so; our attention had not been drawn to it.

Mr. THOMPSON. I confess that I was not aware that the Auditor General was entitled to superannuation under the Act of 1878, under which he was appointed. I think hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that it is sufficiently difficult to bear in mind the statute laws, without being able to recall Acts repealed. The Act was repealed in the revision of the statutes, the view of the revisers being that the Auditor General was under the Civil Service Act, and therefore the Superannuation Act applied. But that was a mistaken view, because he is not a member of the civil service and is not covered by the Superannuation Act without being especially mentioned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Supposing, as it is possible, that the Auditor General became too infirm or too old to properly discharge his onerous duties, how would you act in that case?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think in that emergency the Government would be compelled to take action and assume the responsibility of appointing some officer to discharge the duties of the office until Parliament could be consulted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You would call upon Parliament finally by formal Act to dispose of him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think so, no doubt of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because it is important that the Auditor General should be strictly an officer of Parliament and only be removable as judges are removable.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Exactly so.

Resolution concurred in.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE AND AUDIT ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 87) to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, chap. 29 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How exactly is that Treasury Board now composed? Are there not some considerable alterations in it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It consists of the Minister of Finance, who is *ex-officio* chairman of the Board, the Minister of Justice, the Secretary of State, the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that all?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And one to be appointed by the Government, who at present is the Minister of Public Works.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is in fact a committee of the Privy Council composed of four members and one holding office on what I shall term "good behaviour."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At least one removable officer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

On section 6,

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to that clause there is a large and important omission I think. Some words are omitted from the old thirty-fifth clause. There is an alteration in the month, and the date is changed from the 31st of October to the 30th of September. I suppose that is a matter of convenience. Several words are left out after "June preceding." The words left out are: "For the interest and management of the public funded and unfunded debt, for the civil list, and all other issues in the financial year."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The only alteration is to provide for sending to the Auditor all accounts before the 30th of September instead of the 31st October.

Mr. EDGAR. There is evidently a clerical mistake because some very important words are left out of the old section after the words "June preceding." I suppose that one of the greatest advantages of having the Auditor General's report was that he should comply with the section as it stood?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I shall consider that matter and we will postpone that clause in the meantime.

On section 7,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is referring to public accounts to be laid before Parliament, and it is amended by striking out the words, "Such accounts to be countersigned by the Auditor General." That is according to the present practice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason or the object of the countersigning?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It never has been done, as the Auditor General considers it unnecessary, and it has not been done because it has not been found of any advantage.

On section 8,

Mr. EDGAR. What is the change?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The department prepares the appropriation account on the 30th September instead of the 31st of October.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This makes the report a month earlier, is that the only change?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. It omits by what department such accounts should be prepared and rendered to the Auditor. There is no reason for that, as each department is bound to prepare its own accounts.

Mr. EDGAR. In the amended section 40 there is an omission of the words, "provided always that the Auditor General may, if he thinks fit, require the said department to transmit to him, in lieu of said balance sheet, a certified statement showing the actual disposition of the balances."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This amended section omits the special statement, and requires that outstanding balances shall be accounted for not later than the next financial year. It is more clear and positive than the old section. The amended section 43 enacts by what officer the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

appropriation account of each department shall be signed. The old section merely stated that it should be signed by the proper officer. The old section 44 provides that the accounts shall be examined to see whether the payments are supported by vouchers or proofs of payments. The amended section is more explicit. Under it payments are to be supported by vouchers required by this Act, and by proofs of payment.

On section 10,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This section amends section 48 of the Act. With regard to the matters to which the Auditor General shall call the attention of Parliament, the old Act states that he shall report cases in which it appears to him that a grant has been exceeded. The words, "it appears to him," are omitted in the amended section, so as to require him to report all cases. It leaves no option to him.

Committee rose and reported progress.

ADULTERATION ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 47) to amend the Adulteration Act, chap. 107 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. COSTIGAN. The first change is made on the recommendation of the chief analyst, so as to provide that such articles as baking powder shall be included in the term "food." According to the ruling of some of the judges that term does not include such articles, and therefore, we could not reach baking powder that might be found to be of an injurious character. The second change makes the term "analyst" include any member of the examining board and any assistant analyst to the chief analyst at Ottawa. It is considered that the members of the board ought to be as well qualified to give evidence in the courts as the analysts to whose qualifications they certify. The reason for taking the power under clause 5 is that the vote given by Parliament from the administration of this Act is a limited vote for the services to be performed. It is necessary to obtain these samples all over the country, and have them sent either to the local analyst or to the chief analyst at Ottawa. Instead of appointing a new class of officers outside of the service, to whom salaries would have to be paid, it is proposed to take the power of designating some officer already in the service whose salary might be supplemented by a small appropriation from this vote.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me you take larger powers under the Bill. Under the Act, as it exists, you are limited to employing only inspectors and deputy inspectors of weights and measures. By this Bill you take power to appoint special officers.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am sure that power is there; cases do occur where it is necessary to exercise that power, and we find it very inconvenient not to have it. I am quite willing, however, that this should be struck out. I will not press for the power to appoint others than those named in the present Act.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not know whether the amendment is called for or not, but the amendment does not seem to be consistent with the explanation given by the hon. Minister.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This Bill would give the power to add these additional duties to the duties of any of the officers now in the service of the department, and to take a portion of the amount appropriated by Parliament for the administration of the Act to pay for such additional service.

Section 51 of the Civil Service Act provides that no additional sum can be paid to any member of the Civil Service.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It would be better if the hon. gentleman would explain each section by itself.

On section 1,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the hon. gentleman not got the power under the Act to add any article that he wants by Order in Council. I would like a definition of the word food. For instance, the hon. gentleman speaks of baking powder. Does that come under the term food?

Mr. THOMPSON. A decision was given that the article of food could only be defined to be something that could be consumed in its then condition.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Every article that can be consumed in its then condition would come under this definition?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think so.

On section 2,

Mr. EDGAR. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that this amendment was introduced in order to enable the Government to appoint existing officers to do this work, rather than appoint new officers. The amendment, however, does not agree with that explanation, but gives the power to the Government to appoint any person for that purpose. That would be giving the Government rather a dangerous power. Is it desirable to take up people all over the country and appoint them for this purpose, giving them compulsory powers of inspection? The Government is asking for power to give to anyone at all, without discrimination, these complete powers.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman objects to that part of the clause which proposes that the Government shall have the power of appointing others besides those named. When the leader of the Opposition called my attention to that, I said that I did not consider that feature of the Bill important and I would strike it out.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That will strike out the whole clause.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I wish to add something to the clause. I was explaining the whole matter when I was asked to take the Bill section by section. I am quite prepared to strike out these words:

And any person specially appointed by the Minister of Inland Revenue.

But I stated before that we have the power to give these additional duties to the officers named in this Act, but, on account of section 51 of the Civil Service Act, unless we make some provision here, we have no right to take any money to pay them out of the money which is voted in regard to the adulteration of food, and other things. I propose to add this:

The prohibition contained in the first paragraph of section 51 of the Act concerning the Civil Service of Canada shall not extend to officers rendering service under this section.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the Minister propose to give these officers any extra pay?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Certainly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You propose to give extra pay to your own officers?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Certainly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain?

Mr. COSTIGAN. When I add these additional duties to those already performed by those officers, by using them I save the necessity of creating a staff of new officers, and the

duties can be performed much cheaper than they could by appointing new men. It is the same principal which I have adopted in regard to the inspectors of gas. I do not think I have appointed an additional inspector of gas, or if any, very few, as the duties have been assigned to excise or other officers by the officers already appointed. Whenever the position of a gas inspector was open, I appointed an officer of my department, if there was one in the locality, and paid him \$100 or \$150 or \$200 to discharge the duties of gas inspector in that district. Under the Act gas inspectors might be and were appointed at salaries ranging from \$800 to \$1,200 or \$1,400 a year by the former Government. I have not disturbed those officers who were already appointed, but, instead of creating new appointments, I have added these new duties to the local officer, with some advantage to him and with a saving to the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But this is only, as I understand, for the procuring of samples. That is all which this covers?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How many samples are procured in any one year in any special division? Take the Paris division of Inland Revenue, how many samples were procured there during the last year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I might say a few words more in order to obviate the necessity of all the objections which may be raised. The hon. gentleman is mistaken if he is under the impression that such an officer is to be appointed in every Inland Revenue division throughout the country. That would involve a considerable expense, and the quantity of samples obtained would not justify the extra remuneration; but it is not intended to apply that principle all over the country, even in the employment of our own officers. The appointment will perhaps be confined to one man for a Province. There may be one for Ontario, who will do the whole of that work for the additional amount paid to him; and there may be one for Quebec and one for the Maritime Provinces. Surely the hon. gentleman cannot see anything objectionable in that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But I understand that the Minister has struck this provision for a special officer out. We are now discussing the payment of the officers of Inland Revenue. Surely it is not the intention to allow one officer to go all over the country and procure samples.

Mr. COSTIGAN. An officer will go where it is necessary for him to go.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Suppose the case of Hamilton, the Minister would not ask an officer to go from Ottawa to Hamilton, for instance, but he would tell the officer in Hamilton to get the samples. That officer would not require any additional salary for doing that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If I require samples in the city of Hamilton, I certainly want to have the power to send an officer from the city of Ottawa; and if I require samples in Montreal, I want to have the right to send an officer from Toronto to Montreal to get the samples. An officer in Montreal might do the work, but there may be cases where the officer from Toronto would get the samples much better than the officer in Montreal, and *vice versa* an officer going from Montreal to Toronto, who was not known to the merchants there, would get the samples better than one who was known in Toronto.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand that the Minister is willing to strike out the provision in this Bill to which reference has been made. He was proposing to do one thing, but now he wishes to take power to use an officer in Ottawa or anywhere else for this extra work. It seems to me that the Minister cannot carry this out without additional expense by instructing the officers in the different

Inland Revenue divisions to do the work, and, if he has officers whom he cannot trust in the public interest to assist in carrying out the Adulteration Act, they should be changed. It should not be necessary to send an officer from Ottawa to other parts of the Dominion. We ought to be able to trust our officers, and they ought to be able to do this work, and should be willing to do it, and, if the officer does the work in his own division, there is no reason for him to require extra remuneration. If it should be desired to send an officer from Ottawa to Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, it might be a nice trip for the officer, but how will the ends of justice or the efficiency of the carrying out of the statute be promoted by that? It is clear that this is supposing that the officers in the different divisions are not fit to be trusted in carrying out the provisions of the Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman wants to criticise and find fault, I cannot help it. Have I said a single word to justify the statement that I have not confidence in my officers?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes; when the hon. gentleman says that he might have to send an officer from Ottawa to Hamilton, it must be because he has no confidence in his officer there.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No. The hon. gentleman jumps to a conclusion which is not warranted. I said it might be better to send an officer from Ottawa to Toronto, or from any one division to another, to obtain the samples, because a stranger can get the samples much better than those who are known in the place itself to be officers of the department. Then the hon. gentleman states that I was quite willing to strike out that clause which gives me power to appoint anyone outside of my own staff to do this work. I say at once that I do not want to take that power. The Government is limited now to imposing these duties on the officers named here, officers in regular standing, and belonging to the department in one branch or another. I still hold that in imposing on these officers additional duties, we have a right to ask the power to pay them a small remuneration in consideration of these additional duties.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What words does the hon. gentleman propose to add for that purpose? That is the point.

Mr. COSTIGAN. As I said before to the hon. gentleman, when my attention was called to it by him, I consulted the Minister of Justice on this point and on all the points in the Bill. The words to be added are:

The prohibition contained in the first paragraph of section 51 of the Act concerning the Civil Service of Canada shall not extend to officers rendering service under this section.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The effect of that is that you may pay your officers an extra amount for doing this work.

Mr. COSTIGAN. An additional amount for their services.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is what I object to.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Parliament has laid down this principle. The Civil Service Act provides that, if you come to Parliament in any one case, notwithstanding the 51st section, and state that A, B or C, civil servants, have two or three thousand a year salary, and if you place a sum in the Estimates to pay them a thousand additional for some additional duty, Parliament votes the sum to those officers. The same reason is given now. I take men with small salaries, and I want to pay them out of the fund voted by Parliament for the administration of that branch for which the services of these men will be utilised. All I ask is power to pay a small proportion of that vote to supplement their salaries, instead of being obliged to ask for their whole salary for that particular purpose.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The practice hitherto pursued of adding to the salaries of civil servants in that way, has just been taken exception to by the hon. member for Brant, and I think myself it is a very undesirable practice, and the sooner we put a stop to it the better. But it appears in this case that the hon. gentleman is asking the sanction of this House to appropriate money voted for that purpose to increase the salaries of the officers of his own department. Now, I do think, with all due deference to the Minister, that the officers of his department should do the work allotted to them within their hours of duty—and I do not suppose that they are very frequently worked beyond that time—without any additional remuneration from any other branch. This practice that is growing up of asking the House for an increased vote for such and such a person in the civil service, for services done, or supposed to be done, and very often only supposed to be done, so far as we consider the question, is a practice that should be condemned most emphatically by every member of this House.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman has clearly understood me. The salaries of our excise officers are voted by Parliament. The Estimates provide for a certain amount for the administration of that particular branch of my department, coming under the Act for the Prevention of the Adulteration of Foods and Drugs. Now, I am not asking Parliament for any more money. Parliament has voted the money for the administration of that Act. I have power to appoint collectors of these samples all over the country, and give such a salary as by Order in Council may be approved of, and that will be paid. I do not want to incur such expense as that would be, simply because the clause in the Civil Service Act provides that these accumulated salaries shall not be paid. I want to take the House into my confidence and say that, instead of taking money—not new money—I do not want any more money, because Parliament has voted the money already to enable me to administer that Act. I want Parliament to understand that instead of appointing a new man, as I may do, and which the Civil Service Act does not prevent me from doing—instead of appointing a man at \$1,000 to go and collect these samples, the vote you have given me already enables me to administer the law. Therefore, I want Parliament to understand that I am going to impose this duty upon our present officers, already in our department, and I am going to take a small amount of the money that you voted for that purpose, and pay a portion of their salary out of the vote. I do not ask you to give me a new sum of money to increase the salary of these men; I only want authority to use the money you have placed in my hands for the administration of the law in that way.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has explained the point very clearly, and possibly in some cases the principle may be defensible. I think I understand him, but it amounts to this, and it is a belief which has permeated very deeply the official mind, that no man who holds an office to which a salary can be attached, can be asked to cross a T or dot an I, or do anything that is not in the bond, without being paid extra. Now, the objection which my hon. friend to my left submitted was this, that the hon. gentlemen will ask an official having certain defined duties, with a fixed salary, to do a little work which is not strictly within his department, and then ask us to pay him for it. For every additional act they ask us to pay an extra sum of money. It may be right that should be done, but my impression is, and it is the impression of many members of the House, that many of the officials in the hon. gentleman's department, serving in the outlying parts of the Dominion, so far from being overworked, are very much underworked. I may be wrong in

that, but my impression is that they have not got half enough to do, in some cases. It may be unfortunate that it is so, the hon. gentleman may have to pay a large salary, a man may be necessary in a certain place, and the duties of the office may not be sufficient to occupy all his time, but you have to pay him a salary. The hon. gentleman is carrying out the principle that if you ask any one of these men, who have very few duties attached to their office, to do one single thing that is not in the scope of the appointment he must pay them extra for it. I do not think that is a desirable thing to do. I do not think their duties are very onerous, and they might be fairly asked to do that without additional pay.

Committee rose.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 47) to amend the Adulteration Act, chap. 107 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Inland Revenue has explained that the amendment he proposes would enable him to pay officers in his department, who are already in receipt of salaries, an additional sum for work in which he might employ them in connection with the Inspection Act, and he proposed to do this without placing a sum in the Estimates. The opinion is entertained very largely on this side of the House that members of the Civil Service should be paid enough to secure their time, and not be continually asked to do other work for which extra pay must be granted. The hon. gentleman says the country will not lose anything by adopting his proposition, because payment will be made out of special sums appropriated by Parliament for carrying out the Adulteration Act. Surely if he pays them in that way, he is appropriating their time which should be given to another service, and they should not be paid for both services. There will be no saving, directly or indirectly, effected by paying the men out of one fund more than another. The principle is objectionable as well as the practice.

On section 3.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The same reason applies to this change in the law that I gave in connection with the first clause. It has been decided by the courts that if an article to be submitted to analysis be sent out of the district where it was taken, it is questionable whether that will stand. The chief analyst takes the ground that it would be better that people should be free to submit samples to any of the analysts. One analyst might be a better authority on a particular article than another, and for that reason as well as for the reason that it is important that any analysis should be legal, this section has been framed.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 101) to make further provision respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, Limited.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Any appropriation of public money looking to the development of the natural channels of trade, is, of course, a defensible measure; but it appears to me, looking at this undertaking on its merits, that it is an utter waste of public money. I have never yet seen or heard any man in the Maritime Provinces, familiar with the trade of that part of the country, who entertains the

opinion that any good will result from the expenditure of money to build the railway contemplated under this Bill. The hon. Minister of Finance last night mentioned that an eminent engineering authority in England, a Mr. Fowler, had expressed an opinion as to the feasibility of this work. I have no doubt whatever that that was the case, because there can be no doubt that the work can be completed if you are disposed to spend sufficient money. We know very well that in a great enterprise of this kind where there is a large subsidy concerned, that when people go to England where money is cheap they will go to an engineer of the eminent character that I have no doubt this gentleman is and submit a project to him and he will say it is quite feasible. He did not go so far as to pronounce the same hopeful opinion as to the working of that railway, nor did he give us any information regarding the opinion of any eminent or prominent authority with respect to its usefulness in the future. It is in that aspect of the case that I think it is unfortunate the Government are committed to this expense. I suppose they are bound to go on and I do not intend to delay the House by offering further opposition to it than merely to say I regard it as an unnecessary expense and I cannot allow it to pass without recording my opinion against it.

Mr. WELSH. I quite agree with the words that have fallen from the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). I think it is a work that is unnecessary, and that is my private opinion. I know the place well. I know Baie Verte and I know there is a shoaly strand where you have to go for five miles from shore before you get twenty feet of water. I would like to know how you will build this railway. If you build it on the principle of a marine slip you will find great difficulty. Any person in this House conversant with the shipping interests knows that there are very few marine slips so perfect that they can take a ship out of water and take her on the blocks without doing her an injury. I say that in taking a ship out of water, say a ship of 1,000 tons, loaded or unloaded, and conveying her overland, the chances are that the ship will be badly injured. If this Bill passes I hope there will be a clause inserted that the company will be liable for any damage or injury done to a ship during transport. I notice that this company applied for a charter seven years ago and that they got what they asked for. I find that a few years after they applied for an amendment to that Act. They obtained the amendment seven years after the passing of that Act granting them all they asked for, and without their putting a spade in the ground or having a shilling paid out they asked this House for further amendments. I think that is pressing the matter rather close. The hon. the Minister of Finance stated the other evening that everything comes to those who wait, and I think those gentlemen who applied for an amendment to the charter are acting upon that principle. I think it is a bad principle, where a company after seven years comes a third time applying to this House for further concessions or for further grants in some way or other, that we should grant it until they do something. In looking over the list of promoters of this scheme I do not find many shipowners among them. Every hon. gentleman in this House knows that some ten or twelve or thirteen years ago there was an agitation for a Baie Verte Canal, and this was agitated for a number of years. Finally the Government of the country appointed a commission to take evidence as to the feasibility and chance of success for that canal. I think that the result of that commission was that the canal was not warranted, that it was not feasible and that it would be of no service. I myself remember being in court when the evidence was taken. I remember the evidence of an old man, Captain Salmon, I think his name was, who had been engaged in the Bay of Fundy trade for several years and who had

served in the Imperial Navy. He was asked his reasons for objecting to the canal, and he said he would sooner go the long route than he would attempt it if there was a navigable river across this isthmus. It was a large tidal basin, that there was a great rise and fall of tide, and it was full of rocks and shoals—more dangerous for navigation than any part of the world, I suppose. He was asked what was his reason. He said: A fog; and when they asked him what was the fog, he said: I have been there and I mean it. Sir (somebody) Young, I think it was, asked him how thick the fog was? and he said: I have seen the fog so thick that I could make a looking glass of my hand. I think that is true. If this Bill passes I would like to have a clause in it to the effect that the company should be liable to any damage or injury sustained by any ship transferred by that railway. I know well and any person acquainted with shipping knows, that if you build a ship the foroman must look after her to keep her in proper position when she is building, so liable is she to strain from undue weight on any one section. If a ship is so difficult to keep in position when she is not moving, how difficult is it to get her out of water on to a marine slip and how much more difficult it is to take a ship out of water and take her 20 miles over land and drop her into the Bay of Fundy. I really believe that it will be more than the third time the House will be troubled with this kind of thing, for I do not imagine that any capitalists will invest money in it. I should like another clause in the Act, and that is, that the company shall not commence operations until they have a paid up capital of a million of money. I remember, some years ago, that a company got a concession to build a railway from the same part of Nova Scotia. They commenced operations, employed a large number of men, levelled a lot of the road, and all of a sudden the gentleman who got the charter was not to be seen; he was *non est*. The poor people he employed were done out of their money for their supplies and labor, and the man had gone away. What was the consequence? The consequence was that the Government had to undertake this work and pay the people. Suppose this gentleman who comes here three times asking for concessions commences work, employs men and incurs liability, and the people get nothing, will the Government have to pay it? I suggest to the Minister of Finance that the company be not allowed to commence operations until a million of capital is paid up, so as to secure liabilities, and to prove this a *bond fide* enterprise. I believe if it was a *bond fide* enterprise they would not, after being granted the concessions they asked in this House, after seven years come this time for the third concession, and without having invested, as I believe, one dollar. All this work is costing the country money, and I think there is a disposition on the part of the Minister of Finance to keep our expenses within bounds, and to check it. It is my will that this policy should be carried out, and that the expenditure of public money should be lessened, and the expenditure of public money for useless purposes should be put an end to.

Mr. ELLIS. This is undoubtedly a purely experimental work; I think there is no railroad or marine slip of this character in the world; and it is certainly quite an undertaking for this country to make such an experiment. The navigation there is open only five or six months in the year, and that is all the time this marine railway can be used. However, the Government appear to be committed to it, and all I desire to say in the matter is that I think it should be distinctly understood on both sides of the House that this undertaking cannot be regarded by Maritime Province men as in the interest of the Maritime Provinces. It may turn out so; but I think there are many things that we are agreed on are necessary for the Maritime Provinces, and should be proceeded with before this work. Therefore, I desire as one representative of the Maritime Provinces to

Mr. WELSH.

disclaim the idea that this can be absolutely and purely for Maritime Provinces purposes, and it ought not to be charged to us as undertaken solely for the benefit of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. EDGAR. So far as Ontario is concerned, I think that Province can stand a little further delay and investigation of the matter, and therefore it should not be shouldered on us.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can hardly allow the measure to be carried, after what has been said, without making a statement to the House. I would remind the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Welsh) that they are six years too late in the speeches they have addressed to the House to-night. This Parliament deliberately six years ago adopted the policy of giving a certain amount of aid for securing the construction of this work, after the matter was put fairly and distinctly before the House; and from that hour down to the present, although certain modifications and extensions of time have been asked, not one dollar additional has been asked by the promoters of this enterprise over and above what Parliament deliberately sanctioned six years ago. So much for that part of the question. Now, Sir, why did the House sanction this work? I can understand the position of the hon. member for Halifax perfectly well. The hon. gentleman wants to prevent the construction of this work in the interests of his own constituents. He wants every vessel sailing from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to be compelled to pass by the port of Halifax, to make a friendly call at that port, and leave a little money there on its way to New York, Boston, or Portland. But I consider it the height of ingratitude on the part of the hon. member for Queen's to stand up here and oppose a measure which, if it is going to benefit one part of this Dominion more than another, will benefit the island on which he lives. Why, Sir, it will give to the great article of export of that Island, potatoes, an increased value almost equal to the amount of the duty that now meets them in the United States. It will enable the large fleets with which Captain Welsh is identified—if he will allow me to use his name—to make two or three voyages between Charlottetown and Boston and New York, for every one that it can make as matters stand to-day.

Mr. WELSH. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why, Sir, I am not attempting to offer to the House, on a question of this kind, my opinion in opposition to that of a gentleman who is perfectly familiar with navigation on the water; but that hon. gentleman has had no experience in navigating his ship on land.

Mr. WELSH. No, and I do not want to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He is no authority on the question of taking his ship over land for twenty miles. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) objects to this work. The fact is, I have cannon in front of me, cannon to the right of me, cannon to the left of me, and cannon in all directions—Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Ontario, all bound to crush this enterprise. Now, Sir, what is the fact? This policy of having the means of sending ships from the Gulf of St. Lawrence into the Bay of Fundy is not a policy of mine. I did not propound it to this House. It was propounded to this House by gentlemen who had more interests in ships and more interest in the traffic of the country, than any of the gentlemen who have addressed the House, great as their interests are.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will you name them?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will. I will name Sir Hugh Allan, the chairman of the commission which recom-

mended this work, and I will give the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) a name that will command respect in the Province of New Brunswick for many years to come, as it has for many years in the past. I will give you the names of the foremost men of every section of this country—of Ontario, of Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—all charged with the important duty of reporting for the consideration of the Government, and for the information of Parliament, the value of having the means of transferring vessels from the Gulf of St. Lawrence into the Bay of Fundy. That Commission, Sir, was composed of Sir Hugh Allan, its chairman; of Col. Gzowski, a distinguished engineer, and a man whose knowledge of trade and business is widely known and respected in this country; Mr. Calvin, a gentleman who had a great interest in all questions connected with inter-provincial trade, and who understood this question about as thoroughly as any gentlemen here; Mr. George Laidlaw, a man of high attainments and great ability; Mr. Garneau, from Quebec, a merchant of high standing, whose opinion would command respect everywhere; Mr. Stairs, of Halifax, a gentleman whose name only requires to be mentioned where he is known to command great and unqualified respect; and Mr. Jardine, of the Province of New Brunswick. Now, Sir, what did these gentlemen say? That there was no object in shortening the distance from Quebec to the Bay of Fundy? Let me read to the House what they did say:

"Inseparably connected with the growth of intercolonial trade is the construction of the Baie Verte Canal."

Mr. MITCHELL. Canal, not railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend will keep quiet, I will come to the reason for the substitution of the ship railway for the canal. The first point is the question of traffic—is there business sufficient to warrant the work? Ontario, Quebec, and all the Provinces are interested in shortening this communication. I establish that by an authority that I consider as great and undoubted as any authority that could be offered on a commercial and engineering question to this House. They said:

"The advantages that must accrue, not merely to the Dominion as a whole, but to the commerce of the Maritime Provinces, are so clearly pointed out by the boards of trade of all the leading cities of Canada, and by men interested in the development of our commercial cities—not simply the merchants of St. John and other places in the locality of the proposed canal, but merchants at Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, and Quebec—that it is superfluous for the commissioners more than briefly to refer to a few salient features of the scheme."

"A steamer laden with flour for St. John, N.B., now goes down the Gulf as far as Shediac, where the cargo is transported by rail to its destination. The total distance by water from Shediac through the Gut of Canso and round the coast of Nova Scotia to the Bay of Fundy, as far as the commercial capital of New Brunswick, is about 600 miles, and the consequence is that there is little or no direct communication between the Bay of Fundy ports and those of the River St. Lawrence.

That is to say, that the construction of the canal at that point, or of any other means that will accomplish the same object as the canal, will shorten the distance between Shediac and the port of St. John by no less than 600 miles.

"By a canal through the isthmus, from Shediac, the distance to St. John will not be more than 100 miles. This fact will show the insuperable obstacle that now exists to anything like extensive commerce between Montreal and the Bay of Fundy ports of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and the great impulse that must necessarily be given to the trade by the opening out of a route which will shorten distance so considerably, furnish an inland navigation from the lakes to Boston, and consequently lessen freights between those points at least twenty-five per cent."

Now it is quite true that my hon. friend from Queen's, P. E. I., will lose that 25 per cent. on the voyage; but he must not forget that although he will get 25 per cent. less for the cargo he carries over this ship railway, he will make it up in another way. He will send four vessels through in this way for every one he can send to Boston or New York, with that very valuable commodity of which

Prince Edward Island is so prolific. It has been shown that there is a tonnage on the Bay of Fundy from the gulf ports of something like 2,687,550 tons entering and leaving these ports per annum, which would receive the advantage of this work. Then there is the fishing fleet of not less, I believe, than 600 vessels per annum, which would avail themselves of this ship railway and would be a source of incalculable wealth and profit to the great commercial city of St. John. I am astounded, Sir, at the remarks of the hon. member for St. John; but I was glad from one point of view, to hear that hon. gentleman make the speech he made to-night, because I believe he could not have made any speech that would be of greater strength to the Government or more likely to relieve this House of his presence than the speech he made with reference to this enterprise. Knowing, as the hon. member for St. John's does, that the press and people of St. John have been for years urging the Government to adopt this scheme, I was astounded to hear the hon. gentleman endeavor to kill this enterprise from which the city of St. John will receive greater benefit than any other portion of the Dominion. If I looked upon the hon. gentleman as an exponent, which I do not, of the views and sentiments of his constituents on this question, I would just as soon see the Bill thrown out as not, because I should feel that if a city which must inevitably derive the advantage that the city of St. John will from this measure is disposed to endeavor to thwart and obstruct the efforts the Government are making to give that city these great advantages and benefits, it would be hardly worth our while to endeavor to force these blessings, not only on an ungrateful, but on an unwilling community. The hon. gentleman talks about this country not being able to make the experiment. The country is not making it. Let the hon. gentleman read the Bill, and he will find that the Government of this country are not imperilling a single sixpence of the country's money. No money has been expended on the enterprise by the Government. A large sum of money has been expended in connection with the enterprise, but it has been expended by one of the hon. gentleman's own friends in New Brunswick. It has been expended by a gentleman of high character and standing as an engineer who has satisfied himself of the entire practicability of this work. It has been expended by a gentleman who was so confident of the practicability of the work that without the aid of one dollar from the Government or the Parliament of Canada, he spent six years of his own time—six years of the time of a man whose services commands a very large remuneration—and spent his own money in endeavoring to bring this work to completion. It is not an experiment the Government is making, nor is the Government imperilling a single sixpence, because under this scheme the work must be accomplished and must be continued to be performed if the country is to pay any money. What are the terms? They are, that the Government is not to be bound, directly or indirectly, to furnish one sixpence until that work is completed, and until the ships are transported from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Bay of Fundy and *vice versa* for a year. Vessels five times as large as those which will cross this railway are lifted by hydraulic pressure at the East India docks at London out of the water every day a distance of fifty feet, with the same ease, facility, and celerity almost as I lift up my hand. So that, so far as regards the difficulty, that question has been disposed of. Is there found to be any difficulty, any question of damages in taking these large vessels out of the water and lifting them to this great height? Not the least. That can be seen every day in the week by any one who will visit the East India docks in London. Then, as far as moving the ships on a marine slip is concerned, we have seen marine slips in which, by steam power, ships are drawn, not along a level

as they would be in this case, but up a steep incline, and that is done without any harm or injury to the vessel whatever. But I say that this question involves no risk on the part of the Government, because the company not only have to complete the work, but they have to successfully operate it for a year before they get the first year's subsidy; and if the second year, the third year, or the tenth year, the works fail and the company are unable to carry on this work successfully, that moment the subsidy stops; so that we only pay so long as the work is completely and successfully done. I have shown not only did these gentlemen, the high authority I have referred to, show that we would be warranted in spending \$5,000,000 in the construction of a canal there, and that it would be a profitable investment for the people of this country, but that Parliament only abandoned the construction of this canal when Mr. Page, by his estimates, declared that the work, instead of being accomplished for \$5,000,000, would cost from \$9,000,000 to \$10,000,000. That, it was thought, would be more than under the circumstances the Government would be justified in spending. What does this scheme involve? It involves less, all told, than \$3,000,000. The hon. gentleman may be interested in knowing that our neighbors in the United States take so deep an interest in providing the means of transport of vessels from the Bay of Fundy into the Gulf of St. Lawrence, that at this moment there is a Bill before Congress, placed there by a distinguished senator, by which it is proposed that the Government of the United States should contribute half the money and ask the Canadian Government to contribute the other half to build this canal at joint expense. So that instead of its being supposed by these gentlemen, who know the currents of trade and are acquainted with what is likely to be profitable, that there is no business to be done, the evidence of this Commission shows that great facilities would be given and a great advancement would be made in the trade and commerce of the country. If, instead of circumnavigating Nova Scotia in order to oblige the hon. member for Halifax, by making vessels come in there as lame ducks, they can take the short cut, you will have Montreal, that great centre of commerce, and the great lakes with their shipping, and all those places in connection with them, by saving 600 miles of circuitous navigation, brought into direct connection with the Bay of Fundy, and thus with Portland, Boston and New York. We are not asked to risk any money on this. It is to be a success or we are not to pay any money at all, and an engineer of the highest standing has so satisfied himself as to the practicability of the scheme that he has given six years of the best period of his life to it, and has at this moment behind him the highest engineering talent in the world. There is no higher engineering authority in the world than Sir John Fowler, and he told me himself that, having examined this question from beginning to end, from top to bottom, he had satisfied himself not only of its entire practicability, but of the ease and success with which this navigation overland could be accomplished. Therefore, I have a right to say to the House, having taken the best information which I could get, that the plan is feasible. There is an eminent engineer in this House, and, though I have not discussed the matter with him, I should be greatly surprised to hear him say that there is any difficulty in raising ships from the water, carrying them over a road 17 miles in length on a dead level, and placing them on the other side without any damage to ship or cargo. Sir John Fowler told me that a ship carried in that way from Baie Verte to the Bay of Fundy is not exposed to one tithe of the strain to which a ship is exposed in a severe storm; that vessels that go through a storm with ease and facility, through storms which they encounter every day, is exposed to ten times

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the danger and difficulty that it would be in being transported by the means proposed. Parliament has over and over again voted money for this purpose, and I say that it is certain that the ship railway is infinitely superior to the canal. The hon. gentleman says that it can only be used for six months in the year. That must apply to the canal, because the ship railway can be used much longer, and so has an advantage over the canal. The cost of carriage will be extremely light, and much less than would be involved in the tolls which would be required to pay the interest on the \$5,000,000 necessary for the construction of the canal. I do not think I need detain the House longer than to say that my hon. friend's fear of damages should be removed by the fact that the most eminent engineers in the world are prepared to show him that there is no risk of damage whatever. But, even if there should be damage, does not the hon. gentleman know that, when a vessel is brought through Government canals, and is wrecked through the fault of the Government of Canada, or through any neglect on the part of the Minister of Railways and Canals, we have to pay the money, and we have done so over and over again? So, in regard to this enterprise, as the owners of a canal are bound to pay any damage caused by a failure on their part, the same thing must necessarily result. My hon. friend is very anxious that this company should not be allowed to undertake the work until they can find \$1,000,000. The work would have been undertaken long ago but that these gentlemen would not engage in it until they had raised, not \$1,000,000 simply, but every dollar required to complete the work, or until that was secured by the sale of the bonds and securities. I am asking the House for nothing which it did not grant six years ago, nothing that has not been submitted to the highest authority in this country and admitted to be of the greatest advantage to the business of this Dominion, or at all events to the business of the eastern portion of this Dominion, and I think we might extend it further. The Government is not asked to pay any money, but simply to enable English capitalists to furnish all the money required and to give us this work at half the cost we could obtain these advantages in any other way. I think the House must see the great advantages to the trade and commerce of Canada that will follow the construction of this work.

Mr. MITCHELL. This House knows very well the great admiration I have for the abilities of the Minister of Finance, and I must say that, in all my experience of him, I have never admired him more than I have in the argument which he has made in favor of this Bay of Fundy ship railway. I have heard of a great many queer schemes in my life, but, of all the queer schemes that I ever heard of, to take money out of the pockets of the people of this country, and in addition to fleece the British public, I have never heard of anything to equal this Chignecto ship railway. The hon. gentleman has made two or three propositions. He has referred to the appointment of a commission by the Government some years ago in reference to canals. It is fashionable with the Government of which the First Minister is the head to appoint commissions when those hon. gentleman get into a tight place, and I remember very well when that commission was appointed, but it was not in regard to this particular scheme, but as to whether canals in general should be constructed or subsidised by the Government, as against railways, and it was upon that commission that Sir Hugh Allan and Colonel Gzowski and other distinguished gentlemen to whom the Minister has referred were appointed. They went over a great number of the canals of this country. If I recollect aright, they commenced in the far west with the Sault Canal. Then they had the Trent Valley Canal, the Ottawa Valley Canal, the whole system of the St. Lawrence canals, and last of all they tacked on to their report the ship canal between the waters of the St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman mean that that commission recommended either the Trent Valley Canal or the Ottawa Valley Canal?

Mr. MITCHELL. I am simply stating the facts. I do not think I interrupted the hon. gentleman when he was speaking except to smile in a credulous manner. They made a general report, and they dealt with them, and if my memory serves me right, I think they were rather down on canals generally. The hon. gentleman has striven to show the mechanical possibility of building a railway that will take ships out of the waters of the Bay of Fundy and will land them in the waters of the St. Lawrence. No one doubts the possibility of that. No one doubts that money will do anything. The hon. gentleman referred to a distinguished engineer in this House, who, I presume, is my hon. friend whom I have in my eye (Mr. Shanly), and he called upon him to verify the fact that such a thing is possible. No one doubts that it is possible; no one doubts that money will do anything, and that it is possible to build a railway which will do what the hon. gentleman proposes. That is one proposition which my hon. friend started. That proposition I concede to him at once. My hon. friend says that seven years ago this House sanctioned the idea of building a ship railway. If my memory serves me aright, the proposition seven years ago was to build a ship canal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Six years ago. I said it was in 1882 this Bill was passed.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, six years ago, and seven years ago application was made, if I recollect aright. He states that a young gentlemen who has devoted six years of his life to the prosecution of this enterprise, invested a large amount of money in it. Now, Sir, that gentleman to whom he refers may have invested a great deal of money in it, but so far as I can learn there is no work done. Where the money has been invested I do not know. That is the second proposition the hon. gentleman has made. The third proposition is the great advantage it would be to the trade and commerce of Montreal and Quebec and the Gulf ports, connected with the trade of St. John. Now, Sir, I ask: What would be the trade suppose you had a canal built to-morrow over that route—much less a ship railway? Does my hon. friend pretend to tell me that he has submitted to this House any statistics upon which he could base the continuation of the insane act which he is now pressing? because I say it is nothing more than a piece of folly, first, to have subsidised such a thing as that Chignecto Ship Railway, and next to continue it from year to year upon the Statute-book, encouraging the belief—not that such a thing is not possible, because it is possible—but that such a railway, if built, would enure to the benefit of the country, or in any way benefit the trade and navigation of Canada, or ever return a dollar to those who might invest in it. Sir, my hon. friend speaks of the shortening of the distance of 600 miles between Montreal and the port of St. John. What trade is there between the two? By the railway which we have subsidised from Montreal down to the harbor of St. John, you can carry, in less than twenty hours, freight and passengers. Does any man believe that in face of the low railway carriage at this day, people will ship goods down the St. Lawrence, ship them an eight or ten days' voyage down to the point where a vessel will be taken on to a railway, and then take them over that railway down into the waters of the Bay of Fundy, and thence down to St. John or United States ports? Why, Sir, there is no business between these ports to start with, and my hon. friend has not submitted any statistics to show that there is any business to warrant such an expenditure as this. In the next place it is apparent to every one conversant with the current of trade in this country, that rail-

ways are taking away trade from the ships, that shipments by railway are taking the place of shipments by water in large quantities by vessels. My hon. friend speaks of 600 vessels visiting the Gulf of the St. Lawrence. Whose were they? Were they vessels of Canada? No, Sir. If 600 vessels last year, or the year before, visited the Gulf of St. Lawrence, they were the vessels of the United States, they were the fishing vessels for which we have sacrificed so much by the Bill we have already passed in this House, they were the vessels of a foreign nation from whom we are seeking justice, but have not got it as yet, they are the vessels of a country from which we are excluded from reciprocity in the natural productions of Canada? Are we going to expend \$170,000 a year for 20 years for that purpose? And if we did so, would any of these 600 vessels go over that railway? Why, Sir, there is not a particle of evidence submitted by the hon. gentleman to show that if the railway were built to-morrow, these fishing vessels—and they are the only ones that go there, comparatively speaking—there is not a tittle of evidence to show that they would go over that railway, even if it were built. Now, Sir, is there any traffic in common between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the harbor of St. John, the only port to which my hon. friend has referred, from which traffic would result by passing over that railway? Sir, I know of none, I think I know as much of the business of that country as my hon. friend; I have been engaged in the trade of that country in shipping, and in business, for many years, and my hon. friend has not; and I may tell him now that if that railway were built to-morrow, it would not pay the grease to oil the wheels that run over it, and it is an expenditure of public money which this country is not warranted in making. Sir, my hon. friend has brought forward another argument to induce this House to adopt this scheme, he says it is to be built with British money. Is it possible that my hon. friend, occupying the prominent position he does as the representative of this country in England, speaking with the authority which that gives him, is going to give currency to an idea that if English money is going to be invested in this enterprise it can be invested profitably and with satisfaction to the men who furnish the money? Sir, does my hon. friend himself believe that this railway will ever pay a dollar? He has not told this House that he does. I tell this House that I would regret to see any investments secured under false pretences, brought into Canada to discredit Canada by putting them into a scheme which must be an utter failure, and an utter ruin to the men who furnish the money. The hon. gentleman says this country was pledged to this scheme six years ago. What are the facts? Seven years ago a scheme was propounded for building a ship canal. Subsequently this scheme comes up for building a ship railway and a charter is granted. He says the House is pledged to it. Who pledged the House to it? The influence of my hon. friend pledged the House to that scheme.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was carried unanimously.

Mr. MITCHELL. The influence of my hon. friend pledged the House to that scheme, as he has managed, through his abilities, his eloquence and his persuasive powers, and his control over the Administration of which he is a member, to pledge this House to many a scheme which has not been very profitable to this country. That is the way this House is pledged to a scheme to which it never should have given its sanction, and which, now that it has an opportunity of terminating it ought to do by refusing to extend the time. This House, if it has any regard for the credit of Canada, should put its foot down and stamp out a scheme which is nothing but a fraud upon the British public, where we desire to maintain our credit and our reputation, and where its promoters expect to obtain the funds. That is the way I view the scheme of my

hon. friend. Now, I am not going to follow my hon. friend through every point that he has raised. I want to lay down a few propositions. First, that if the railway was built, comparatively speaking, no ships will go over it. I talked of that ship railway to-day with the largest ship owner in the port of St. John. He said: "It is a fraud; there is nothing in it. I own more ships than any man out the port of St. John, and I would not send one of my ships over it. In the first place, I believe it will be detrimental to shipping, because it will strain them to be carried over the long track over which they will have to travel." The hon. gentleman says a distinguished engineer tells him that one storm at sea would strain a ship more than carrying it over that road. Sir, a practical man who has his money invested in ships, tells me that he would not trust one of his ships over that railway, even if she was carried free. In the next place, what trade is there between the two sections which this railway connects? Why, Sir, there is no trade, comparatively speaking, between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and St. John. Any trade that exists between Montreal and Boston and Portland and New York, has railway facilities for carrying it cheaper and quicker than it could be possibly carried by water, certainly in one-fourth of the time, and I believe at less expense. Then we come to another point, the claims which the persons who have promoted this railway, have upon this country. What claims have they upon the country? Is it because a scheme is propounded of this character that nobody but the hon. gentleman ever believed in, and I doubt much if he does? Why, Sir, I looked at him, listening to his dulcet tones, listening to the persuasive arguments which he used, looking at his countenance as he spoke, and I was almost led to believe the hon. gentleman was sincere. He is always sincere when Nova Scotia is concerned. Just suggest that one million dollars be spent in Nova Scotia and he is the man for it, no matter what the results and consequences may be. You may take the railways, whether the Cape Breton road or the Short railway, in regard to which the country had to step in and pay the workmen, or any other railway, and if the scheme is one that will advance the interests of Nova Scotia and will cause the expenditure of money, especially British money, the hon. gentleman will support it and let the consequences take care of themselves. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman with his knowledge that this scheme has been before the British public for years, has been quoted in the financial papers of England to the disadvantages of Canada, has been cordially denounced by men whose opinions are worth something,—with these facts before him I am surprised the hon. gentleman should come to this House and ask this House again to renew the offer, which is nothing more than deceiving the British public who are to be fleeced if they put their money into it, and though I have no hope of defeating the Bill, I, at all events, enter my protest against it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I entirely concur in the views expressed by my hon. friend who has preceded me. I fail to see what benefit would result from this project if carried out. In regard to the practicability of constructing the work from an engineering point of view, that is only a question of expense; but so far as Mr. Fowler knowing the resources of this country I would prefer not to take his opinion but the opinion of practical men. I have never heard anyone, with the exception of the originator and the Minister of Finance—and I have spoken to a good many persons on the subject—speak favorably of it; but the opinion of practical men is that the work would be practically useless. Although the company was incorporated in 1882, I do not find in the list of incorporators a single man who is interested in shipping; some are engineers or merchants who have interest in vessels, but there is not a single name interested in the shipping business.

Mr. MITCHELL,

This scheme has been before the country during the last seven years. The Minister of Finance says a large amount of money has been expended. I believe the gentleman who originated the scheme spent some money in soundings, and if my memory serves me he discovered that Baie Verte, which he supposed was sand, was, after a short distance had been passed, wholly rock. I admit that I am utterly incompetent to give an opinion as to the practicability of the scheme from an engineering point of view, but with respect to its value in a commercial sense, that is a matter on which I think it is incumbent for the Government to show clearly by statistics the benefit that will be derived. As regards large ships, they would not venture to go over it. Not only the gentleman to whom my hon. friend alluded, who is the largest shipowner in St. John, but others have told me that they would not trust their vessels over that route. As regards timber vessels going from the Gulf to New York, they would continue to go through the Gut of Canso. The small vessels which might possibly use the route would be prevented on the ground of cost, for a man would rather beat about a week in the Gut than pay the expense. Of course statistics can be brought forward to assert that all the potatoes and produce of Prince Edward Island would go over that route. They would, however, continue to be shipped by railway to a large extent, while the balance would be sent by schooner as at present. The Finance Minister has explained that a large sum has been expended. What work has been done? It is true that the gentleman at the head of the scheme, who is a perfect enthusiast, has made several trips to England. Has a company ever been incorporated? It is true that a contract has been entered into with the Government, but I do not know there is in existence such a company; the promoters are simply endeavoring to obtain a subsidy in order to get British capital invested in what I can truly call a wild-cat scheme. We have had some experience, and I am afraid we are going to have some more sad experience in the direction of getting British capital invested in this country, and while it is put forward that the credit of Canada is pledged to this scheme I hold that the credit of Canada would be better maintained in the mother country if Parliament would not lend itself to a scheme for the purpose of inducing capitalists to put money in a scheme, when, if the promoters went through the different towns of Canada they could not get one single man to invest a dollar in it. We are always being told as to the amounts of public money expended in the Lower Provinces; we are reminded of the expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway, and I am bound to say that we do not want \$5,000,000 of public money invested in this scheme. If the money has to be expended, I would rather have it invested in a subway between the Island and the mainland, which, if not so practicable, would be more useful and beneficial than ever this railway will be to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know nothing about the engineering merits or demerits of this scheme, but no sort of evidence has been submitted to us to-night or at any other time to show that this will be a commercially profitable transaction. As I understand, the Finance Minister was not correct in stating that this would cost us nothing. This is to cost us \$170,000, if my memory is correct, for a period of either fifteen or twenty years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Twenty years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is but equivalent to a present payment of \$2,000,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A little over.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must say that, looking at the enormous proportions our debt has attained, looking at the enormous proportions of the taxation of this coun-

try, looking, as I have had occasion to point out again and again, at the enormous disadvantages which every million of added debt and every additional tax means to us in our commercial contest with the nation beside us, this is the last time in the world when we should be called upon to add, if we can possibly avoid it, to the expenditure or liability of the country. This contract will expire on the 1st July, 1889, and we will be free of the whole concern. The Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company was bound to complete the work, I see by this Bill, on 1st July next year, and it is quite clear that cannot be done, and therefore we are honorably free from all liability. They have not been able to live up to their agreements, and they have had the chance during five or six years, and I can see no reason whatever why, under these circumstances, we should practically throw away, or at all events risk, to take the mildest possible view of it, a couple of millions on an enterprise, the profits of which are of a most dubious description. I hope, Sir, that this scheme will not be proceeded with and that we will not add to our existing debt or liabilities as this would do on the evidence of hon. gentlemen who know more about the matter than I do, and who are very much interested if this were a practical scheme in putting it forward. It appears by their evidence that it is extremely doubtful as a commercial undertaking.

House divided on motion for second reading :

YEAS :
Messieurs

Amyot,	Dawson,	Marshall,
Bain (Soulanges),	Denison,	Moucreiff,
Baird,	Desaulniers,	Montague,
Bell,	Desjardins,	O'Brien,
Bergeron,	Dickinson,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Bergin,	Dupont,	Porter,
Borden,	Ferguson (Welland),	Riopol,
Bowell,	Freeman,	Roome,
Boyle,	Guilbault,	Bykert,
Brown,	Godbout,	Shanly,
Bryson,	Gordon,	Skinner,
Cameron,	Grandbois,	Small,
Cargill,	Gillet,	Smith (Ontario),
Carling,	Hale,	Stevenson,
Carpenter,	Hall,	Taylor,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Henderson,	Temple,
Chisholm,	Hickey,	Thompson,
Chouinard,	Jamieson,	Tisdale,
Climon,	Joncas,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Cochrane,	Kenny,	Tyrwhitt,
Colby,	Labelle,	Vanasse,
Costigan,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wallace,
Coughlin,	Laurie,	Weldon (Albert),
Coulombe,	Macdowall,	Wilnot,
Couture,	McKeen,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Curran,	McLellan,	Wilson (Lennox),
Davin,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Brockville),
Davis,	McNeill,	Wright.—84.

NAYS :
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Flynn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Gauthier,	Perry,
Barron,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Béchar,	Guay,	Purcell,
Bernier,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Bowman,	Innes,	Robertson,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Jones (Halifax),	Rowand,
Casey,	Kirk,	Ste. Marie,
Casgrain,	Lang,	Scriven,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Somerville,
Cook,	Lovitt,	Trow,
De St. Georges,	Macdonald (Huron),	Turoot,
Dessaint,	McIntyre,	Watson,
Doyon,	McMillan (Huron),	Weldon (St. John),
Edgar,	McMullen,	Welsh,
Eisenhauer,	Meigs,	Wilson (Elgin),
Ellis,	Mitchell,	Yeo.—52.
Fiset,		

Second reading agreed to.

Mr. TROW. I beg to call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Labelle) was not in the Chamber when the motion was read and voted on.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Richelieu will please state if he was in the House when the question was put ?

Mr. LABELLE. I was in the entrance of the House when you read the motion and I came in as they were taking the vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. You were not in your seat ?

Mr. LABELLE. I was very near it then.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question to which the hon. member must answer is if he was in the precincts of the House when the question was put either in English or French—that is in the Chamber.

Mr. LABELLE. I was within the precincts of the House

Some hon. MEMBERS. (Translation.) In French, in French.

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) Does the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Labelle) state that he was in the House when the question was put ?

Mr. LABELLE. (Translation.) I was near enough to hear the reading of the motion, only I was busy talking. But if my vote annoys too much these hon. gentlemen, I am willing to withdraw it.

Mr. Fiset. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) is about in the same position ; as for him, he was in the entrance.

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) Does the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Labelle) state that he was in the entrance so that he could hear the reading of the motion, or was he in the lobby ?

Mr. LABELLE. (Translation.) Since the hon. members opposite do not care for my vote, I don't object to its being struck off.

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) It is better that the point be decided according to the Rules of the House. Was the hon. member in the entrance or in the lobby ?

Mr. LABELLE. (Translation.) I was in the entrance.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member's vote will be allowed to stand.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) has not voted.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I paired with the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Moffat.)

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) The hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Landerkin) did not vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was very near the House, Mr. Speaker.

Bill considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the application of certain laws therein mentioned to the Province of Manitoba.—(Mr. Thompson.)

Bill (No. 24) to consolidate and amend the Railway Act.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 89) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, Chapter 8, Revised Statutes of Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the object?

Mr. THOMPSON. I explained this when I introduced it the other day. It contains most of the provisions which were in the Bill before the House last Session, for increasing the safeguards as to secrecy of voting and it contains some further provisions also with regard to corrupt practices.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has that Bill been distributed? I do not find it amongst my papers.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, it has been distributed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When was it distributed?

Mr. THOMPSON. Some time ago.

Mr. EDGAR. I understood that the hon. Minister of Justice promised the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), who has a Bill on the subject of the Dominion Controverted Elections before the House, that it might be considered at the same time as this Government Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. I only proposed that it should be read a second time to-night, and when we go into committee on the Bill to-morrow, he will have an opportunity.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

PUNISHMENTS AND PARDONS.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 90) to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 181, respecting Punishments, Pardons and the Commutation of Sentences.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time; House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. LAURIER. What is the object of that?

Mr. THOMPSON. I explained in introducing the Bill that the defect was a technical one. There is no clear provision to enable a sentence with hard labor to be imposed in the North-West Territories, and this Bill is to remove that defect.

Bill reported, and read the third and passed.

FRAUDULENT MARKS ON MERCHANDISE.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 91) to amend the law relating to Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the hon. gentleman explained this Bill when he introduced it, I was unfortunate enough not to be present, and I would call the attention of the House to the fact that it is a Bill of considerable length which is to be substituted for the Act upon the Statute-book, and it would be convenient if the hon. gentleman would state the changes made.

Mr. THOMPSON. I explained when I asked leave to introduce the Bill that its object was to carry out the Convention of Paris which was entered into a few years ago by the principal powers of Europe and assented to by the United States as well. The convention was followed by a subsequent one in Rome, in which other details were agreed upon. Our law on the Statute-book is practically the same as the English law, and the principle embodied in the amendment. I can best state in a few words which contain the synopsis of the English enactment. The most noteworthy features of the new Act are as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON.

"First, the protection by criminal process which it affords to trade marks is confined to registered trade marks, a provision which will be recognised as just, now that the register has been opened to the public for upwards of twelve years. Second, it throws the burden of proving the absence of fraud largely upon the defendant. Third, all offences under it may be subject to summary conviction. Fourth, it enlarges the law as to false trade descriptions. Fifth, it provides as to search warrants. Sixth, it provides for the seizure by the Customs authorities of goods bearing false indications of general or other marks, rendering them liable to forfeiture under this Act."

I may say that the Bill which was framed to carry out the convention was adopted in Great Britain last year, and Her Majesty's colonies have all been urged by circular to adopt it. The present Bill is an adaptation of the English Act to our condition.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SPEEDY TRIALS ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 93) further to amend the Speedy Trials Act, chapter 175 of the Revised Statutes. He said: The object is to amend the Speedy Trials Act in such a way as to make it applicable to the new districts in the Province of Ontario. I shall ask the committee to allow me to add one or two clauses to remedy one or two technical defects.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SUBMARINE TELEGRAPH CABLES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 98) respecting the International Convention for the Preservation of Submarine Telegraph Cables (from the Senate). He said: The object of the Bill is to carry into effect the provisions of the convention by imposing penalties on those who break cables, either in disentangling anchors or in any other way.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time

PROCEDURE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill No. 48, further to amend the law respecting procedure in criminal cases.

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the bearing of this Bill?

Mr. THOMPSON. The Act which this is to amend is an Act of last Session. Hon. members will remember that I proposed last Session to take away the appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The words used were the words which have been read by the hon. gentleman, that no appeal should lie to any court created by the Parliament of Great Britain. One would suppose that this would cover the case of the Privy Council, but, at the time of drafting the Bill, a decision of the House of Lords was overlooked, in which these words were defined in regard to an Act of Australia, and were considered to mean not the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, although that is organised under an Act of the Imperial Parliament; but it was considered that the Legislature must have contemplated the establishment of a Court of Appeal under the authority of the Parliament of Great Britain and was not applicable to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time; House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. THOMPSON. I want to add another clause to the Bill. I ask the attention of the Committee to section 267 of chapter 174 of the Revised Statutes, the chapter which this Bill is to amend. There is a verbal error in the second line. The word "or" has been used instead of the word "on." I propose to amend the section by striking out in

lines 2 and 3 the words "or any indictment, information, presentment or inquisition," and I think that will meet the case.

Mr. EDGAR. I observe that there is another change in the Bill as introduced by which the word "authority" is inserted. What does that mean?

Mr. THOMPSON. I am glad the hon. gentleman has called my attention to that. It is a misprint. The word should be inserted in another place. It should be that no appeal can take place from any judgment, &c., to any Court of Appeal or authority.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 20th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved third reading of Bill (No. 101) to make further provision respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was in hopes that my hon. friend—if he will allow me to call him so, after the sharp discussion we had last night—would not have made this motion. I hope I am not trespassing too much in calling him my hon. friend, because, with all the assurance with which he submitted this to the House again, my confidence in him has been a little weakened. I think he has worked himself up to a belief that the Bill is everything he has portrayed it to be, but still I was in hopes that, after some reflection, the hon. gentleman, knowing that this will be of no benefit to the country at all, would have seen the propriety of dropping the Bill. In my opinion, it is a Bill which ought not to be pressed, and I hope the hon. gentleman will see the propriety of dropping it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE AND AUDIT ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 87) to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that there was a clause of this Bill which was left over when the House was in committee yesterday for further consideration, in consequence of an enquiry made, I think, by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). I have had an opportunity of conferring with the Auditor General as to the exact meaning of this clause, which was prepared in connection with my department during the time I was not able to attend to business, and I find that the alteration in this clause is simply for the purpose of avoiding surplusage; that it is held that the instructions to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, to cause an account to be prepared and transmitted to the Auditor General on or before the 30th

September in each year, cover everything, and therefore it was unnecessary to provide more in this Act.

Mr. EDGAR. I have taken some trouble to look over the Act since the Bill was last in committee, and I quite agree with the Minister of Finance that that is the effect of it, though the whole thing is rather complicated and it was not very clear at the time.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

FRAUDULENT TRADE MARKS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 91) to amend the law concerning Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. THOMPSON. I stated last night, in answer to the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), what the particular changes are that the Bill proposes. I may state to him, however, as a supplement to my answer of last evening, what the principal causes were for the failure of the existing legislation. They are stated to have been principally threefold. In the first place, offences against the Trade Marks Act had to be prosecuted by indictment, and inasmuch as that is a very difficult and cumbersome mode of procedure, the mercantile community practically abandoned any prosecution under the Act. In the second place, there was a difficulty about the burden of proof. The original legislation contained words like these: that it was an offence against the Act to use a forged trade mark with intent thereby to deceive, and in all cases in which prosecutions were attempted, it was found practically impossible to prove intent in relation to goods which so easily and so quickly change hands, as trade-marked goods generally do. Furthermore, it was found absolutely necessary that a provision should be inserted for search warrants in cases which are provided for in this Bill. The question was asked me by a member of the House, as to the representation of this country in the convention at Paris and the convention at Rome. There was no representation, even of Great Britain, in either of those conventions; but subsequently Great Britain became a party to them, and it is intended that countries which adopted the convention this year or last, shall send representatives to a convention next year. One of the features connected with that convention is to be a representation of the colonies of countries which have been parties to the convention. Great Britain, however, as I said, has become a party to the convention, and has urged upon her colonies to take part, and the advantage of that will be the protection of registered trade marks in all countries which form part of the convention.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to call the attention of the Minister to a communication I have had in respect to this, which seems to me to deserve some attention. It is from an eminent merchant in Toronto, and he advises me that in consequence of the fact, as the Minister knows, that importers usually place their orders for foreign goods a long time ahead, he hopes the Government will see their way to delay bringing this Act into operation for a reasonable period—he suggests six months, after the Act passes. I am not sufficiently conversant with all the details to know whether that is an unreasonable time, but it seems to me there might be some hardship in applying this at once. I wish the Minister would be good enough to take that into his consideration, and after he has considered it, to see whether he can accede to the proposition.

Mr. THOMPSON. I shall be very glad to consider it, and examine the ground upon which it is based. But as

regards the prohibitions which are contained in this Bill, there are none that are not contained in the present law. It is merely a prohibition against the importation and the use of fraudulent trade marks. They are as much prohibited at present as they will be under the new Bill. The only difference is that there will be provisions for prosecuting offences in a different way. But if the hon. gentleman ascertains that there is any practical difficulty, I will see what can be done to meet it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will just send him the letter confidentially. I do not care to give the gentleman's name in public, but I will just hand the letter to the Minister and let him take note of it.

Mr. THOMPSON. When the Bill was before the House on a previous occasion it was urged that something should be inserted in it which would more effectually protect manufacturers. This Bill does give a large amount of protection to manufacturers, inasmuch as it is made an offence against this Act to use a bottle which bears a trade mark of one manufacturer and contains the product of another manufacturer. But the persons who were asking for that legislation request that the following section be inserted as clause 7 of the Bill, to which I have no objection:—

"Every person other than the lawful owner of the bottle and proprietor of the trade mark who sells, disposes or offers for sale bottles marked with the trade mark of the owner and without the assent of such owner, is guilty of an offence against this Act."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The name must be registered?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes. With regard to the special case the hon. gentleman asked me about, I might inform him of the origin of it: "This section presupposes marks indicative of origin on the case and no marks of origin on the movements; if by common repute the marks on the case are considered indicative of the origin of the movement, and if they are false as regards the movement, an offence will be committed. The marks usual on cases made to contain foreign movements are either an English hall mark or some such words as 'sterling silver' or 'fine silver.' The evidence given to the Select Committee was very strong as to the public being misled by the English hall mark; whether they are misled by the above or any English words without a hall mark, will be a question for the jury."

On section 17,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This 17th section levies the whole penalty on the vendor.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will leave that stand, if you please. I am not quite sure about our right to do that.

On section 21,

The CHAIRMAN. What shall the blank in the clause be filled by as to the amount of penalty?

Mr. THOMPSON. \$500.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am not quite sure whether this 21st section does not conflict with the 17th. Does not this 21st section make the purchaser equally liable?

Mr. THOMPSON. Oh, yes; but the 17th section relates only to the civil contract.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not understand legal phrases very well. Will the hon. gentleman tell me if this \$500 is the minimum?

Mr. THOMPSON. It would be a fixed sum.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do you think it should be so large as that?

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON. Make it not less than \$200 and not exceeding \$500.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUBMARINE CABLES.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 98) respecting the International Convention for the Preservation of Submarine Telegraph Cables (from the Senate).—(Mr. Thompson.)

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 89) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Justice will tell us how he proposes to shorten the time for electoral proceedings in British Columbia and other outside constituencies, as is proposed by this section.

Mr. THOMPSON. The facilities for communication have been so much increased during the last few years, since the Election Act was adopted making those exceptions, that I think we can now make the dates for holding the elections uniform all over the country, except perhaps in one section of British Columbia, as to which representations have been made to me very lately, and I shall not, therefore, ask the adoption of this clause at present. That is, however, the effect of this measure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he proposes to amend this clause so as to provide, in the case of bye-elections, that the writ shall issue within a certain period of time? Certain great abuses grow out of the practice of delaying the issue of the writ, after the Speaker's warrant has been issued, and it ought to be provided that it shall be the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to issue the writ to some specified officer, unless the Government names some person, within a certain number of days after the Speaker's warrant is issued.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no provision of that kind in the Bill, and it is not the intention to alter the law in that respect.

Mr. BARRON. I had drafted an amendment following the idea of the hon. member for Bothwell, and I think it is very important that something of the kind should be introduced. We have had some experience already of the danger of allowing a prolonged period to elapse between the receipt of the Speaker's warrant by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the fixing of the date of the election. I propose that there should be an amendment of this kind:

And in the case of a vacancy happening in any electoral district by death or otherwise, the day so fixed by the Governor General for the nomination of candidates shall, so far as relates to the electoral districts of the Province of British Columbia, to the electoral district of Algoma, in the Province of Ontario, and to those of Gaspé, Chicoutimi and Saguenay, in the Province of Quebec, be within thirty days after the Speaker's warrant shall have been received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and so far as relates to the other electoral districts of Canada, within twenty days after the Speaker's warrant shall have been received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery aforesaid.

That will apply to all cases, I think, arising in the bye-elections. Of course, it would not apply to the cases where a judge who tried the election case reported that there were corrupt practices existing in the election, because in that case the fixing of the nomination day and the order-

ing of a new election would have to be disposed of by order of the House. In all other cases, however, the Speaker would have to render his return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and then the Governor in Council, as provided by the statute, fixes the nomination day, and the returning officer will hold the election in a certain fixed time after that. I propose to add at the end of the fifth clause of the Dominion Election Act the following words:—

The day so fixed by the Governor General shall be named in the writs of elections for the several bye-elections to which this Act applies.

I think that amendment will meet all the cases and do justice between all the parties. It is to the effect that in all the cases of bye-elections—of course it does not apply to general elections—the nomination day shall be fixed within a certain time positively, and it shall not remain with the Governor in Council to prolong the fixing of the nomination day as long as he chooses.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to move this as an amendment to the first section?

Mr. BARRON. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. I stated the object of the first section. I propose to let that section stand for the present, because there may have to be one or two exceptions added to it. As to the section the hon. gentleman has just read, I would ask him to give me a copy of the clause, as it is one that must be carefully considered.

On section 2,

Mr. DAWSON. I would call attention to this fact that if this becomes law it will strike out Algoma from representation. It would be absolutely impossible in the time allowed in ordinary districts to send proclamations over the district of Algoma; and after the proclamation had issued and the nomination had taken place, it would be impossible to convey information to the remoter parts of the district within three weeks. Twenty days is the shortest time in which it has been found possible to convey information over the district. With every exertion, even in summer when the travelling is good, it takes a fortnight, and in winter when hundreds of miles have to be travelled on snowshoes, it is impossible to distribute a proclamation within the time occupied in ordinary districts.

Mr. THOMPSON. Sections 2 and 3 will stand for the same reasons.

On section 7,

Mr. EDGAR. This makes a great change in the law by striking out the use of all the oaths for the voter at the election, except one. We have no oath now at all for farmers' sons, and, therefore, they have not to swear that they have been resident with their parents and have not been absent from such residence more than six months since they were placed on the list of voters. As I understand it, the effect of this change will be to make the list, as revised, absolute in regard to farmers' sons and owners' sons.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is only fair that I should allow this section to stand, because the substance of that legislation will have to be an amendment to the Franchise Act. Therefore we will let this stand until that is passed upon by the House.

Mr. EDGAR. Does the Minister of Justice think that this requires an amendment to the Franchise Act?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, I think so. There is a qualification required that, subsequently to the making of the list, he has lived with his parents.

Mr. EDGAR. These oaths are not in the Franchise Act but in the Elections Act. The Franchise Act only refers to what is required in order to put the name on the list, and it does not say anything about the subsequent oath; so I think the Minister will see that this does not require an amendment to the Franchise Act.

Mr. THOMPSON. Perhaps so, but we will let the section stand for the present.

On section 8,

Mr. EDGAR. I give my cordial assent to this, because it is my Bill of last Session.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman will remember that I stated last Session that, if he would allow his Bill to stand, it would receive fair consideration, and he will understand now that that statement was not made captiously.

On section 9,

Mr. EDGAR. Will the hon. gentleman explain the effect of this addition to section 63?

Mr. THOMPSON. The section provides for the loss of the ballot box, but it contains no provision in case of the loss of the lists. It says that if ballot box is lost the list should be used, but there is no provision where not only the ballot box but the list also is lost.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is a very important provision. I nearly lost my election, two years ago, in consequence of that.

Mr. THOMPSON. That would have been an irreparable misfortune.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Act provides for giving copies of the certificates to the representatives of the parties at the polling places, and this provides that the returning officer shall retain a copy as well as put one in the ballot box. I suppose it will be the duty of the returning officer to make up his return from such certificates of the result of the polling, where the original is not found in the ballot box. It would not be the duty of any returning officer to open the envelopes and undertake to count the ballots?

Mr. THOMPSON. Only in the case of no returns being available.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is that quite clear? Might not the returning officer prefer to count the ballots instead of taking the result from the certificates or the copies of the certificates? I think he ought to take the result from the certificates or the copies of certificates, and should only take the recounting as a last resort.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it is quite clear that if the list is not found in the box, and no copy can be found, then only can he count the ballots.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It reads that:

"The returning officer may proceed, in the manner hereinbefore directed, to ascertain, by the ballots or by such evidence as he is able to obtain, the total number of votes given to each candidate," and so on.

I do not think that is clear as to the order in which he is to take these means.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will let that stand.

On section 10,

Mr. PLATT. I would draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that section 62 of the Act should be amended by making provision that the returning officer may adjourn the proceedings if any of the contents of the ballot box are missing. At present, the Act only allows him to adjourn if

the ballot box is missing, but there is no provision for adjournment where the lists are missing.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is quite likely. I will look into that point.

On section 11,

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Justice was going to allow another clause to stand with reference to the qualifications of farmers' sons. This relates to the same matter and should stand also. The Minister suggested that it might involve a change in the Franchise Act, and this refers to the same point.

Mr. THOMPSON. That clause will stand.

Mr. LAURIER. I think you are giving great power to justices of the peace:

"Every person who acts in contravention of the provisions of this section shall be liable, on summary conviction, before two judges of the peace."

I would suggest the ordinary courts.

Mr. THOMPSON. That involves an indictment.

Mr. LAURIER. You can employ a stipendiary magistrate, or some such like officer. It is giving justices of the peace large powers, and there are some of them which would be utterly unable to try such cases.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would it not be well that the offender should be tried by any judge having jurisdiction in such cases where punishment for misdemeanor to this extent may be awarded?

Mr. THOMPSON. Such jurisdiction is now possessed by two justices, or one stipendiary or police magistrate.

Mr. LAURIER. There is a great difference between the ordinary magistrates and a police magistrate.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no objection to let that sub-section stand.

On section 14,

Mr. EDGAR. The two sub-sections of this clause seem to be very desirable, and create offences of corrupt practices. But the third clause provides that the "Candidate shall not be liable, nor shall his election be avoided for any corrupt practice under this section committed by his agents, other than his agent appointed under the provisions of the Act." Now, I think that would be quite reasonable as regards the second sub-section, which provides that any person who, during an election, "knowingly publishes a false statement of the withdrawal of a candidate, shall be guilty of a corrupt practice." I think it would be rather hard to disqualify a candidate for a report of that kind being started by any agent except his special agent. But as to the provision in the first part of section 14, that "every person who votes, or induces, or procures, any person to vote at any election, knowing that he or such person is not entitled to vote thereat, is guilty of corrupt practice," I certainly think that the candidate should be responsible for his ordinary agents who choose to commit a corrupt practice of that kind. I do not see why the candidate should be exempt from responsibility for such a serious corrupt practice as that one is. I would suggest that it would be much more reasonable to make a provision in sub-section 3, only limiting it to the second sub-section.

Mr. THOMPSON. The whole section is taken from the late English Act regulating corrupt practices. I think that law is exceedingly stringent, and that if we go as far as they have gone in that direction, we should be going far enough. The adoptions of agency are going so far that it is almost impossible for a candidate to avoid constituting agents, if he runs an election in the way they must be run, to solicit votes and solicit aid.

Mr. PLATT.

On section 15,

Mr. BARRON. Before the Bill is passed in its present stage, I think there should be an amendment. Section 66 of the Elections Act provides:

"The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall, on receiving the return of a member elected to the House of Commons, give notice in the next ordinary issue of the *Canada Gazette* of the name of the candidate so elected."

That should be amended by adding the following:—

"And the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall give notice in the ordinary issue of the *Gazette*, the next after such return shall have been received by him, or, in the case of several returns being received by him at the same time, he shall then give notice in the next ordinary issue of the *Canada Gazette*, of the names of the candidates so elected in the order in which the said returns are opened and read by him."

That proposal, I think, would meet the case that came up last Session, regarding which there was a good deal of discussion.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will leave that when the committee sits again, I suppose.

Committee rose and reported progress.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 92) to amend chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Customs.—(Mr. Bowell.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are the Board of Customs to have additional powers?

Mr. BOWELL. No additional powers. Now they have a status only by Order in Council, and it is proposed to give them a status by law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the meaning of the word "Commissioner of Customs?" The old Act says: "Commissioner of Customs, who shall be deputy of the Minister of Customs." In the proposed legislation there will be a board to consist of the Commissioner of Customs, Assistant Commissioner, and so forth. Is the Commissioner of Customs the Commissioner under the statute we passed last year, or under the Customs Act?

Mr. BOWELL. It is Commissioner of Customs under the customs law. The Act to which the hon. gentleman now refers is not in force and, therefore, can have no reference to this. As soon as that Act comes into force the Commissioner of Customs will cease, and I am advised that this Act, so far as it relates to the commissioner, will have no effect. That point was fully discussed.

On section 4,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are you taking extra powers under this clause?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is there any necessity for doing so?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. It is proposed to give a lien on the goods with the additional duty; this section is to make the law more plain than it is at present.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The department could come upon innocent purchasers and take goods at any time.

Mr. BOWELL. Just in the same way as if a man steals a horse and sells it to another, it belongs to the original owner; and the Crown, I take it, always has a lien on goods for customs duty.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You have found some necessity for obtaining the power ?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this not a totally new power ?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, to a certain extent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The goods might pass through half a dozen hands and be finally seized in the hands of a man who was utterly and completely innocent of any intention to defraud the revenue. That would be a hard case, I think.

Mr. BOWELL. It does appear to be a hard case. The Customs Act is different from almost any other Act on the Statute-book, and experience has taught all countries that this is necessary in order to protect the revenue, and that we require power to enable us to follow the goods. There may be hard cases, if I may use the expression, such as those referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but we have found cases of this kind: Horses have been smuggled; they have been seized in the hands of an innocent party, but unless there was some power to follow, it would be questionable whether the department would be able to collect the duty. You may sue the person who smuggled, but the probabilities are he is not to be found, or if he is to be found, he may not be worth the duty. The practice of the department has been that in cases of that kind, upon the payment of the duty, the innocent party has been allowed to retain the goods. We simply ask the power to continue that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that this is a very exceptional power. The hon. gentleman gives us an illustration from the criminal law, but the law that he has given us is not good. The sale of any property sold by a thief becomes the property of the innocent purchaser; and why should the hon. gentleman undertake to lay down a different rule? Here the Government, from want of vigilance or some other cause, fails to collect the duty on the goods. Those goods pass into the hands of the innocent purchaser, and the hon. gentleman proposes that the innocent purchaser shall pay the duty when he would not have purchased the goods if he had not obtained them at a particular price. Why should the Government seek to exercise this exceptional power and practically rob the purchaser of moneys that he is not morally bound to pay? Certainly the Government may take power to punish a man criminally who undertakes to defraud it in this way. It may undertake to take from him property which he may possess in lieu of the money which he ought to have paid; but why punish the innocent purchaser? If a man steals a horse and that horse is brought into the market and sold to an innocent purchaser, you do not allow the purchaser to be punished in that way. You do not compel him to pay the value of the horse to the man who has lost it, but you provide for the punishment of the thief if you can catch him, and you allow the party who lost the horse to take the value of the property from him if he possesses it. I think the Government should rest upon that general principle for the protection of its right, but the idea of following up an innocent party in this way is perfectly monstrous.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think that what my friend the Minister of Customs has said is quite applicable to the arguments of the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). All the remedies given by the Customs Act are just as severe as that which he now proposes, and necessarily so for the protection of the revenue. The owner of a valuable ship loses his ship if one of his seamen smuggle goods in her, entirely without his knowledge, and in the existing law with regard to the duty on goods, the unpaid duty attaches as a lien upon the goods if the goods have been smuggled into Can-

ada. They may be seized even in the hands of an innocent purchaser for the amount of the duty, and now it is proposed simply to extend the right of lien in respect to the increased amount of duty to which the goods are liable.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Justice gives the case of the responsibility of a shipowner for wrong-doing by the party who was using the ship. There is an attempt to force the owner to diligence as a matter of public policy. If it were established absolutely that he was innocent, and had taken every possible precaution, and the Government should undertake to forfeit the ship, the law would very soon disappear from the Statute-book. You merely undertake, in that case, to secure the diligence of the owner, and his act of co-operation along with the Government, in order to prevent the ship being so used. You do that as a matter of public policy, but it does not apply in this case.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, precisely.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How is the purchaser of goods going to see whether duty is paid on those goods or not. Take a man living in Chatham or London or some other town, and he goes to Montreal for the purpose of purchasing goods. He buys them, and takes them home as a retail dealer; and after he has them for twelve months, under the provisions of the hon. gentleman's law as he proposes to make it, the hon. gentleman may send his customs officer and seize those goods because the original importer has not paid the duty upon them. Such a rule is perfectly monstrous, and there is no analogy between the rule he proposes to adopt, and any other principle in law.

Mr. THOMPSON. The rule which the hon. gentleman says is monstrous is precisely the rule with regard to a vessel. A seaman smuggles goods in a vessel even without the knowledge of the master or owner; the vessel changes hands and may go through a dozen hands in foreign ports, and when she comes back to Canada she is seized, as has been done time and again.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). An outrageous thing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perfectly outrageous.

Mr. THOMPSON. Perhaps so. It is the law, and the hon. gentleman says that if used with severity the law would disappear from the Statute-book. I say that in this case precisely the same means of relief exists here as exists in relation to a vessel. That is to say that while a lien is declared by law to attach to the goods in all cases, even in the case of duty, and that the man originally guilty could not be punished, still the same discretion to relieve rests in the Minister and the Crown in cases where goods have passed into the hands of innocent parties. We can do nothing more than lay down a general rule as regards custom laws. They are severe rules, but they are always subject to modification where the rights of innocent parties intervene.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is another principle which perhaps does not occur to the Minister. He is aware that a large amount of business is done by taxes on property. By this law he would strike at the credit and create a great deal of uncertainty in the business transactions of the banks and other financial concerns of the country. A man has certain articles which are dutiable, and he goes to a banking institution or private individual and asks for an advance on them or he may sell them. In many cases he asks for the advance and they give him the advance in good faith. He is in possession of the property. He is not required by the law to prove that property has been duty paid, because if it is in his possession the assumption is that the duty has been satisfied. Therefore when he goes to a monied institution and gives a warehouse receipt for that property the bank of financial concern would readily advance him the money upon it, but if this law passes the bank may advance

the money and months afterwards the Government may come down and say: "Oh, it is quite true the duty was not paid on that, and we will take it out of your possession or you must pay the duty." I think that is a most arbitrary Act. I think it is very unnecessary and I think it is more power than the Government should ask. I do not think, from the explanations given by the Minister of Customs, that he has sufficient grounds for asking this House to confer such a power upon the Government. If the hon. gentleman could satisfy this House that it was necessary and give us some sound reason for it, I have no doubt the House would go a long way to meet his views, but up to the present moment I fail to see any just reason for asking for such extraordinary exercise of power to be placed in the hands of the Government, and which may be destructive of commercial confidence. I think the hon. Minister will see it when he looks at it in that light.

Mr. BOWELL. I think that a few moments reflection will teach the hon. gentleman who has just spoken that if his ideas were carried out there would be no protection against smuggling in many cases. The advance which may be made upon a ship cannot by any possibility protect it from seizure, if the captain or one of the proprietors or any one of those on board it had been smuggling. Take the case, for instance, where a man advances on a mortgage upon a ship, and certainly he is not responsible for the smuggling which the owner may carry on, yet the ship is liable to seizure and confiscation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The fines are really a small matter in comparison with the value of the ship.

Mr. BOWELL. I admit that, but the principle is precisely the same. The principle of punishing shipowners whose vessels are used for smuggling is recognised by law, whether the penalty is \$50 or \$400, or confiscation of the vessel. Any vessel which is caught smuggling is subject under law to confiscation, though an innocent party may have advanced money on mortgage upon that vessel, just as a bank advances money to a merchant who purchases his goods, for which interest is expected to be paid; but surely no one would argue that that would protect a merchant against the confiscation of goods he had purchased in a foreign country and smuggled into this country. Take a case which is now under consideration. In one of the western towns a party carrying on a woollen factory or something of that kind, obtained a large quantity of machinery which had been purchased in the United States and entered in Canada at an undervaluation. Before it was discovered that a fraud had been perpetrated in the entry of this machinery, the importer had sold it to another party. Now, if the theory laid down by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) be correct, that the party who now owns the property is to be exempt from the duty, then all a rogue would have to do would be to import goods, enter them at an undervaluation, and, if not caught in the act, transfer them to an innocent party. All you could do would be to punish the individual who had committed the fraud in the importation, and you would have to prove that the party who purchased was a party to the fraud, or you could not touch him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That seems fair.

Mr. BOWELL. Although the hon. gentleman was in a former Cabinet, he had not much to do with intricate cases that came before the Minister of Customs; if he had, he would have come to this conclusion, that though an honest man might perhaps suffer, still the moment that door was opened, many persons would become parties to fraud for the purpose of escaping the duty. Under the present law you can follow smuggled goods wherever you can find them. The only object of this provision is to set the matter at rest, so that people will know that there is a

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

lien on the goods. I am not particular whether this clause is passed or not; but, for the protection of the revenue and the honest importer, you cannot make the law too rigid in cases of this kind.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I do not think there is an analogy between the case of vessels and this case. The case of vessels is a peculiar one. The law is no doubt harsh, but as a rule the parties are treated very lightly unless they are actually guilty. In this case the Government have a lien on the goods for the duty, even after they pass out of the possession of the importer. I do not see why the Government should stand in any other position than any other person who has a lien, and allows the goods to pass out of his possession. The person purchasing the goods has a right to assume that the duty was paid. In the cases of fraud the hon. Minister has mentioned, he is going beyond the common law of the land. If a party obtains goods by fraud and sells them to an innocent party, the purchaser has a title to the goods; but no matter how innocent a person might be, he could not get a title against the Crown. If a person has had goods passed through the custom house improperly, either through carelessness or negligence of the officers or by fraud, let him be punished by the proper tribunals; but it would be hard to put the penalty on the innocent purchaser.

Mr. BOWELL. If hon. gentlemen have no objection, after what has been said, I will allow this clause to stand for further consideration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the hon. Minister to say that in such a case as the one he has cited, the party would be obliged to pay only the difference between the duty which had been originally collected and that which ought to have been collected, or is there any fine besides?

Mr. BOWELL. There is no fine at all. The practice has been this: that if an article has been smuggled, and is in the hands of an innocent party, all we do is to ask him to pay the extra duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it limited as to time?

Mr. BOWELL. Three years, under the present law for penalties, but not for duty.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think the law is always carried out in the way in which the hon. the Minister has stated. I know of a case which occurred last fall, in which two grain cleaners were imported from the United States into Manitoba. The price paid for them was \$450, and that was the amount on which the duty of 30 per cent was paid. They were released by the customs officers and placed in an elevator; and after they had been in actual operation for two months, the contractor was notified that the machines were entered at an undervaluation, the customs authorities claiming that they should have been entered at \$600. There appeared to be no resource but to pay the duty on \$600. The extra duty was paid, and in addition, a fine was imposed of 50 per cent on the original duty under section 8 of the Customs Act; but the fine was afterwards returned. Now, I think the innocent purchaser should not suffer. Thirty per cent was paid on the full price which had been paid for the goods in the United States, and as it was the actual duty paid, instead of being 30 per cent. was exactly 40 per cent. I think the Act should provide that if no fraud was committed, no fine should be imposed, and the duty should be paid on the actual price of the goods.

Mr. BOWELL. The case mentioned has no reference to the question now under discussion. The hon. gentleman is discussing the clause that provides for an additional duty being imposed on an article which was undervalued. I suppose he states from his knowledge that the machines

were only worth \$450. I am not going to dispute that, because I know nothing of the case. The hon. gentleman knows that if it were purchased in the United States at \$400, and that was \$100 less than it was sold at for home consumption in the United States, it would be just \$100 under valuation if so entered, and subject to additional duty of 50 per cent. of the duty. This provision of the law I propose to modify when I reach it. At present, in cases where the undervaluation amounts to or exceeds 20 per cent. of the value of the article as sold for home consumption in the country where it is purchased, 50 per cent. of the duty follows as a matter of course; and that is just as much a part of the law as the imposition of 20 or 25 per cent. is.

Mr. WATSON. What I said was in answer to the illustration given by the Minister of Customs with regard to the woollen machinery. Here is an innocent party, the owner of an elevator, who paid the contract price for building the elevator, and is then liable to a fine as well as the extra duty.

Mr. BOWELL. His recourse would be against the person from whom he purchased, just as if a man sells you goods which he had no right to sell. The customs laws make every article imported absolutely forfeited the moment the crime is committed. From the moment smuggling takes place, the goods are really not the property of any one but the Crown, and if you purchase, and are an innocent person, you ought to treat the seller the same way as if you purchased from him any other article that was not his.

Mr. WATSON. The contractor in this case was an innocent person.

Mr. BOWELL. Very likely.

Mr. WATSON. What I say, is that the customs collectors at those outposts should be instructed as to what goods they are in a position to release. That collector ought to have been in the position to know that these machines were valued at \$600, and that a duty of 30 per cent. should have been paid on \$600, no matter what price was paid for the goods. Had the collector been informed at what prices these articles should have been entered, the proprietors of the elevator would not have been in a position to be imposed on by the customs authorities.

Mr. BOWELL. The giving of instructions such as that indicated by the hon. gentleman could not by any possibility be done. An article to-day might be worth \$100 and to-morrow \$200 or \$50. The value for duty is the value of the article at the date it was exported to Canada.

On section 5,

Mr. BOWELL. On looking at the old Act, you will find that where the undervaluation exceeds 20 per cent. a sum equal to one-half the duty shall be levied in addition to the regular duty. It also provides that 50 per cent. of the duty shall apply to goods which bear a specific as well as an *ad valorem* duty. I propose to change that so as to relieve from the penalty the goods upon which a specific duty is imposed, and have it apply only to those which bear an *ad valorem* duty. And I propose to grade the penalty for undervaluation, commencing at 10 per cent., so that in case the goods are entered at 10 per cent. under value, then the penalty will be, not 50 per cent., as at present, but 10 per cent. of the duty, and so on in proportion to the amount of undervaluation. Under this clause an article would have to be entered at an undervaluation of 50 per cent. before the penalty now imposed by the Act could be collected. For instance, if you import a horse for which you paid \$100 and entered it at \$20, that would be 20 per cent. lower than the price you paid. Under the present law, that entry would subject the importer to a penalty of 50 per cent. of the whole duty, which would be \$10; under the proposed law,

it would be simply 20 per cent. of the duty itself; that is, \$4 instead of \$10.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How would that apply to cargoes of sugar?

Mr. BOWELL. Just the same, if there was an *ad valorem* duty. It would not apply to cargoes of sugar for refining purposes, because such sugars pay the duty on their strength, as tested by the polariscope. If sugar were entered at an undervaluation for general grocery purposes and not for refining, then the penalty would be imposed upon the *ad valorem* value of the sugar. Sugar now bears a duty of 1½ cents per lb. specific and 35 per cent. *ad valorem*. If it were undervalued, the penalty for undervaluation would apply only to the duty *ad valorem* and not to the specific value as it does at present.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I asked that question because it applies to other articles as well as to sugar. Take cargoes of molasses.

Mr. BOWELL. Just the same.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is perhaps aware that difficulties have at all times arisen in the customs in valuing cargoes of molasses, where part has been purchased at a lower rate than other portions of the cargo, and I have known frequently cargoes coming from the West Indies which have been entered at the *bond fide* prices at which they were paid. Yet the prices have been increased by the appraisers, very improperly, I think. It would be hard enough under those circumstances if they were called upon to pay an increased duty at all, but, if they are to pay upon an increased valuation as well, it would make it so much the worse, and would be very unfair. There is no intention, as a rule, on the part of importers to evade the customs law in that way, but this arises sometimes from the fact that a part of a cargo may be purchased at a lower rate than the balance. I think the hon. gentleman is aware that sometimes his officers have raised the value of the whole cargo to the highest amount specified in the invoice. It seems to me that that would work unfairly to the original importer.

Mr. BOWELL. If that were so, it would be much worse under the old law than under this, because, if the officer raised the price of the whole invoice before, if it exceeded 20 per cent., the 50 per cent. penalty would follow, but now it would not. Under the present law, if the cargo was undervalued 20 per cent., as the hon. gentleman says—

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not say it is undervalued, but that the customs suppose it to be undervalued.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course the customs must suppose it, or the officer would not take that course.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course the customs are right.

Mr. BOWELL. Sometimes they are not right, or I would not have so much trouble. The basis of this measure, however, is to relieve, as much as possible, parties who have not intentionally undervalued their goods.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My hon. friend does not quite catch the point which I desired to lay before him. Under the present practice the customs would increase the value of the portion they suppose to be undervalued, and the 15 per cent. duty would be placed on the increased value; but, under this Bill, they would not only make that increase, but would add 10 per cent. to the duties.

Mr. BOWELL. No, not at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is so unusual for the Minister of Customs to relax the rigor of the law that one must feel persuaded that he has found that the old clause worked very harshly, and that being the case, I would like to ask him now, when he sees that it is fair and right to relax the

rules, whether any relief will be given to innocent parties, parties acting in good faith, who have been fined when there has been a dispute between them and the customs officers in cases such as that instanced by my hon. friend where a *bond fide* purchase was made and the importer had to submit, as we all have to submit, to the ruling of the department, and had to pay the amount, but did so under protest. I desire to know whether the Minister will look back at all. If not, the passing of this law is an admission that parties have been fined in the past who should not have been fined, and have been harshly dealt with. We practically admit by this that the penalty for innocent undervaluation heretofore inflicted was unjust. Very many people throughout the country feel that, but they have had to pay the penalty and did it under protest. I suppose that where it has not been paid under protest, the Minister would not take any notice of it, but I suggest whether justice does not require that he should take power to deal with cases of that kind where the amount has been paid under protest.

Mr. BOWELL. There is full power now under the law. If there are any cases where injustice has been done to an importer, if he will show where the money has been improperly collected, the money will be refunded. The hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Watson) mentioned a case of that kind, where the officer made a mistake, and the \$90 was refunded. If the hon. gentleman can show any case where an injustice has been done, the matter will be considered, and if the Minister of Customs cannot deal with it, he will take it to the Treasury Board, and the money will be refunded. The hon. gentleman knows that, when once money goes into the hands of the Receiver General it is only by action on the part of the Treasury Board and the Council that the money can be refunded. The present Bill does not affect that principle at all. The only result is to impose a smaller penalty than under the old Act.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My hon. friend from Marquette has stated a case in which he paid \$450 for an article. The Government made the amount \$680, and \$90 was the double penalty, or the fine imposed. What would we have to pay under the new arrangement?

Mr. BOWELL. Under the old law, assuming that the imposition of the extra duty was correct, he should have paid \$180 duty, and \$90 would be 50 per cent. on that, but under this provision he would have to pay \$60 instead of \$90.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I asked a question as to the case of a person who paid a larger amount under protest than we are now deciding by this Bill he should have paid. Would not the Minister have power to deal with this by way of refund?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly not any more than if the duty on an article was 20 per cent. to-day and was reduced to 10 per cent. to-morrow, the Minister of Customs could not refund the difference. The question of paying under protest has never been considered. If a man has paid the duty, and afterwards shows that he has paid it improperly, that the value of the goods had been improperly raised, and that the market value in the United States was that at which they were entered by him, and the officers exacted more from him than they should, I have always recommended the refund. The matter of paying under protest has never made any difference.

On section 6,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There the Minister is enacting the first part of the section in the old law, and is removing the alternative provision which was in the old Act which permitted the production of the original invoice of the goods or a certificate.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will read it closely, he will see the latter portion of the clause contradicts the first. It says:

"Whenever duties are charged according to the weight, toll, gauge, or other rate, such allowances shall be made for tares and draft to the packages as are prescribed by regulations made by the Governor in Council."

There it gives the Governor in Council power to declare what tare, gauge, etc., shall be allowed. That has been acted upon. Now, if you read the other portion:

"But when the original invoice of any goods is produced, and a declaration of the correctness shall be made as hereinafter provided—"

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What are you reading from?

Mr. BOWELL. I am reading the old Act, because the proposition is to leave out a portion of that Act.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not see the contradiction.

Mr. BOWELL. Well, you have not let me finish. I say the first portion of the clause gives power to the Governor in Council to make such regulations as they may deem necessary, allowing tare, etc. Then the latter part of the clause goes on to say:

"When the original invoice of any goods is produced, and a declaration of the correctness thereof is made as hereinafter provided, the tare according to such invoice shall be deducted from the gross weight of the goods, instead of the allowance aforesaid, subject to such further regulations as may be made from time to time by the Governor in Council."

So that although it gives power to the importer to declare by affidavit the correctness of certain weights, it also goes on to say that they must be subject to any further regulations which may be made from time to time by the Governor in Council. Now, we very often find cases of this kind, that an importer, many of them, or an exporter, as the case may be, will add to the tare of their goods a great deal more than ought to be added, or they will as they have done in the past, add to the value of the packages more than should be added. One merchant may deduct as high as 20 or 30 shillings upon certain goods that constitute a portion of the tare, while another from the same port will deduct nine or ten. So, you see at once the difficulty that presents itself in the administration of this provision of the law. The proposition is to provide that the Governor in Council shall have power to declare by Order in Council what the tare, etc., shall be, and thereby remove any ambiguity.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see that; but still I do not see why the production of the original invoice, giving the tare, and supported by affidavit, should not be good proof as to the correctness of the tare. Now, I can understand that the Minister should make a regulation as to the tare of a certain article; but it is quite possible that the goods, or the packages in which they are contained, may vary, the tare may vary, and to make a new rule might work a hardship or injustice upon some importer. It seems to me that when an original invoice is produced, and an affidavit made to the correctness of it, that should be made *prima facie* evidence of its correctness. The Minister has mentioned one or two cases. I should suppose that any fraud that would be perpetrated would be in the original shipper altering his tare in order to avoid the customs duty; but he would have to make a fraudulent invoice all through in order to do it, and the Minister would have the original invoice, and could detect the fraud. Suppose there was a collusion between the parties, and that the importer should say to the exporter in a foreign country: Now, you make the tare 10 or 15 per cent. more than it is—especially if the duties were levied on the *ad valorem* basis; he would have to increase the price at which it was entered, and would reveal the difference in that way.

Mr. BOWELL. I ask the hon. gentleman what good reason, or any reason, is there why we should have a clause upon the Statute-book that is ambiguous in its wording and leads to complications between the administrator of the law and the importer? As I understand it, the Order in Council which has been issued regulating and declaring the tare upon certain articles, has been accepted by all the merchants; it was done after a great deal of consideration and consultation with the largest importers of the country; and when they accepted that as fair, and it is working harmoniously, there is no reason why we should allow a clause to remain upon the Statute-book which gives any importer who likes to be cantankerous or troublesome, the opportunity of saying: Mine is a correct invoice, these tares are correct, and I am prepared to swear to them,—and even if he does, then the last two lines of the clause give power to the Governor in Council to demand further evidence.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, I do not so understand the meaning of these last words, I do not think that is a fair interpretation of them. I interpret them this way; that you make your rule and it does not apply in the case of a certain importer, and he says: Your rule is not doing me justice, and in proof of that I produce my original invoice, giving the original tare, which I support with affidavit. The section in the old law, as I understand it, permits the Minister to accept that as proof, but it has added: "subject to such further regulations as are made from time to time by the Governor in Council," but I interpret that part in this way, that the Governor in Council might require more proof than the original invoice, more proof than the declaration of the owner, for instance, if the Order in Council should require that he should have a declaration from the exporter from whom he bought the goods—that is how I understand the meaning of the words, and I think they were put in the Act for that purpose.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It appears to me that it is absolutely necessary that the Governor in Council should have power to deal with it in that way, though I presume the Government would not very frequently interfere with the established tares in the various countries from which the goods were received. But, at the same time, I think it is absolutely necessary that the Government should have power to deal with that, in the event of an invoice leading them to suppose there was something irregular in the tares which the importer declared to have on his invoice. I cannot see any objection to it, although I think the Government would not interfere very often, or at all events, change the established tares of the country from which the goods were imported.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand from the Minister of Customs that that subject has been for a long time under consideration, that they have modified their rules from time to time, as experience shows to be necessary, and at the present time the rules on that subject are uniform and complete. Now, of course, the only object in giving the Governor in Council power to deal by Order in Council with a subject of this sort, is that Parliament has not the necessary data upon which to base specific and minute legislation; but if the Minister of Customs thinks that they have now, by Orders in Council, or by their experience, arrived at a condition of things when these Orders in Council no longer require to be modified or changed, then that ought to be embraced in this section as part of the legislation; the experience which the hon. gentleman has acquired, and which is set forth in these Orders in Council, should be embraced in the statute itself. At all events, if that is not the case, there ought to be made an appendix to the statute where they would be accessible and known to the mercantile community.

Mr. BOWELL. The suggestion made by the hon. member for Bothwell could only be carried out when trade ceases to fluctuate, and importers and administrators become perfect. I do not anticipate that day will arrive until perhaps the hon. gentleman reaches this side of the House. Trade is continually changing, and there is no member on that side of the House who knows it better than the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). It may be necessary to change these regulations affecting tare, and weight, and deductions allowed upon packages containing goods which are exempt from duty. That may occur tomorrow or a month hence. We know that a package containing molasses may be worth 9 shillings one day and 12 shillings a month hence. If the hon. gentleman's suggestion were adopted we would have no power to make a change. These regulations, however, have to be varied as changes take place in the trade of the country. It would be utterly impossible to carry out the suggestion, which would either impose a wrong on the importers or on the revenue.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That would only apply to cases where there were specific duties on particular packages. If the duty was on the value of the packages, then there would be no difficulty. Besides, if the value fluctuates in the way the hon. gentleman has described the Order in Council always comes too late. The trouble is that the hon. gentleman's rule is always made after the fact, whereas ordinary legislation is made before the fact.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to enquire the reason why the latter portion of the clause in the old Act has been omitted in framing the new clause?

Mr. BOWELL. Under the old Act the importer appears to be given the absolute right to insist on his statement being accepted. That might be correct in dealing with an honest man, but such was not the case in dealing with a dishonest trader. I do not see the necessity of retaining that portion of the clause.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That portion of the clause must have been inserted when the old Act was passed to give the alternative to the honest importer. At the same time the Governor in Council was given power to require something more from the importer than the mere production of the invoice, or that the Governor in Council might make regulations requiring something more.

Mr. BOWELL. Then it simply means this, that the Minister of Customs, or whoever administers the law, must throw doubt upon the statement of the importer who has sworn to the invoice. Taking the interpretation of the law, as given by the hon. gentleman, and perhaps it is correct, then the old clause gives power to the Minister of Customs or party administering the law, to say: You are not telling the truth, I will not accept your invoice, but I require further evidence. No doubt the words referred to were inserted for a good purpose; but, like many other clauses in the Act, they might be applicable at the time, but the changes of trade have been such and the way of doing business has changed to such an extent that we find it impracticable to carry out some of the clauses without coming into collision with importers, which we desire to avoid as much as possible.

On section 9,

Mr. BOWELL. The change made is one already existing by Order in Council, but many importers plead ignorance, and say, because it is not in the law they do not know it. I propose to add that which is the law by Order in Council to the statute.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). A consignee of course can only make a declaration to the best of his knowledge or belief.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, that is all.

On section 10,

Mr. BOWELL. I explained this fully the other night. It simply refers to the payment of damage on sugar which goes into a refinery. It would not refer to sugar which was imported for household purposes, for that would be entitled to the same reduction for damages as under the 4th section. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) knows that sugar used for refining purposes is tested by the polariscope, and we allow for damage done to such, by salt water, in the testing.

On section 11,

Mr. BOWELL. This section simply changes the words: "Whenever any vessel is entered," to "whenever any vessel is reported." The only change is substituting the word "reported" for "entered." In former times the word "entered" was used whether referring to the reporting of a vessel or the entering of goods. Under the present Act the terms are distinct, and our desire is that there should be no conflict hereafter as to what is the meaning of entering or reporting.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). "Reporting" is the proper word.

Mr. BOWELL. I think so.

On section 12,

Mr. BOWELL. The House will see that in making those changes where only a word or two had to be changed I have reenacted the whole clause, as I thought it better it should be done. The only change made in this clause is by inserting "assistant appraiser" and making it in conformity with the Civil Service Act, which recognises assistant appraisers.

On section 13,

Mr. BOWELL. Under the old Act, there is a doubt existing as to whether it applies to parts of machines that are imported or to the whole machinery which is imported in parts. The words added are: "when parts of any manufactured articles are imported into Canada, each such part shall be dutiable." The object of the clause is to make the matter so plain that we cannot misunderstand it.

On section 14,

Mr. BOWELL. The object of this clause is to make clear the power to impose a duty upon an article which has been sent from one country to the other upon which a bounty has been paid or a drawback given. For instance you purchase sugar in New York upon which two cents per pound has been paid to the purchaser as a drawback, and that article is sent to Liverpool and there purchased in the market and brought to Canada. The question then arises: does the law empower the Customs to impose a duty upon that two cents in addition to the price paid for the article. If the article were purchased in New York and exported directly to Canada, then there is no question but that the two cents would be added to the value of the sugar for duty, but an attempt has been made to evade that provision of the law by sending it to some other country and ostensibly selling it in the market and then sending it to Canada. The law is not clear upon that point, and this provision is to place it beyond a doubt.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Even with the law obscure as it is, I should think "they could not come it over you" in that way.

Mr. BOWELL. No, sir; I want to put it beyond the power of anyone importing goods in that way to take advantage of the supposed defect in the law.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman only refers to one article.

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Mr. BOWELL. I merely give that as an illustration.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Practically it refers to only one branch, such as refined sugar. Under the operation of this clause I presume, duty will be demanded on sugar coming from Germany, including the bounty as well. There is a bounty or drawback on sugar coming from Germany which interferes very much with our trade relations with the West Indies, in which hon. gentlemen lately have shown much interest, and under the operation of this Act, that sugar heretofore has come in a different way. Of course, I know that the polariscope test makes the principle of levying a duty somewhat difficult, and that perhaps may be my answer. I think the hon. gentleman, while he is dealing with the subject, should take power to place an *ad valorem* duty on German beet root sugar to cover the drawback so as to place it on the same footing as the refined sugar which comes from the United States. The principle I think should be applied in both cases, and if so it would very materially assist our trade with the West Indies by keeping out the German sugar. It now averages 60 or 70 per cent. of the refined sugar of the Dominion, and there is only about 25 per cent. of West Indian sugar. The German sugar is allowed to come in and compete with it under the operation of this Act, and I suppose the hon. gentleman will deal with the matter.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will read the clause carefully he will see that the object he has in view is provided for. It applies to every article on which it can be established a drawback has been allowed.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman's explanation is perfectly satisfactory, if he only carries that provision into effect. That has been the practice. The subject having been brought to the notice of the Government some years ago, an order was passed that the duty should be collected on the increased amount; but that order was subsequently rescinded, and beet root sugar has recently been permitted to enter the Dominion on its actual value, less the amount of the drawback. I wish to know whether the hon. gentleman proposes to place an *ad valorem* duty on German sugar, because, under the present arrangement of a polariscope test, German sugar is hardly included.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to suggest that, as this is a subject in which a great many gentlemen are interested, and as a number wish to go away to-night, perhaps it would be as well not to resume this discussion this evening.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the hon. gentleman had better let me go through with the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will be here.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know what other business can be gone on with just now. If it is desired that any clause should stand over, I shall have great pleasure in letting it stand, but I would like to get through with the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is a very important Bill. It has excited a great deal of attention in the mercantile centres of this country; several gentlemen have written to me about it; and I know that a number of members are going away to-night after half past eight o'clock, and I think it would be only fair to allow this Bill to stand over until the next Government day, because there are some sections of this Bill which I take particular exception to. I trust, therefore, that the hon. gentleman will not press the Bill to-night. If he does, he will force a number of us to stay, and I do not think it will help public business.

Sir HECTOR LANGENIN. We would like to meet the wish of the hon. gentleman, but he must see that the Session is so far advanced that if we postpone measure after measure because some members go away or take exception to a

clause, we shall never get away; we shall be here until June, and later than June, and I have no doubt that the wish of the hon. member and of the House is to get through the work as fast as we can. This is a measure that we thought we would take up this afternoon, and resume it after 8 o'clock.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not aware that any other Bill has been asked to be postponed, certainly not at my request. I do think this is not an unreasonable request. This Bill is one that affects the interests of the commercial community of this Dominion, and we have a right to a fair and reasonable opportunity of discussing it. There has been no Opposition shown to the Bill, but we desire to criticise it clause by clause, as they come up, and we request that it may be left over until the next Government day, in order that those who wish to go home to-night may do so. If it is necessary for me to stay, I will stay, but I do not think it would promote public business. I tell hon. gentlemen that frankly.

Committee rose.

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

After Recess.

MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA.

Mr. TISDALE moved that the order for the third reading of Bill (No. 46) to amend the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada (Mr. Scarth) be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of adding the following clause:—

The directors of the company may make and issue as paid up stock, shares in the company, whether subscribed for or not, and may allot and hand over such stock in payment for right of way, plant, rolling stock, or materials of any kind, and also for the services of directors and engineers. Such issue and allotment of stock shall be binding on the company, and such stock shall not be assessable for call, and the paid up stock heretofore issued and allotted in accordance with the provisions of this section is hereby legalised and affirmed.

He said: I may say that, excepting the last words with regard to the legalising of any allotment, this is precisely the clause that is in the model Bill. I am moving this in the absence of Mr. Scarth. The promoters of this Bill had supposed, until it went through the Railway Committee, that they had the ordinary powers this clause contained. The addition I ask is, therefore, simply to have the model Bill clause put in and to legalise whatever the directors have done in accordance with that clause. I presume no hon. gentleman will object to this legislation. This railway is one that has built over two hundred miles of road, and has expended over \$3,000,000, so that I am asking for no new thing, but simply that the charter shall contain the ordinary clause, and that what has been done in the belief that the charter did contain that clause shall be legalised.

Mr. EDGAR. The amendment conforms, I see, except in the last sentence, exactly with the model Bill, and that only makes the model Bill retroactive. I do not think there can be any objection to it.

Motion agreed to, Order discharged; and House again resolved itself into Committee.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Detroit River Winter Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

SOUTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the Order for—

Further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Hall for the third reading of Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the South-Western Railway

Company, and the motion of Mr. Bergin in amendment thereto: That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be read a third time, this day six months.

House divided on the amendment:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Bain (Soulanges),	Deasaint,	McMullen,
Barron,	Doyon,	Meigs,
Bergin,	Edgar,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bernier,	Eisenhauer,	Patterson (Essex),
Bourassa,	Ferguson (Welland),	Perry,
Bowell,	Geoffrion,	Platt,
Brien,	Girouard,	Préfontaine,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Godbout,	Rinfret,
Casgrain,	Guay,	Rykert,
Chapleau,	Hickey,	St. Marie,
Chouquette,	Labelle,	Shanly,
Chouinard,	Labrosse,	Thompson,
Cockburn,	Landerkin,	Tisdale,
Cook,	Landry,	Turoot,
Costigan,	Laurier,	Vanasse,
Couture,	Lister,	Wallace,
Curran,	Lovitt,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	McLellan,	Wilson (Lennox).—57.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),	Guilbault,	Porter,
Baker,	Guillet,	Prior,
Bergeron,	Haggart,	Reid,
Bowman,	Hale,	Robillard,
Boyle,	Hall,	Roome,
Brown,	Henderson,	Ross,
Burns,	Hesson,	Rowand,
Cameron,	Holton,	Royal,
Cargill,	Hudspeth,	Scriver,
Carling,	Innes,	Skinner,
Chisholm,	Jamieson,	Small,
Cimon,	Joncas,	Smith (Ontario),
Cochrane,	Kirk,	Somerville,
Coughlin,	Lang,	Sproule,
Daoust,	Langvin (Sir Hector),	Sutherland,
Davin,	Laurie,	Temple,
Davis,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Thérien,
Dawson,	Macdowall,	Trow,
Desaulniers,	McOulla,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Dupont,	McDougald (Picton),	Tyrwhitt,
Ellis,	McDougall (Cape Breton),	Ward,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Madill,	Weldon (St. John),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Mara,	White (Renfrew),
Fiset,	Marshall,	Wilmot,
Flynn,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Gauthier,	Mitchell,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Gigault,	Moffat,	Wright,
Gordon,	Montplaisir,	Yeo.—86.
Grandbois,	Perley (Assiniboia),	

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for North Perth has not voted.

Mr. HESSON. I paired with the hon. member for Kent, (Mr. Landry).

Mr. LANDRY. I did not vote either. The hon. gentleman is quite correct. I paired with him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Vote.

Mr. HESSON. I vote against the six months' hoist.

Mr. LANDRY. Then I vote the other way.

Mr. TROW. I notice that the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen) has not voted, and I see that he is in the House—at least he is in the gallery.

Mr. ROYAL. I call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has not voted.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is too late. I have declared the amendment lost.

Mr. CURRAN moved that the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House, to have the following clause inserted therein:—

This Act shall not go into force until the first day of May, 1890.

He said: I shall make very few observations in connection with this motion, as the time for private Bills is nearly up; but this Parliament having last year refused to pass the Bill which is now about to be granted, it is of the highest importance, owing to the fact that some \$300,000 have been spent, not only on the branch line, but in perfecting the connection with the American system, that the present company which are now constructing the road should be permitted to complete their works which are now commenced and are nearing a termination, and that they should have an opportunity of floating their bonds, and in fact of carrying out the large construction they have now on hand and of bringing commerce to this work, which will be destroyed altogether, and will prove almost ruinous to the company if this Bill should go into force immediately. This is not the first occasion upon which similar legislation has been enacted. In 1882, the Great Eastern Railway Company was incorporated by this House, and it was provided in the Act of incorporation:

"That so much of this section as authorises the construction of any part or parts of said railway, from and lying east of any point on the frontier, at or near the village of Dundee, and which passes through the counties of Huntingdon, Chateauguay, Beauharnois, Napierville and Laprairie, shall not come into force until the first day of May, 1884."

Thus giving two years' limit before the Act should come into force. As this House, through its Committee on Railways last year, threw out a Bill similar to this one, and thereby it was considered by the promoters of the other road that Parliament was pledged that this Bill should not be granted, and went to work and expended this large amount of money, I think the House will consider it only fair that the company should have that brief time allotted to them, and then, if there is a prospect of business, if the gentlemen who are promoting this Bill see that there is enough business for them to operate their present charter, they can do so, and the people of the country will be glad to see them do so; but, in the meantime, there is no justice in crushing out an enterprise which has begun in good faith, and upon which a large amount of money has been expended.

Mr. BAKER. I ask if that amendment is in order. Clause 67 of the Rules of this House says that no important amendment can be moved, either in committee or on the third reading, without one day's notice having been given. Has that notice been given?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have to declare that this motion is not in order.

Mr. BERGIN. I object to the Bill being read the third time to-night. It must go over until Monday.

Mr. SPEAKER. On what ground does the hon. gentleman object?

Mr. BERGIN. You cannot take that stage to-night.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Order for to-night is for the third reading.

Mr. BERGIN. The Order to-night is for the consideration of the amendment I proposed.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot entertain the objection. The third reading must take place if the House so wills it.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 83) to amend the Act to incorporate the Moncton Harbor Improvement Company.—Mr. Wood (Westmoreland).

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Grenville International Bridge Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Mr. CURRAN.

Bill (No. 59) to confer certain powers on the Nova Scotia Telephone Company (Limited).—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. Masson.)

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Central Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. O'Brien.)

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 92) to amend chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Customs.—(Mr. Bowell.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I enquired of the Minister of Customs before recess in reference to his interpretation of a previous clause which I did not understand to be passed. That was with reference to the value of goods on which there was a drawback. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he proposed to deal with the beet root sugar in the same way as the sugar from New York?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. The proposition is to deal with all articles whether it be sugar or anything else. I might state, however, what I did not state before recess in reply to my hon. friend in reference to beet root sugar. There was a difference of opinion among lawyers whose opinions were sent us upon this point, some contending that we had no right to impose an extra duty upon sugar which was manufactured in England from sugar imported from Germany upon which the drawback had been paid. However, I may state frankly that we differed in the department from that opinion, which was given to us by some Montreal gentleman who belongs to the legal profession, on behalf of the sugar refiners. But, under the peculiar circumstances which the hon. gentleman remembers, I explained at the time, we did not think it advisable to put our construction of the law into force. The change proposed will place it beyond a doubt, as it makes it more defined. In the future, under this clause, the extra duty will have to be levied upon bounty-paid sugar if purchased in England or any other country.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is, beet root sugar coming from Germany?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How will you apply that to the others on which duty is levied by the polariscopic test? Do you propose changing the law so as to have an *ad valorem*?

Mr. BOWELL. You are quite right; we cannot do that under the polariscopic test for refining purposes. That is the point that arose in dispute in relation to the sugar manufactured in England from the German sugar. It was the refined sugar purchased in England for grocery purposes, or the "low yellows," as they were called. Those do not go to the refinery and, consequently, they will bear an *ad valorem* duty, and this clause can be applied.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Perhaps I did not make myself understood. I understand that a complaint made by the refiners led to a change in the duty a few years ago, and that beet root sugars were admitted, less the bounty, for a time, because it was said that the English refiners having the advantage of using the beet root sugars, if the raw material was not admitted into the Dominion on the same terms as other sugars, that our refiners could not compete with them. Since the change has been made under which the duty on refined sugar from Great Britain has been in-

creased to meet the views of the refiners, what I desire to know is whether the Government propose taking any action to levy the duty on the raw beet root sugar from Germany on the same principle that they apply it on the refined sugars from New York. That is to say, on the value of the sugar without deducting the large bounty or drawback which is allowed the purchaser off the raw material in that country.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no proposition of that kind. The proposition before the House is simply to apply to sugar or any other articles upon which an *ad valorem* duty is imposed. Under the system that prevails now—the charging of duty in accordance with the strength of the sugar—that question cannot arise, nor has it arisen in the past, and unless an *ad valorem* duty was imposed in addition to the duty which was imposed upon the different degrees of strength now the principle could not apply.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. BOWELL. We do not propose to change that. The hon. gentleman will remember that one of the principal reasons why we changed the mode of collecting the sugar duty was to encourage the West Indian trade with Canada. It was contended by those who were engaged in the trade that, when sugars were purchased in China, or the Sandwich Islands, &c., it could be purchased at a very much lower rate than in the West Indies, or Cuba, and the result of that was that the freights being so much lower for the long voyages, it, in a measure, acted against the West Indian trade. Then it was changed to the polariscopic system, by which it mattered not from what part of the world it came, and it mattered not under what circumstances it was purchased, the duty would be collected on the actual strength of the sugar, so that if it were purchased in China and brought to Canada, and contained the same strength as sugar purchased in the nearest Islands to Halifax or other parts of Canada, it would pay precisely the same duty as that brought the short distance. It is not proposed to change this mode of collecting duty on sugar.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The point I was trying to get the hon. gentleman to notice was this, he stated the object was to encourage the West Indian trade.

Mr. BOWELL. That was the object of the change.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes, I understand that was all right so far as it went, but the hon. gentleman will see he is not carrying out his own policy; that is to say, he was only carrying it out with a particular object, and in so far as it is beneficial to the refiners. He is placing duty on the refined sugar coming from the States at its market value without allowing for that drawback. An *ad valorem* duty is assessed at the same rate as the article sells for in the wholesale market in New York. I wish to know whether the hon. gentleman does not see that under that principle the beet root sugar should be assessed in the same way. I admit you do not reach it by the polariscopic test system. The question is whether you should not apply an *ad valorem* duty in that way to meet that difficulty. The hon. gentleman knows, and no one knows better, that under the present arrangement the beet root sugar is driving the West Indian sugar almost entirely out of the market. I have not the figures in my hand at the moment, but I think, if the hon. gentleman refers to the Trade and Navigation Returns he will find that less than 40 per cent. of the sugar manufactured in this country is what is called Barbadoes and that the large proportion is the beet root sugars coming from Germany. If the import of that article goes on under the present system in the same ratio it has for the past few years, instead of encouraging the West India trade which seems to be the object the hon. gentleman and the Government have in view, it will completely kill that trade. Therefore it is needless for them to talk about building up a

trade with the West Indies, while at the same time the effect of their tariff regulations is to encourage the importation of beet root sugar, and is driving the West India sugar out of the market. If the Government desire to help the West India trade, they should take some means by which the duty will be imposed on the raw sugar at its value in Germany, without allowing any deduction for the bounty or drawback, just as they do on sugar from New York, to benefit the refiner.

Mr. BOWELL. I fully recognise the logic of the hon. gentleman on this question, but to adopt the system he proposes now would disarrange the whole system of the collection of sugar duties. The probabilities are from present appearances that the discrimination which he has pointed out may not exist for any length of time, for I understand that the effect of the international congress which has been discussing this question, is that Germany, Belgium, France, and nearly every country which has been paying heavy bounties on the production of beet root sugar, have agreed to their abandonment. I am not aware of any that have not joined in the conference except the United States, and it was only about a week ago that it was announced in England that the colonies had given in their adhesion to that principle.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In the meantime the West India trade shall suffer.

On section 16,

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not see any difference between this and the old law, with this exception, that under the amended clause the collector appoints one appraiser, the individual who feels aggrieved nominates another, and an officer of the Customs Department is the third; virtually leaving the Government or their officers to appoint two, whose decision is final.

Mr. BOWELL. Under the old law, in case of a dispute between the importer and the customs authorities as to values, the collector is empowered to appoint two merchant appraisers who are supposed to know the value of the goods. They take the evidence, and report to Ottawa, and the decision of the Commissioner of Customs is final. The importers have contended that that arrangement is too one-sided, and that they ought to have something to say. Therefore we have changed the law so as to give the importer a voice on the board. The Government, instead of having the power to appoint the whole of them, have only power to appoint one, who is outside of the customs, and the appraiser, who is supposed to have a better knowledge of the value of the goods than any one, is the third; and their decision is final. This relieves the Government of any responsibility in the matter; and is a concession which has never been given before either in this country or in the United States. In the United States they have had two or three systems of appraisement, but they have abolished them all, and at the present the law there is that the Government appoint a board of appraisers from their own officers, whose decision is final. It was thought under the circumstances that it would be better to make our law a little more moderate by giving the importers a say in the matter.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I understand that, but really I cannot see that it is such a concession on the part of the Government as the hon. Minister would lead us to believe. Virtually the Government control the whole valuation. Before, the party feeling aggrieved had no voice in the matter. Now, he may have a voice, but the voice does not amount to anything, because the two Government appraisers decide as to the value of the article and the duty to be paid, and their decision is final.

Mr. BOWELL. That argument is very good, based on the assumption that the only object the Government have

is to take all the duty they can get out of everybody. I take it for granted that the Government do not want any more than they are entitled to, and this provision is only to protect the honest importer who enters his goods at a fair valuation. The Government have no power to take one cent of duty out of the importer if it is shown, after these appraisers meet, that the original appraisement by the department was too high. All they have to enquire is whether the article imported has been entered at a value less than that article is sold at in the market where purchased for home consumption. Under the circumstances, my hon. friend will see that this is a very equitable provision, unless I am to infer that he desires when a difficulty arises that the merchant who imports shall have the selection of the board to decide the question. Then, I suppose the argument is fair on the other side, that the Government would have nothing to do with the valuation, and might as well surrender at once, because the importer would select such friends as would annul the valuation put upon the goods by the appraiser.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think my hon. friend will see the Government should have such a power as this, if they deal with it at all. They must take the responsibility, and we are bound to assume that the Government have no object in getting more than the fair duty which the importer is entitled to pay.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not object to that in the least, but I do not think the Minister of Customs has really shown that the individual aggrieved can feel he has every protection desirable. Of course I can understand it is necessary to protect the Government, but we should also not look upon every importer as a dishonest individual, and frame the law so as to punish almost every individual who may fall at times into the hands of the Government. I think the protection offered here to the importer is very little indeed.

On section 17,

Mr. BOWELL. Clauses 78, 79, 82, 83, 103, 124 and 125 are all changed so as to provide for the doing away with the giving of bonds, to which I called the attention of the House the other night. As the law now stands, bonds are required to be given in each case when goods are removed from one warehouse to another, thus entailing a large amount of labor on the part of the merchants as well as the custom house officers. About 30,000 to 35,000 bonds are passed during a year. The proposal is to provide that the moment a party ex-warehousing goods from one warehouse to another, or from one bonded warehouse in one Province to another, he becomes just as responsible for the delivery of the goods to the other warehouse as if he had given the bond, so that it relieves the merchant from giving the bond, and it relieves the customs officials in different parts of the Dominion from filling out some 30,000 to 40,000 bonds every year. The revenue will be just as safe as it is now, because the parties who gave bonds did not give sureties, but simply their own individual bonds, and if they can be held as responsible by a clause in the Act as by signing bonds, we do away with all the difficulty and at the same time protect the revenue.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Do I understand that when the party warehousing a cargo and giving his bond, transfers it to a second party, whether the latter gives bonds or not, the original importer who has given his bond, and who loses all control of the goods after he has parted with them, is held responsible?

Mr. BOWELL. Do you mean when the goods remain in the bonded warehouse?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No; after they are delivered. For instance: If I import a cargo and give a bond, and then

Mr. BOWELL.

sell it to a refinery; they may either pass a bond, or not, as the case may be, but I, as the original importer, cease to be held responsible for the duty?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; the moment the transfer takes place, and the party who has purchased from you in bond transfers it from that warehouse to his own, he is responsible.

On section 18,

Mr. BOWELL. Clause 82 makes the acceptance of the transfer of goods in the warehouse equivalent to the bond heretofore exacted, and places the new owner under the same obligations as was the party who originally entered the goods for warehouse.

On section 19,

Mr. BOWELL. Section 86 is to give the officers of the Customs Department power to enter and examine a warehouse in which goods are stored in bond. At present such officer has no legal authority to enter and examine without the consent of the proprietor. It is manifestly necessary and proper that the right to enter and make an examination should be beyond dispute. At present, it is contended that an officer has no power to demand entrance to a warehouse, when he has to pass through a free portion of it to enter the bonded portion. This will enable him, if he thinks anything is wrong, to demand entrance, and the owner of the warehouse is obliged to give it to him.

On section 20,

Mr. BOWELL. The object of this provision is to keep the statistics right, so as to show the country to which the vessel belongs and from which it comes.

On section 21,

Mr. BOWELL. That is a clause defining the time at which the articles seized may be sold, if the decision of the department, or of any court, is not complied with.

On section 22,

Mr. BOWELL. The object of this is to assist exporters and relieve them of a good deal of trouble to which they are now put. Take the case of an exporter of lumber from Buckingham by way of Rouse's Point. He is now compelled to come to Ottawa to make his entry, instead of making it at Rouse's Point, which would be more convenient. Take the case of lumber exported by rail from Alexandria, on the line of the Canada Atlantic Railway. The nearest custom house to that place is at Cornwall, which is some 40 miles out of the way, and he must make his entry there. I propose to allow him to make his export entry at the nearest place to that by which it is going out of the country. The next provision is a question of bonds again.

On section 23,

Mr. BOWELL. This is to provide for vessels which do not enter a regular port of entry. The penalty before was only fixed in regard to vessels which had dutiable goods on board, leaving a vessel which had no such goods to do practically what she pleased, and, therefore, to a certain extent enabling her to evade the necessity of reporting. It is also intended to reduce the penalty from the forfeiture of the vessel to a fine of \$400, in case the vessel is worth less than \$800, and then to authorize the sale of the vessel if the penalty is not paid within thirty days. It often occurs now that a vessel may run in for shelter or for smuggling purposes, but, as the law reads, it is doubtful if anything can be done with her unless she has dutiable goods on board. We want to make her report whether she has dutiable goods on her or not. The House will see that it would be very easy for her to run in and get rid of the dutiable

goods, and afterwards to state: "We have no dutiable goods on board."

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How will that affect the fishermen under the treaty?

Mr. BOWELL. It will not affect them, because they will be specially exempt under the law accepting the treaty.

On section 25,

Mr. BOWELL. This is to cover disputes which have arisen as to the right of a customs officer to make a seizure. It has been contended that no seizure can be made except unless under cover of a writ of assistance, as provided under a section of the old law. If that were the correct interpretation, it is not that under which customs officers have acted in the past. The operation of the law would be impracticable, as we should have to obtain from the courts a writ of assistance, and place it in the hands of every customs officer. In the past when any customs official has had reason to suppose that there were smuggled goods, he considered that he had the right to make the seizure. I believe he had the right; but it having been disputed it is better to make it clear.

On section 26,

Mr. BOWELL. This is to correct an absurd wording of the law. The old law refers to places where no justice can be found within five miles; that has been struck out.

On section 27,

Mr. BOWELL. These words have been added to the original clause:

"And unless payment is made within thirty days, such vessel may, after the expiration of such delay, be sold to pay such penalty and any expenses incurred in detaining, keeping and selling the same."

It is only carrying out the provisions of the earlier clauses.

On section 28,

Mr. BOWELL. That is striking out the words "North West Territories," as courts have been established in the Territories since.

On section 29,

Mr. BOWELL. These words are added:

"Which he has reasonable grounds to believe are liable to forfeiture."

On section 30,

Mr. BOWELL. This is somewhat of an important change, and I will give the House the reasons for it. The object of the amendment is to render more plain and unmistakable the intention of the law. While it would appear, by section 148 of the old law, that no action, suit or proceeding of any nature could be commenced against an officer making a seizure on account thereof, it has been contended that this does not include actions in replevin or revendication to recover possession of the thing seized. While it is impossible to deny that the owner or claimant of the thing seized has a right to an adjudication on the legality of the seizure, such opportunity should be afforded him to obtain a decision in regard to the ownership of the thing seized; but the intent and purpose of the law is not so clear at present as to debar the owner from taking action in replevin or revendication, and that necessarily tends to embarrass the officers of the Government, and in some cases to defeat the ends of justice. The amendment will prevent unnecessary and unprofitable litigation. The law in the United States provides that property seized under such circumstances shall be irrepleviable. We desire to prevent as much as possible the delay in settling these cases by lawyers replevining goods, and then keeping them standing in that position for years. These cases have occurred, particularly in Montreal.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the right of replevin, the officer gets the condemnation. There is great doubt whether a replevin applies at all. The 148th section seems to be entirely new. It says that action shall be brought against the Crown or any officer of customs until a decision has been first given either by the Minister of Customs or by a court of competent jurisdiction, in relation to the condemnation of the things seized. It seems to me that is rather cutting down the rights of the parties.

Mr. BOWELL. This amendment was made for the express purpose of facilitating the settlement of all these cases. When a seizure is so made a certain length of time is given for the Minister or the deputy to make his decision, but before that can be done, the goods have been, in many cases, replevined, and there they stand for years, and cannot be touched until that case is decided. This has been framed after a good deal of thought and consideration, as leading to the best and quickest possible mode of arriving at a decision.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). But by section 147, any action must be brought within three months; it is possible no condemnation will take place before that three months; therefore the parties in the action may be completely barred. I think that section ought to be left out. By the sub-section of section 148, you declare that no action shall be brought until adjudication by the Minister of Customs, or by a court of competent jurisdiction, as to the condemnation of the thing seized. The previous section 147 limits the time for bringing the action within three months, and possibly a condemnation might not be arrived at and the party would be deprived of his remedy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The decision of the Minister will save it, "until a decision has been first given by the Minister of Customs, or by a court of competent jurisdiction."

Mr. WELDON (St. John). But no action shall be brought within that time.

Mr. BOWELL. I think you will find, when we reach a later section, that there is a time fixed for giving a decision, or a reasonable time. But if the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will let that stand for consideration.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would suggest three months after the decision, or after it has been passed upon.

On section 32,

Mr. BOWELL. This is to strike out the words "for entry" and "to hold the vessel in case of penalties being put," the contention being by some parties that you can only collect from the officer who committed the offence, and while it makes that provision, it also says you may detain the vessel. But the contention is that though you may detain the vessel, you cannot compel the owners to pay the penalties. This is to provide against that. Whenever a captain has committed an offence which makes him liable to a penalty, you not only detain the vessel, but you compel the owners to pay. That was evidently the original intention of the law, or they would not have given power to the customs to retain the vessel.

On section 33,

Mr. BOWELL. The present Civil Service Act confines the administering of the oath of allegiance to certain officers and officials in Ottawa. The object of this is to give inspectors of customs and certain other officials the power to do that which they formerly had power to do; that is, to administer the oath of allegiance and the oath of office to any new officer that may be appointed, without having to come to Ottawa to do it.

On section 34,

Mr. BOWELL. This gives power to the Minister in case of dispute, with a party who has been fined, instead of waiting for him to commence an action, to transfer the case at once to the courts.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is the difference between this and the old clause, as regards production of books and papers in case of seizure of goods?

Mr. BOWELL. Only that the three years' limitation is abolished. You can now seize for duties for any time. Many were confounding the collection of duties with penalties which have been imposed, which were limited to three years. By the provision of this section of the old Act, power is given to customs officers to examine the books of an importer respecting importations made within the three years next preceding the date of the seizure made by him. It is proposed to strike out this limitation.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Then you will be able to go back any number of years?

Mr. BOWELL. Not unless there is reason to believe that there has been improper dealing.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Then the officers would be able to expose a man's business for any number of years?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, as can be done at the present time for three years. Suppose it is known that a man has been smuggling for ten years, why should he be exempted for seven years' fraud? That is really the point for the committee to decide—whether a man not having been caught for the three years is to be held to be innocent because the crime was committed three years before the time the fraud was discovered. The discovery may not take place for three years. It may be discovered, as has been done, that frauds have been continually perpetrated by importers for years and years. Under the present law, although his books may give evidence showing that he has committed those frauds, the Department can only secure penalties for three years.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Has there not been a great deal of trouble in the United States respecting a provision of this character, and has it not been repealed there?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman may be right; we have no knowledge of it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the United States that power was exercised very harshly, and was attended by very serious consequences. It is a very harsh clause. There should be a limitation of some kind. This clause is giving very inquisitorial power on very slender evidence.

Mr. BOWELL. The whole Customs Act is of a very inquisitorial character, and it is only on information that custom house officers can act. Action is very often taken in this way: An importer has a manager or foreman who quarrels with his employer. Thereupon the employé enters a complaint to the customs against his employer, whom he accuses of having been engaged in smuggling, and he gives such evidence of the fact as to justify the officers in entering the establishment and making a seizure.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No doubt this Act is in the interest of the honest importer, but, at the same time, it gives great power to inflict annoyance and take action of an inquisitorial character that can be made very offensive. We know that it sometimes happens that an importer is subject to a pique on the part of some one who sends notice to the Customs Department that he has reason to believe that the importer is smuggling. On the faith of that statement the officer walks into the man's business premises and demands to have his whole business exposed for years. That is a most improper authority to give to any one, except under the most extraordinary circumstances. I am quite

Mr. BOWELL.

willing that the law should be of a nature to protect the honest importer, but this provision opens the door to a great deal of annoyance, and an honest importer may be annoyed by a man walking in and saying: I believe you are smuggling, and I demand to see your books and papers. Under this clause the importer, under a penalty of \$5,000 will be obliged to expose his business. Advantage may be taken of this by another man who wants to obtain knowledge of his business. Customs officers are not always above suspicion, and if a man wanted to obtain knowledge of his neighbor's business he could send to the customs officers a complaint that his neighbor was smuggling. His friend could thereupon examine the books and report as to where purchases were made and the rates paid. That is an authority which the hon. gentleman should not ask the committee to grant. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman, or any hon. gentleman responsible to this House, going himself to any importer and making an examination of the books; but to send every Tom, Dick and Harry that belongs to the department is, I think, asking too much. This clause can be, no doubt, operated so as to be very offensive indeed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are there any departmental regulations which would prevent a party who undertook to make an inspection of another man's business for the purpose of reporting to anyone else? Are the officers under an obligation to maintain secrecy?

Mr. BOWELL. Under the rules of the department any officer giving information subjects himself to dismissal. One of the complaints against the officers, in the large cities and other places, is because they will not tell and have not told, and they have been accused of entering into collusion with merchants and others to take a certain sum and hush the matter up. But those people wanted the whole thing published in the papers. I have never known a case in the last ten years similar to that suggested by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). His whole argument applies just as strongly to the three years' limit as to a ten years' limit. He will also understand that unless this power be given to customs officials—this work is not done by every Tom, Dick and Harry, but by responsible officers—you cannot reach cases of men who have been committing smuggling frauds, but were only recently discovered, unless you can go back for some years. Take the cases which occurred in Montreal a short time since, in which it was found that an importer had been systematically entering goods under false invoices; that he had been numbering cases improperly, and that he would secure the delivery of one case containing very valuable goods while the case which he had entered contained goods of very little value, and, consequently, bore a lower rate of duty. We only found out the extent of the frauds by going to their establishment and demanding to see their books. It transpired there were invoices upon which entry had been made, and the entry in their books showed that they had paid a much larger sum for their goods than was shown upon the fare of the invoice, and it was also discovered that while he had entered and paid duty on one class of goods, he had actually purchased from an exporter in the other country goods of a much more valuable class and which should have paid higher duty. If you eliminate that from the Act, there is no safety at all for the honest importers. In one case where parties in Montreal paid over \$32,000, the frauds were only reached by the means which I have pointed out. Experience told others, and their lawyers probably advised them, that, instead of giving up their books, we have reason to know they burned them, that the only penalty we could inflict on that person was a penalty of a thousand dollars. It was impossible to reach the frauds or the extent of them, because we could not get their books. It is true I might have sent an officer to England, or the

great markets of the world, where they bought their goods, in order to find out the quantity and quality of the goods purchased. Suppose I had sent to Manchester, and an officer had gone into an establishment, even accredited from the Government, the exporter might have said: "It is none of your business, sir, walk out;" as they do sometimes. In other cases they gave us their books as they have done in New York, when it was shown they had sent goods to people in this country who were enabled by defrauding the customs to sell goods at half their value. This clause is only giving the Government power to send customs officers to demand books, and if importers try to prevent investigation to deal more severely with them.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I admit it is in the interests of the honest importer if properly carried out, but at the same time it opens the door to a good deal of annoyance.

Mr. BOWELL. So it does.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I know of cases within my own knowledge where an intimation was given of a certain vessel having goods on board which were not reported, and merely to annoy the owner of that ship the customs officer examined her and nothing was found on board. The same principle would apply to any person having a large amount of goods in his store, and he would have to allow this officer to have knowledge of all his transactions for a number of years. I have it on authority that in many cases those officers do not exercise their power very judiciously or very impartially. I may be wrong, but I have heard that officers from the Minister of Customs' Department have been through our own Province and they have shown a remarkable avoidance of certain business premises in the country that were known to be more in sympathy with the views of the Government of the day, and they always scented out with an extraordinary amount of readiness and activity prominent business places conducted by gentlemen who did not sympathise with them. Now, this is one of the difficulties. I admit if the law was honestly carried out it would be all right, but it opens the door for such an inquisitorial interference with the honest trader and the business generally that it would be very objectionable and looked upon with very great disfavor by the commercial community generally.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). The argument of the Minister of Customs seems irresistible, but suppose we confine the power to customs officers of the port alone. Here you say: "to any officer of customs." This would give the power to an understrapper, which he might exercise arbitrarily, and I suppose the intention of the Government is to confine it to a responsible officer.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. It says: "or any other proper officer of customs."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). Suppose you confine it to the customs collector himself.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In the first line of that clause, section 85, would it not be better to make it read "Whenever information has been given under oath."

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection to that; let it be so. In order to meet the objection made by my hon. friend from St. John's (Mr. Weldon) I will confine the time to five years, and make it read: "And of all goods imported into Canada by him at any time within six years preceding such request or seizure." There are two or three other verbal corrections which I desire to make in that clause, such as changing the word "and," in the sixth line, to "or," and make it read "either the exporter or the owner." There is an objection to making the officer the collector of customs alone, because the officer who discovers the fraud might be 20 or 30 miles away from the port in charge, and the goods might be removed before the collector could act.

We have found, in our experience of sending a man from one port to another, the moment that it is known he is there the smugglers are on the *qui vive* at once, and sometimes even the officers of the port will frustrate his action, because they think if he succeeds it is a reflection on them. It is absolutely necessary, in order to catch smugglers, for a stranger to go to a port and wait there sometimes two or three weeks before the parties are discovered.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). As it stands now a tide-waiter who is not responsible might demand the books.

Mr. BOWELL. We never do that.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). He has the power to demand the books.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, but the man sent is a man who occupies some position in the customs, and who knows what his duties are.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The objection is not to the seizure, it is to the demanding of the books by an inferior officer.

Mr. BOWELL. I understand that. The amended section 186 fixes the penalty for refusing to give up the books at from \$1,000 to \$5,000. The law of the United States is that if the party refuses to give up the books, that is *prima facie* evidence of his guilt, and in case of a suit the decision is given accordingly. If it is alleged that a person has smuggled goods and there is no means of ascertaining the facts except by his books and he refuses to give up his books on an order of the court, we also provide that that shall be taken as *prima facie* evidence of his guilt.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The order of the court should not be taken unless the party has an opportunity of being heard. The books might be destroyed so that he might not be able to produce them.

Mr. BOWELL. This is a case we want to meet. I have in my mind a case that occurred in Montreal, in which, just as soon as the importer consulted his lawyer—I do not know that his lawyer advised him to do so—the books were burned, and we could not reach them. Therefore we thought it better, after a great deal of consideration, to adopt the American system in this respect. If a man is innocent, he will give up his books, and I think it will be in the discretion of the court to say whether his excuse is sufficient or not.

On section 35,

Mr. BOWELL. This amends section 192 so as to make a party guilty of smuggling or of an attempt to defraud subject to a penalty equal to the value of the goods. The Act as it exists provides for the forfeiture of the goods, which would be sufficient if the goods were found; but when they are not found, the party escapes after conviction with a penalty of from \$50 to \$200, as the magistrate may decide; but practically it is only \$50, for the sympathy, I am sorry to say, is generally with the smuggler and not with the Government, whereas the goods might be ten times that value.

On section 38,

Mr. BOWELL. This section provides that in cases where smuggled goods have been disposed of or are beyond the reach of seizure, the penalty for concealing them, &c., is the same as for smuggling, as provided in section 192. At present, the penalty for being an accessory is four times that of being a principal.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Why omit the word "knowingly?" You should make it "knowingly harbor, conceal, &c."

Mr. BOWELL. I will add that word.

On section 39,

Mr. BOWELL. The intention of this amendment is to make part of the offence any misdescription of goods in the invoice. At present the law only refers to misstatement of values, and frauds are frequently perpetrated by giving goods a name by which they can be entered free or at a lower rate than if they were properly named.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I brought before the hon. gentleman last year a case on which the goods were entered under a different name. Did the law not cover that case?

Mr. BOWELL. Not clearly. Of course we could call it a fraud, but a great many technical objections were raised by legal gentlemen. For example: persons have imported ground quercitron, which in its crude state is free, but when ground or otherwise manufactured dutiable at 20 per cent., but have invoiced it simply as quercitron, thereby defrauding the revenue. It has subsequently been discovered, after seeing the correspondence, that these parties instructed the merchants in the foreign markets to invoice the goods simply as quercitron; and to ascertain whether it was ground every barrel would have to be opened.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In the case I brought up, there was clear misrepresentation. Would this be a convenient time to ask what was done in that case?

Mr. BOWELL. If you will give me the case and the name, I will let you know what was done.

On section 41,

Mr. BOWELL. This strikes out the name of the Provinces, which I am advised is unnecessary and only encumbers the Act.

On section 44,

Mr. BOWELL. The clause in the old Act is obsolete and has never been acted on, and we have substituted this in its place to define what is meant by the commencement of an action, suit or proceeding. Under the Act differences of opinion have arisen. Strange to say, there are four or five different opinions as to when the time commences for the beginning of an action. Some eminent lawyers contend that the time begins to run the moment the offence is committed; others contend that it is not until the discovery of the fraud has been made, while we have always acted upon the view that the time begins to run from the time the decision has been made by the department. This amendment is to declare exactly when it does commence to run.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That is in regard to any suit of the Crown under the Act?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

On section 45,

Mr. BOWELL. That defines the time within which proceedings must be commenced.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does not that conflict with the six years' provision which has been already made?

Mr. BOWELL. No; that is only in regard to the demand for books, &c.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But supposing there was a seizure under that? It seems to me that this provision with conflict with the other.

Mr. BOWELL. The Minister of Justice tells me that it does not interfere at all.

On section 47,

Mr. BOWELL. This clause is simply to make the law as it now stands upon the Statute-book applicable to rail-

Mr. BOWELL.

ways as well as to steamboats and vessels. There was no provision in the law applicable to railways.

On section 48,

Mr. BOWELL. There is no provision in the law as it stands for disposing of the surplus.

On section 49,

Mr. BOWELL. I move to strike out the portion of the clause repealing section 117, which is not repealed.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I should like to ask under what authority the Government claim the right by Order in Council to vary the duties or classify the duties on different articles from time to time. We frequently see an Order in Council issued changing the duties or fixing the duties on certain classes of goods. On more than one occasion, I heard that, when articles have been imported and admitted at a certain rate, when it was found that they rather interfered with some manufacturing interests —

Mr. BOWELL. Do not put it in that way.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am well aware of that by the representations which have been made.

Mr. BOWELL. They are not always true.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In those cases, I have found that they have been changed. Have the Government any authority to do this by Order in Council under the Customs Act or under any special Act?

Mr. BOWELL. It often occurs that an article is imported, and sometimes the appraiser and sometimes the collector will rule the article under a certain clause of the tariff. When the entries are sent to the Department the check clerks often discover that the goods have been improperly classified; these are, I think, the cases to which my hon. friend refers. The ninth section of the Customs Act provides that:

"Whenever any dispute arises as to whether any or what duty is payable on particular goods, and there is no previous decision in the matter by any competent tribunal, or there are decisions inconsistent with each other, the Governor in Council may declare the duty payable on the kind of goods in question or that such goods are exempt from duty; and any Order in Council containing such declaration and fixing such duty, if any, and published in the *Canada Gazette*, shall have the effect of law."

That provision is only taken advantage of when disputes arise as to the proper classification of goods, and the proper rate of duty to be levied upon them. There is another clause, however, which gives power to the Governor in Council to put articles on the free list which are used in the manufacture of other articles.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not object to that so much, because it is a relief from taxation. Perhaps it is not exactly in accordance with constitutional government to vest that authority in the Executive; still, we never complain when they relieve us from the burden of taxation, but, when, as is often the case, the duties are indirectly increased by an Order in Council, putting articles under different headings from those under which they have been previously admitted, it seems to me that the Government practically assume the functions of this Parliament, to declare what duties shall be levied on those articles.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government must construe the law if a question arises as to what the duty is.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We have not, I think, that implicit confidence in the Government which would lead us to believe that they will always rightly construe the law.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose that will occur, no matter what Government is in power.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That Act has been in operation now for several years, and still we constantly find Orders in Council passed placing goods under different heads, and I

think the Government should have had sufficient time to decide as to what heads these articles ought to be placed under before this period.

Mr. BOWELL. My hon. friend forgets that the tariff has been changed nearly every year since 1873, except this year, and consequently the difficulties which he refers to will necessarily occur under every new tariff. We have those difficulties now under certain classes of iron. After we thought we had taken every possible precaution to define what scrap iron was, we have now different importers and manufacturers giving different interpretations as to what scrap iron is. There is another clause of the Customs Act which provides:

"If an article is enumerated in the tariff under two or more names or descriptions, and there is a difference of duty, the highest duty provided shall be charged and collected thereon."

Some collectors may impose the lower duty, and then our attention is brought to that by a manufacturer or an importer. Because when an importer has been charged the higher duty, and we learn that at another port the same goods have been admitted at a lower duty, our attention is called to it, and then upon investigation, if we find the higher duty the correct one, we have so to rule. Those are the only cases in which duties, as the hon. gentleman says, may have been apparently increased, but they are not really increased.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I pointed out last year that certain dealers in agricultural implements found that they could get them from Montreal by rail to Halifax cheaper than they could import them from the United States direct. I am not sure whether that is still going on, but up to that time it had been going on for a number of years. Will the hon. gentleman look into it?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, we are constantly looking into cases of that kind; there is scarcely a month that these complaints do not come to the department. They arise, I dare say, much from the fact of the great number of ports in the country, and the diversity of ideas that collectors have as to the proper rating of articles which are imported. Then again it arises in this way: A man may be importing into one small port an article at a very large undervaluation, and that would enable him, until it was found out, to do precisely what the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This applies to a large port like Montreal. There were two cases that I mentioned to the hon. gentleman last year. The difference was so glaring that these goods could be imported in Montreal and sold in Halifax, paying all the expense over the Intercolonial Railway, at a lower rate than they could be imported into Halifax direct from the United States. This shows there was something wrong in Montreal.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is difficulty here. In the 185th section we extend the limits, and on explanation of the hon. Minister, we gave power to a person to examine the books, originally to go back any length of time—the hon. Minister has limited to six years the time within which he can examine the books of any importers who have entered. Well, what is the object in looking through a man's books for six years unless it is to discover the frauds committed during those six years?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, that is the meaning.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, he is not going to look through those books for fun, simply to ascertain whether the man did what was wrong or not. If you look back for six years, it is thought that at any time during those six years a fraud has been committed, and that it will institute a suit to recover—is that the idea? Well, if I understand section 240 that you passed a minute ago, it says:

"All seizures, prosecutions, or suits for the recovery or enforcement of any of the penalties or forfeitures imposed by this Act, or any other law relating to the Customs, may be made or commenced at any time within three years after the offence was committed, or the cause of prosecution or suit arose, but not afterwards."

The difficulty I see is this: What is the use of looking through a man's books six years back to find frauds if you pass another Act declaring that the time is limited to three years within which an action will be brought?

Mr. BOWELL. I think that you will find that the 185th clause relates almost exclusively to payment of duties, while the three years' clause refers only to penalties which have been imposed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think you are wrong, but it is your own Bill.

Mr. BOWELL. That is what I am informed. If we find, as the hon. gentleman says, that there is a conflict, I will ask to go back into committee so as to rectify it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the Minister to look at section 5 again. I am certain, as it now stands, that it would not bear the construction that he puts upon it. I am referring to his substituted section. From the explanation the Minister gave, he proposed to impose a duty of 10 per cent. on the *ad valorem* duty of goods; but that is not what the clause says as it stands. It is 10 per cent. on the duty according to the *ad valorem* value.

Mr. BOWELL. No, it is not the intention to impose 10 per cent. on the value of the goods, the intention is to impose 10 per cent. upon the duty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, but the hon. gentleman, when he was giving the information, mentioned a case where there was \$450 charged, and where they valued the goods, as fixed by the customs, at \$600. He said there 10 per cent. would be \$60. Now, as this reads, 10 per cent. would be \$18, that is, it would be 10 per cent. on the *ad valorem* duty. The *ad valorem* duty is \$180, and 10 per cent. on that is \$18. But 10 per cent. on the value of the goods would be \$60, and that is not what the clause says. Now, the hon. gentleman, under this clause, could not collect \$60, but only \$18.

Mr. THOMPSON. But the *ad valorem* duty of the goods would be the whole \$180, because the value is \$600. In addition to that, a sum equal to the same percentage of the whole *ad valorem* duty is usually payable as the percentage of the under valuation in the original bill of entry. The original bill was \$140, and it was deficient by \$150. Now, as \$450 is to \$150, so is the sum which he paid to the additional sum he would have to pay by this, and that would amount, I think, to \$60.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It would amount to \$45.

Mr. BOWELL. The principle upon which this clause is based is this: That if the goods are entered at 10 per cent. under the correct value, then the penalty is 10 per cent. of the duty in addition; if, as in the case referred to, it was \$150, that would be 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. under value, and that would be the proportion, not 10 per cent. of the whole. The penalty is not 10 per cent. upon every undervaluation. If it is 50 per cent., then it would carry with it 50 per cent. of the duty.

Mr. THOMPSON. In that particular case the goods were undervalued by 33 per cent., then there will be 33 per cent. added to the actual duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We will take the illustration the hon. member gave. Goods are introduced at \$450, which are worth \$600. Those goods bear 30 per cent. duty. In that case, would the result be this: that the party would have to pay 30 per cent. on the \$150, which is \$45, and 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. on the \$45, making \$60.

Mr. THOMPSON. He would have to pay the whole \$180 and the \$60 besides. It is 33½ per cent. on the \$600.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A large portion of the \$180 has been paid in the first instance.

Mr. THOMPSON. He has only to make up the difference and the fine of \$60.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The fine will be levied, \$45, on the whole \$180 he had to pay, not on the difference between the duty.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not understand the clause in that way. I thought the fine of 33½ per cent. was on the surplus duty, not on the whole amount of duty. As I now understand it, it is on the whole amount of duty.

Mr. BOWELL. In order to avoid detaining the committee I propose to strike out section 4.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 23rd April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1888; and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, April, 1888.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that His Excellency's Message and Supplementary Estimates be referred to Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

THE LATE HON. THOMAS WHITE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I expected that my hon. friend and leader, the First Minister, would have been able to announce, as he wished to have done, the death of our worthy colleague, the Hon. Thomas White, Minister of the Interior. His death was entirely unexpected, and is a terrible blow to his colleagues, and especially to the First Minister, whose intimate friend he was. I have no doubt that hon. members on both sides of the House sympathise with the bereaved family, and deplore with us the great loss which this House has met with in the death of Mr. White, and that the country has sustained by being deprived of his services. Mr. White, for many years, had been an active member of the press, and in that capacity had rendered great services to his country, and especially to his party. He was a good writer, but he was also a good friend, and although he fought his opponents vigorously, he was nevertheless always ready afterwards to shake hands with them; and he was always careful so to conduct his controversies with them that he could afterwards

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

be their friend again. I must say that during the last ten or eleven years that he has occupied a seat in this House, my friend, Mr. White, showed that he was worthy of his position—worthy to occupy a seat in this House; and when, at the suggestion of, and on the selection of, the First Minister, he was called to take a place in the Government, I know that on our side of the House, everybody applauded the choice, and his opponents likewise recognised that he was worthy of a seat alongside the other members of the Cabinet. Mr. White has lost his life in the service of his country. He was entirely devoted to his duties, and in order the better to be able to fulfil them faithfully and well, he visited the North-West twice, if I remember aright, and undertook a long voyage through that country in order to make himself perfectly acquainted with the needs and circumstances of that vast region, the affairs of which he had to administer. He made himself perfectly *au fait* with the wants of that country, and during the last year or so, he was in a position to render those services that were expected of him, when, in the midst of his great labors, he has been taken away, and thus leaves a great void in the Government of the country. I have no doubt that the country at large will mourn his loss, and will say with us that a good and able man has disappeared from our midst. Of course, it is not for me to dwell upon the consequences of this loss, or upon the lesson which this sad event teaches us; but let me say, at all events, that he has passed away, leaving, I hope, not one single enemy in this House, or even outside the House. I have no doubt that although his opponents, and our opponents, found that he was sometimes a very formidable adversary, on the other hand they will recognise that he always tried to avoid such expressions as might wound their feelings. For myself, at all events, the lesson I drew from his example is, that we must always remember that though we are called here to perform a duty, nevertheless we must be lenient towards others if we would have others lenient towards us in the performance of our duties. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the First Minister, will move that this House, when it adjourns to-day, will stand adjourned until Wednesday at three o'clock in the afternoon. The reason for this adjournment is that the funeral will leave the house of the deceased to-morrow morning at nine o'clock, and a special train will leave the Canada Atlantic Station at 9:30 for Montreal, for the convenience of the family, of members of both Houses, the heads of departments, the officers of his own department, the press, and some other officials. The train will return to Ottawa the same afternoon, leaving Montreal at an hour which will be announced to the passengers on the train during the course of the voyage. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. In seconding the motion, I can scarcely find words to give expression to the very sad emotions which this occasion arouses. Engaged as we are in daily strife, divided as we are in aims and purposes, struggling as we are every day, and sometimes bitterly struggling for our own convictions, we are too apt to forget, what we readily realise to-day, that after all there is an universality about us; and when a man of Mr. White's eminence is removed from amongst us we all individually feel that we have suffered a loss, and perhaps for the first time we can see the full measure of the man's worth. It is, however, a misfortune of our nature that we never appreciate fully what we have until we have lost it, and this feeling comes forcibly to me to-day. In Mr. White's death the whole nation has suffered a great loss, but I realise and understand that to his friends the blow must seem almost unbearable. His untiring energy and industry, his vast and wide knowledge of all political questions, his aptitude for business, his great administrative ability, his skill in debate, his eloquence, all were the happy

combination of varied qualities which made him a tower of strength to those with whom he was associated, and we on this side of the House can never forget, as has been said by the Minister of Public Works, that upon all occasions, whether on the floor of Parliament or whether in his department as an executive officer of the Crown, he was always civil, courteous and obliging. But I am sure that great as the blow must be to the country at large, to his party and to his family, there is no one who feels it more deeply than the veteran Premier. We all can sympathise with him, and we do sympathise with him now, and much as we may differ from him in politics on various questions we all understand that at his time of life the death of a long trusted friend must deal a severe blow. Death with us has been of late unusually cruel, Mr. White is the ninth of our colleagues we have lost since last elections. Death has been unsparing, striking alike on all ages and stations, and this last blow coming as it does so suddenly and so unexpectedly after so many others, recalls very forcibly the words of Burke: "What shadows we are and what shadows we pursue."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, we meet to-day under circumstances different perhaps from any which have ever marked the assembling of the representatives of the people—the death of a Minister of the Crown during a Session of Parliament—the occasion, Sir, hushes all party strife and a feeling of profound sorrow fills every heart in this Chamber. As a companion of the boyhood days of the deceased Minister, and a close and warm friend of maturer years, it is becoming that I should say a few words on this sad occasion. Not only as the head of an important department had our deceased friend rendered most valuable service to his country, but he for thirty years and more before he entered Parliament had been a leader in everything which tended to Canada's prosperity. Full of energy and a high sense of right, he had administered the important Department of the Interior in such a way as to secure the confidence of the people of our great North-West and British Columbia. He faced every obstacle which beset him with sagacity and ability. He appreciated the needs of those great sections of our country and he met them, inspiring the people with hope in their great future. Had his valuable life been spared it is impossible to predict how great would have been the results of his administration of the department. When he assumed the duties of the office he had mountains of difficulties to encounter, but he overcame them all and secured the grateful appreciation of those who were the most interested. I know, Sir, that hon. gentlemen who represent Manitoba and the North-West Territories and British Columbia will sustain me in this statement. We often fail in the bustle of life fully to recognise the merits of men until we lose them. It is so in this case. We shall all miss our deceased friend—miss his pleasant recognition and the hailing him by his familiar name. He was a man of talent and of truth, dealing with all questions in a spirit of equity and good judgment, inspiring the settlers with fresh courage, and as a Minister of the Crown ever most painstaking with the representatives whom the people sent here to look after their interest. In the adjudication of all matters brought before him, he did not "hew to the line," but met them in a spirit of concession. No man, Sir, I venture to say, has contributed so much to the prosperity of the North-West and our territory on the Pacific, present and prospective, as the Minister who has been called to his rest. Mr. Speaker, he was my friend. I knew him as perhaps few in this House did; he was always a true friend. The elevation to office made no change in him—a great man and one to whom the country looked for many years of still greater public usefulness has passed away at an age when it may be said he was in his prime. Truly, Sir, "his sun has set while it was yet day." Those of us who were

permitted to enjoy his society in his happy home, surrounded by those among whom there was such mutual love, and of whom he was so proud, will not soon forget it. Full of manliness he was tender as a woman. We shall not again see his face or listen to his persuasive eloquence, but it will be long before the brilliant ability of Thomas White as a Minister of the Crown and the beauty of his whole character will be forgotten either by this House or the country.

"Death has moulded into calm completion
The statue of his life."

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3:30 p.m., until Wednesday, 25th inst., at three o'clock, p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 25th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BANK OF LONDON.

Mr. MILLS moved:

That the report of the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce relating to the Bill for winding up the affairs of the Bank of London be not now concurred in, but be referred back to the Committee with instructions to consider the Bill as soon as the shareholders of the bank have signified by resolution, at a special meeting called for the purpose, that they desire the proposed legislation.

Mr. HALL. The report that has been submitted shows that the committee declined to consider the Bill on the ground solely that the shareholders of the institution have not been consulted. As the motion which has been submitted recognises the necessity of such a consultation, and is based upon it, there can be no objection to the second reference even by those who have opposed the consideration of the Bill already.

Motion agreed to.

ADVERTISING COUNTERFEIT MONEY.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 108) respecting the advertising of counterfeit money. He said: As the name of this Bill signifies, it is desired to attach penalties to the advertising of counterfeit money.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CARE AND REFORMATION OF NEGLECTED CHILDREN.

Mr. O'BRIEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 109) to provide for the care and reformation of children neglected or ill-treated by parents or guardians. He said: This Bill is brought in at the instance of the Humane Society of Toronto, and its object is to provide means whereby children neglected or ill-treated by parents or guardians may be brought before certain magistrates and by them admitted to institutions suitable for the reformation and care of such children. The Bill, so far as the first two clauses are concerned, is similar to the Bill already passed by the Ontario Legislature. The other clauses go a good deal further than that measure does. I have to admit at the outset that this Bill travels on that very narrow debatable ground lying between the civil jurisdiction of the Provinces and the criminal law as administered by the Dominion. Hon. gentlemen are aware that in regard to a Factory Act here is great difficulty in the way of that legislation, and it is very possible that one or two of the clauses in this Bill may necessarily be struck out on the ground of there being no jurisdiction. However, it is not proposed to go further

with this measure, as there is no time to give it full consideration; but I bring it before the House that those gentlemen who feel interested in it may have an opportunity of considering it, and at a later period the subject will be brought forward. It is a subject which may be considered upon its merits, as one entitled to the fullest consideration of all those who desire that the class of persons referred to shall have every protection the law can give them and every means by which they can be rescued from temptation, and enabled to be brought up in a condition of life which may be beneficial to themselves and to their fellow subjects.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 110) further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: This is a Bill on which I shall ask special action on the part of the House. A few weeks ago Mr. Justice Taschereau of the Supreme Court asked leave of absence for reasons which appeared to be quite sufficient, and very shortly afterwards another of the judges became incapacitated by illness. The result is that only four judges remain to perform the duties which begin on Tuesday next in connection with the May term of the court. I understand the docket of the term is a long one, and it is very undesirable that the term should be passed over and the cases thus go into arrear. The present provision of the statute is that five judges shall form a quorum, and inasmuch as only four are available the term of the court must go over unless it is the pleasure of the House to pass this Bill, and to pass it without reference to the procedure which governs Bills in ordinary cases. This has been done occasionally in cases of emergency, and in asking leave to introduce the Bill, I will ask to have it expedited through its several stages today in order that it may be finally passed and sent to the Senate. The reason why I ask permission to proceed with it so urgently is that a number of practitioners in different parts of the Dominion desire to know before they leave their homes for the term, whether the court will be postponed or will proceed. The Bill will contain one section only:

"Any five, or in the case of the illness, absence on leave, or any incapacity or the death of any judge, any four of the judges of the Supreme Court shall constitute a quorum, and may lawfully hold the court: Provided, however, that in such latter case, in the event of the judges being equally divided as to their decision upon any cause or matter heard before the court, there shall be a rehearing of such cause or matter before a court comprised of at least five judges; and provided also, that it shall not be necessary for all the judges who have heard the argument in any case to be present in order to constitute the court for delivery of judgment in such case, but in the absence of any judge, from illness or any other cause, judgment may be delivered by a majority of the judges who were present at the hearing; and any judge who has heard the case and is absent at the delivery of judgment may hand his opinion in writing to any judge present at the delivery of judgment, to be read or announced in open court, and then to be left with the registrar or reporter of the court; and in such case it shall not be necessary for a quorum to be present at the delivery of such judgment."

And so on, as in the present section. The only new provision being that in the case of urgency, which I have mentioned—four judges shall constitute a quorum, and that in the event of their being equally divided the cause shall be argued again before the full court.

Mr. LAURIER. The first reading, of course, may very well take place to-day, but I do not think the hon. gentleman should ask us to take any further stages. This is a very important Bill, and I am sure that the principle of it may be found very objectionable in many ways. I do not mean to say that it would negative the Bill altogether, but before we take this very important step it is nothing but fair that we should have an opportunity to read the Bill, and

Mr. O'BRIEN,

then if we can favorably consider the Bill we will do what we can to expedite business. I think that we should have an opportunity to consider the Bill, and that it must take its usual course. I trust that the Bill will be printed and distributed at once.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In Quebec matters are managed differently. When a judge is unable to preside another judge is appointed to his place temporarily. It may be well for the Government to consider this.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 111) to provide for the crossing of railways by streets, drains and water-mains.—(Mr. Lister.)

IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, 1. Whether the attention of the Government has been called to the fact that a considerable number of the immigrants who have landed in Canada, of late years, have been necessitous persons, unfit for settlers, and that these parties have frequently become permanent charges on the charity of the people of Canada?

Mr. CARLING. 1. The attention of the Government has been directed to the character of the immigration to Canada, and it has been found that the numbers of the unsuitable are very small, being only a fractional percentage of the whole, and have not been of a nature to call for any exceptional measures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If so, what precautions? Will the hon. gentleman state that?

Mr. CARLING. The precautions taken by our agents in Liverpool, who are in attendance on the sailing of vessels and at the purchase of tickets, to prevent unsuitable immigrants being sent by those vessels.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked further, 2. Whether the Government have taken any precautions to prevent such necessitous and unfit persons being landed in Canada? And if so, what precautions? 3. Have any such persons been sent back to the countries from which they came? And if so, how many? 4. Is it in the power of the Government to inflict any penalties, and if so, what penalties on any steamship company, or other persons, bringing such people into Canada? 5. If in their own opinion Government do not possess adequate powers to prevent and punish the importation of such persons into Canada, is it their intention to ask Parliament for further powers during the present Session?

Mr. CARLING. 2. The Government has taken precautions to prevent the sailing of persons who would be unsuitable for settlement in Canada. 3. The answer to this question is substantially the same as that made to question 1. 4. The Government can exact a duty in the nature of a penalty if a vessel arrives without having observed the necessary sanitary measures, and also in addition to the duty, a bond of \$200, with sureties, for each lunatic passenger. 5. The Government has power, by proclamation, to take any steps necessary to prevent the landing of unsuitable persons, and sending them back at the ship's expense.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not understand the answer to question number 4 to be an answer to the question. As I understood the hon. Minister, he alluded to the case of steamships bringing diseased persons into Canada.

He talked of sanitary precautions, and my question had reference to the case of the importation of persons unfit as immigrants to Canada.

THE VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. WELDON, St. John) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill to suspend the revision of the Voters' Lists, under the Franchise Act, during the present year?

Mr. CHAPLEAU, It is the intention of the Government to present such a measure.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND WHARVES AND PIERS.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, What official, if any, in Prince Edward Island, has charge of the Dominion Government wharves and piers in that Province? Is there any such official, what are his powers? Has he any authority to cause necessary repairs to be made from time to time?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My department sent an engineer there when wanted to look after those piers and to report. Besides that, there are the wharfingers under the department of my friend the Minister of Marine, who also report if repairs are required. That is communicated to my department, so that any of those repairs may be made, and in this way we are fully cognisant of what is going on.

MR. A. P. SHERWOOD.

Mr. COOK asked, Is Mr. A. P. Sherwood still occupying the position of Chief of the Dominion Police? If so, are the Government aware that he is engaged as agent or attorney for certain contractors on the Cape Breton Railway? Has he obtained permission from the Government to engage in such business? Has a member of the inside Civil Service the right to engage in business connected with the building of Government railways, or otherwise?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At the time the contract was taken out of the hands of Slater & Co., Mr. Sherwood was advised by the department that he could get leave of absence, which he did get for a few days, to go down to Cape Breton and ascertain just how matters stood in the interest of Mrs. Slater, the lady in whose hands the contract had remained, she having been surety for the contractors who had to put up the money. So it was in the interest of his family that he obtained leave of absence, to go and see how things were and report; Mrs. Slater is his mother-in-law.

Mr. COOK. The last part of the question is whether a member of the inside service has the right to engage in business of this kind?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He does not belong to the inside service.

WHARF AT ISLE-AUX-NOIX.

Mr. BOURASSA (translation) asked: Is it the intention of the Government to place an amount in the Supplementary Estimates this year for the building of a wharf at the end of the road leading to Isle-aux-Noix, known as the "Chemin aux approches de l'Isle-aux-Noix," in the Parish of St. Valentin, County of St. Johns, on the Richelieu River, in order to render more easy the approach to Isle-aux-Noix and to facilitate business intercourse with the surrounding parishes?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I am sorry not to be able to answer, either in the affirmative or negative, the hon. gentleman on this question. When the Sup-

plementary Estimates come down, they will give all the information desired.

ANALYSIS OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. CURRAN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to require inspectors under the Food Adulteration Act to subject to analysis intoxicating liquors publicly offered for sale, in conformity with the suggestions of the Temperance Association?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is the intention of the Government to require samples of intoxicating liquors to be subject to analysis.

MEDALS TO THE VETERANS OF 1866-70.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, Has the Government had any communication with the Imperial Government with regard to the granting of medals to the veterans of 1866-70, in accordance with the promise made to a deputation from Montreal in 1887?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Communication has been had through His Excellency the Governor General with the Imperial Government in reference to the granting of medals to the veterans of 1866-70, but no reply has yet been received.

MR. WILLIAM SHANNON'S DEFALCATIONS.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Whether Government has paid or promised to pay any sums of money to any parties on account of Mr. Wm. Shannon's defalcations; and if so, what amount has been paid?

Mr. McLELAN. The Government has not paid, nor has it promised to pay.

INSPECTOR OF RANCHES.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta) asked, What are the duties and salary of the Inspector of Ranches? What is allowed for expenses in addition to salary? How long has he held the office? What work has he done in connection with his office, and what (if any) reports has he made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The inspector of ranches inspects such ranches as he is instructed to do from time to time by the Department of the Interior. He was appointed on the 1st of May, 1886. He receives a salary of \$600 a year, and is allowed actual travelling expenses in addition. He has reported from time to time, but I am not in a position to give the exact number of the reports.

HEADQUARTERS OF MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to build police barracks at Edmonton and remove the headquarters of police in that district to same; if so, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Fort Saskatchewan, about 20 miles north-east of Edmonton, has been the headquarters of the police in that district since the organisation of the force in 1874. It is now under the consideration of the Government whether the headquarters of that division had not better be transferred to Edmonton.

ERRORS IN THE CIVIL SERVICE LIST.

Mr. DAVIN asked, 1. Whether there is not a typographical error in the Civil Service List of Canada, 1887, on page 129, second column, as to description of official position of Thomas Albert Scott, "2nd" being printed instead of "3rd;" and 2. Whether Robert Montgomery (line

10) has not been transferred from the Manitoba division to the Ottawa division, or some other outside Manitoba and the Territories?

Mr. McLELAN. There is a typographical error. Thomas Albert Scott is a third-class clerk, not a second-class clerk. Robert Montgomery has been removed from the Manitoba division to some other division. The railway mail clerks are not supposed to be confined to any one division, but are removable.

LOSS OF THE BARGE *ORIENTAL*.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether in view of the report of Inspector Risley, upon the loss of the barge *Oriental*, the Government have caused proceedings to be taken against the owners of such barge, or whether they intend to do so?

Mr. FOSTER. The papers in this question have been handed to the Minister of Justice, with the request that he take such action upon them as he deems proper to take in the premises.

PROTECTION OF SAILORS.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation this Session to further protect sailors against wrecks or accidents, the result of vessels being unseaworthy?

Mr. FOSTER. The first page of the Order Paper will be a sufficient answer to that question.

P. WATERET, EMIGRATION AGENT.

Mr. HOLTON asked, Whether P. Wateret is employed by Government, in Belgium, or elsewhere, as emigration agent, or in any other capacity? If so, what are his position and duties, and how are his services remunerated? How many immigrants have come to and settled in Canada through his agency during the past year? Is the Government aware that acting as a Canadian emigration agent, or pretending to be such, the said P. Wateret has very recently induced the removal from Belgium to Montreal of a number of artisans, under the promise and guarantee of immediate and profitable employment there; that since their arrival in Montreal a number of these men have not succeeded in obtaining employment, and that no effort has been made by him or by Government officials in that city to procure employment for them?

Mr. CARLING. This refers to Paul Wateret, not Wateret. He is not an agent of the Government, nor employed by it in any capacity. He is a steamship agent in Belgium, and is allowed the same commission as all other agents on the continent of Europe, for immigrants actually arriving in Manitoba, but not for any sent to any of the old Provinces. The Government is not responsible for any immigrants he brings out, nor for any representations made by him. As a consequence, however, of some statements furnished to the department, an enquiry is now being instituted respecting some immigrants brought by him to Montreal.

SEIZURES IN BEHRING'S SEA.

Mr. GORDON moved for:

Return of all correspondence having reference to the seizure of Canadian vessels while engaged in the seal fisheries in Behring's Sea. He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion and the correspondence to which it refers are of too great importance to the people I represent to justify me in allowing the question to stand over any longer. My hon. friend who seconds the motion will deal particularly with the question involved, and other hon. gentlemen, I presume, will also discuss it. I am sure Mr. DAVIN.

every hon. member here must be aware that the grossest injustice has been inflicted on our fishermen who were in pursuit of what they considered to be their rights and interests in Behring's Sea. They want to know whether the rights of British subjects are to be as sacred in Behring's Sea as they are in the other great seas of the globe, or whether they are to be pursued by American cruisers and have their ships seized, towed into the ports of Alaska and confiscated, with their whole cargoes, and the captains and mates of their vessels sent to prison, and their crews, some of them sent to San Francisco to find their way back to British Columbia as best they could, whilst others were obliged to coast 1,500 miles in canoes, reaching British Columbia in the greatest destitution. Circumstances of such a serious character as these are not to be allowed on my part to remain unnoticed. I am sure that the correspondence, if brought down, will show that this Government has taken every step in its power towards having those grievances redressed, and I have hopes that the Imperial Government, through its jealous regard for the rights of its subjects in every part of the inhabited globe, will see that its distant subjects, pursuing their business in Behring's Sea, will have every care and protection.

Mr. PRIOR. I have great pleasure in rising to second the address of the hon. member for Vancouver, but I am sorry that, owing to indisposition, he has not been able to place the matter more fully before this House, because I am sure he could have done so more forcibly and more plainly than I can hope to do. This is a matter that deeply affects every man on Canadian soil, involving as it does the honor and credit of the whole country; but more especially does it affect the constituency that I have the honor to represent, as upon it has fallen, not only the indignities which have been offered, but also the heavy losses incident to the seizure of these vessels. As the territory of Alaska is one that is very little known, and as I, in common with other British Columbia members, claim that the representatives from other sections of this country in this House have equally with us a deep interest in this matter, and should assist us in endeavoring to obtain redress, I will give you, Sir, a short sketch of the country and of the events that have led up to the late outrage. Alaska became a part of the Russian Empire in the year 1741, by right of discovery, when the Russian traveller Behring first planted his country's flag on that portion of the North American continent, and gave his name to the sea, the jurisdiction over which is the question at present in dispute between the United States and the Dominion. During the next twenty years, the spirit of discovery placed the Russian ensign over the whole of the Aleutian chain, from Behring Island to the mainland, many forts were established, and numerous trading enterprises founded, until the year 1772, when we find that no less than twenty-five different trading companies were engaged in catching the seals that are so numerous in those waters. In 1779, a consolidation of these different trading companies took place, and a company was formed under the name of the Russian-American Trading Company. In 1821 the Russian Government issued an ordinance regulating traffic in its Asiatic and American possessions, and reserving exclusively to its subjects:

"The transactions of commerce, the pursuit of whaling and fishing or any other industry in the islands, in the harbors and inlets and in general along the north-western coast of America from Behring Straits to the 51st parallel of north latitude, and in the Aleutian Islands and along the coast of Siberia and on the Kurile Islands from Behring Straits to the south-eastern promontory of the Island of Urup, viz., as far south as latitude 45° and 50° north."

This really meant that Russia claimed sovereign jurisdiction over these seas for 100 miles from shore. Previous to the issuing of this edict, British and American sealers had been in the habit of pursuing their trade in those waters, and of course as soon as this ordinance was promulgated, both the

British and American Governments protested most emphatically against the claim of the Russian Government. The United States Minister at St. Petersburg made use of these words in his protest :

"The existence of territorial rights to the distance of 100 miles from the coasts upon two opposite continents, and the prohibition of approaching to the same distance from these coasts, or from those of all the intervening islands, are innovations in the law of nations and measures unexampled."

Well, the evidence goes to show that after protracted discussion, the Treaty of 1825 was drawn up and signed, by which Russia gave up her claim to the sole jurisdiction in Behring Sea. The treaty between Russia and the United States contained the following agreement :—

"That in any part of the great ocean commonly called the Pacific Ocean, the respective citizens, subjects of the high contracting powers, should be neither disturbed or restrained in navigation or fishing."

A similar treaty was made between Russia and Great Britain. In 1867, the year when Confederation took place, the United States bought the territory of Alaska from the Russians for the sum of \$7,200,000; and just to show what a good bargain they made, I may say that at present, one gold mine in Alaska is yielding over \$1,000,000 per annum to its fortunate owners. After the United States bought Alaska territory, a good deal of trouble was caused by the different nationalities trying to get hold of the valuable seal fisheries. Vessels came from Japan, Honolulu, Australia, San Francisco, and almost from every part of the world, and there was no end of trouble and dispute until at last the Americans found it was necessary to do something to keep order. They, therefore, in 1870, called for tenders for the exclusive rights of catching seals on the Islands of St. George and St. Paul; and after the tenders were opened, it was found that a company trading under the name of "The Alaska Commercial Company" was the successful tenderer. That company got a charter, dated the 1st May, 1870, for a period of twenty years, giving it exclusive rights to sealing on these islands. A few years ago, its annual payment to the United States Government for its rights and privileges over these fisheries was \$315,000, a sum sufficient to pay interest at the rate of four per cent. per annum on the whole purchase money which the United States gave for the territory, besides paying for the full cost of government of the territory. Under the Treaty of 1867, the Americans claimed jurisdiction over that part of Behring Sea, lying to the east of the westerly boundary of Alaska, which sea, in its widest part, is some 600 or 700 miles wide. Just to show how absurd this claim is, I will read to the House a portion of a despatch from Lord Lansdowne to Mr. Stanhope, dated the 29th November, 1886 :

"The statements contained in the Report (i.e., the Report of the Privy Council) are sufficient to establish that the claim now put forward on the part of the United States to the sole right of taking fur-bearing animals within the limits laid down in the first article of the Treaty of 1867, is inconsistent with the rights secured to Great Britain under the convention of 1825, and is in substance the same as that which, when advanced by the Russian Government on occasions prior to the cession of Alaska by Russia to the United States, was either strenuously resisted or treated with ridicule and contempt by the Government of the latter power."

And again :

"Under the Treaty of 1867, Russia ceded to the United States all the rights, franchises and privileges then belonging to her in the territory or dominion included within the limits described, but could not cede a right which, in the express terms of the Treaty of 1825, was recognised as belonging to the subjects of the British Crown as well as to those of Russia."

You will therefore see that our neighbors across the line do not believe in the old adage that "what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander," because, when Russia claimed the right to those seas and the Americans wanted their vessels to go in, the United States protested most emphatically against the attempt to exclude them; but when the United States took over the rights which Russia had there, and

Canadian sealers want to go into those seas, the boot is on the other leg. Relying on this preposterous claim, the United States vessels have seized our vessels, have imprisoned our crews and have confiscated our sealskins. They have been guilty of one of the grossest outrages which has ever been perpetrated by one civilised nation upon another. On the 1st August, 1886, three of our schooners were seized when they were plying their peaceful avocations on the high seas, not within the three-mile limit, but at distances varying from 139 miles to 68 miles from Ounalaska. The *Carolina* was seized at a distance of 139 miles, and the *Onward* and the *Thornton* at a distance of 68 miles from the coast. Not only did they seize these vessels, but the revenue cutter *Corwin* towed them to Sitka, the capital of the Territory of Alaska, and there the captains and mates were fined \$500 and \$300 respectively, and were also imprisoned, when they did not pay, for a long term. When they were released from prison, they were turned out destitute. Some of them were taken to San Francisco, and turned adrift there, and had to make their way back to British Columbia as best they could. A few were taken to Nanaimo, but some were turned adrift destitute in Alaska. I cannot understand any more inhuman act than leaving these people destitute in that country. I was in those waters myself in 1874, and I know what a rugged and inhospitable country it is. There is no civilisation at all. There are very few people there but savages. There is no language which I can make use of which is too strong to express the injustice which has been done to our people in this matter, which has crippled one of the most important industries on the Pacific coast, and has entailed great pecuniary loss on our citizens, because the three vessels and the skins they had on board when they were seized were worth \$33,000, besides the indirect loss in consequence of their not being able to finish their season's catch, which loss amounted to at least \$115,000. Last Session, certain documents were brought down to the House—all the documents that could be got up to that time in relation to the matter—and I am glad to say that they proved that the present Government have been fully alive to the gravity of the affair, and have done all in their power to get the Imperial Government to bring about a settlement with the United States, but no such settlement has yet been arrived at. In 1887—that is, last year—a though negotiations were pending between the different Governments, the United States cutters again seized, in the same place, six more of our sealers, under the same circumstances, and they also seized eight of their own sealers—in fact they seized every vessel which was not under the control of the company which has the right to fish on those islands. It seems to me that this means that the United States Government would rather seize British vessels there and trample on the British flag, and afterwards pay compensation and make apologies, than they would allow the Alaska Commercial Company to lose its hold on the seal fisheries in the Behring Sea. This company has only the exclusive right to seal on these two islands. I will only read the clause of the lease which refers to this point, which is as follows :—

"That the said Secretary hereby leases to the said Alaska Commercial Company, without power to transfer, for the term of twenty years, from the 1st day of May, 1870, the right to engage in the business of taking fur seals on the islands of St. George and St. Paul, within the Territory of Alaska, and to send a vessel or vessels to said islands for the skins of such seals."

That is all the right they had given them. Further, Sir Lionel West, in a letter to Lord Iddesleigh, says :

"Outside of these islands it holds no exclusive rights or franchises from the Government, nor does it pay any rent or royalty to the Government for the territory it occupies, or the furs it procures from the natives. It has no rights over any other citizen or company of citizens who may desire to trade in competition with it, and yet it has been aided by the revenue marine in suppressing competition from rival traders, for it appears that under instructions from the Treasury Department the revenue cruisers board and examine every trading

vessel sighted in the Behring Sea, or on the north-west coast of Alaska, except the vessels of the company."

I am glad to say that a large portion of the American press, the most respectable portion of the American press, concur in condemning the action of their Government in seizing these vessels, especially as that action was contrary to the advice of the ablest of their own jurists. To show what is thought of that Alaska Commercial Company, I will read what Governor Swinford says in his report of last year :

"The fur trade of Alaska is practically monopolised by the company, a non-resident corporation, which does not confine its operations to the Seal Islands leased to it by the Government, but holds and possesses most of the Aleutian chain and the greater part of the mainland as a principality of its own, on which it exercises undisputed sway and control. Clothed by the Government with a monopoly of the seal fur trade, by which it has profited to the extent of many millions, it has, octopus like, thrown out its great tentacles, and gathered to itself about all there is of value in the fur trade of the whole Territory—it has by the power of its great wealth driven away all competition—its paid agents and lobbyists are kept at the National Capital to oppose any and every effort that may be made to loosen the grip of the company."

And yet this is the company which they are backing up against the wishes of their own people and against the wishes of every other nation. I hear that this year three revenue cutters have been ordered to cruise in the Behring Sea and in the Straits and to seize all sealing vessels, and that instructions have been issued from Washington to warn all vessels off except those belonging to the company. I do not know whether this is true or not, but I have seen it stated in the newspapers. I have received a telegram from the owners of one of the sealers, and I believe my hon. colleague has received several others of a like tenor. The one I have received is as follows :—

"Official orders issued from Washington to seize all sealers this season in Behring Sea. We demand protection, otherwise must protect ourselves. Please urge Government."

Well, Sir, the Government sent out a warning to our vessels not to resist any armed force of the United States, as it might lead to grave difficulty, and I hope that advice will be taken. I see by the papers a statement that some gentlemen who owned those sealers have been to Sitka to try to obtain possession of the vessels and seals seized in 1886, but they could not get them. Now, I hope the Government will accede to the wishes of my hon. friend, and bring these papers down, if it is not considered prejudicial to the negotiations now going on; and I believe when they are brought down they will fully reveal the insults that were offered to our people, and I trust we shall also learn that full reparation for insults has been demanded and complete compensation asked on behalf of those who have suffered by these seizures.

Mr. FOSTER. A few days ago when a question was asked across the floor of the House in reference to the Behring Sea papers, I replied that owing to the state in which the negotiations were at that time, it was not thought wise to lay the papers before the House. Negotiations are still in progress upon this question, but I may say that since the other day I have received permission to bring down an assorted collection of the most important papers, covering the negotiations which have taken place from the date of the printed papers which are before the House, up to the present time, with some few exceptions of papers which it is not thought best, in the present state of the negotiations, to have made public. I think Mr. Speaker, the House owes the hon. junior member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) a debt of gratitude for the clear and lucid explanation of this matter which he has made to the House, and from the interest with which members on both sides listened to it, I am certain that they appreciate it as much as I do myself. The question is widened a little from its first position, since the United States Government have seized vessels of their own

Mr. PRIOR.

nationality as well as Canadian vessels which were sealing there, thus affirming the right of their law to prevent all from sealing in the Behring Sea except the trading company to which the monopoly is given. My hon. friend stated that the papers that were brought down last year showed that the Government had acted with vigor, and in the best interest of the sealing industry that was more nearly in question, and in the interest of the country at large. That, I think, was true, and I think it will be found, when the papers are brought down, that the Government has not been remiss in its exertions up to the present time. Of course, it is a large Imperial matter, and the British Government are now engaged in close negotiations with the Government of the United States, and the course of these will be largely shown by the papers which will be brought down, and the result, I hope, will be favorable alike to those whose interests have been injuriously affected, and to the larger rights of the country that are in question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This, Sir, is a very important question, and I am sure that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House very much regret that it was not made a subject of negotiation in the recent conference at Washington. This is a matter of very great importance to this country. It is a question which was supposed to have been settled more than half a century ago. The Russian Government, at a very early period, claimed, in consequence of holding the territories on both sides of Behring's Sea, jurisdiction over that as a portion of the Russian territory, and they held that Behring's Sea was wholly within the dominion of the Russian Empire. That pretension was contested, both by the Government of the United States, represented by John Quincy Adams, and by the Government of Great Britain. Russia, in the treaties to which the hon. gentleman has referred, conceded the pretension put forward both by the United States and by Great Britain. It is clear that it is quite impossible that the United States could claim to have received from Russia, along with the cession of Alaska, any portion of the high seas over which Russia had herself abandoned her pretensions, especially so when she abandoned those pretensions at the instance of the United States. Now, Sir, it does seem to me very extraordinary that when the United States Government were contesting our rights to any portion of the inlets upon our coasts that were more than six miles wide, she should claim to exercise sovereignty over a sea that is nearly three thousand miles in width, and that has long been recognised as part of the Pacific Ocean. It does seem to me, so far as we can judge from the information placed before us, that this measure has not been pressed with the energy that we had a right to expect—I do not say with a want of energy on the part of the Government of Canada, but I refer especially to the want of energy on the part of the Government of the United Kingdom. Why, Sir, look at the facts. The United States has herself put forward a claim to fish in those seas, as a part of the open ocean, more than half a century ago. Her pretensions in that respect were conceded when Russia owned both coasts; now, after she has acquired possession of the coast of Alaska, it would give her no more claim over the Pacific Ocean, at least in those latitudes, than it would over the Pacific Ocean further south. She revives the original claim of Russia, owning one coast of Behring Sea, and puts forward, aggressively, a pretension that denies to us a right which we had for many years exercised. I think this House would be remiss in its duty if it failed to express its opinion as to our right, and as to the aggressive policy that has been pursued by our neighbors with reference to our rights to fish in those waters. Sir, it does seem to me that the Government of the United Kingdom would have been justified in placing there a portion of the navy for the purpose of protecting

us in the exercise of those rights which we had before claimed, which we had before exercised, and with reference to which, if they were improperly claimed and improperly exercised, it was the duty of the United States to exercise forbearance until their rights against us were established. But, instead of that being done, there has been usurpation; we have been denied rights that we exercised for half a century without molestation from the Government that owned both coasts. I think it is the duty of the Government here, sustained by Parliament, to press the claim of Canada in those waters with energy, and to insist upon the British Government giving to this country adequate protection. Sir, we have heard hon. gentlemen on that side, not long since, tell what protection the English Government were prepared to give us, stating how ready they were to sacrifice the last man and the last shilling in our defence. Now, here is a matter where our pretensions are undoubted, and where those that were set up adversely to us, are of recent growth, and if there ever was a case when a Government would be justified in taking strong measures for the protection of its citizens, or of a sovereign for the protection of her subjects, it is the case of Canada in the right to fish in the Behring Sea.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I join with my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in thanking the junior member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) for having brought this subject up and placed it in such a clear and distinct light before the House. I rise for the purpose of making a single remark in reference to the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that there was a failure on the part of Her Majesty's Government in not pressing this question before the recent conference that took place at Washington. I may say that the British side were prepared to take this question up there, but they were met on the part of the Administration of the United States by the statement that it had not reached that stage, that the claims had not been distinctly formulated on the part of the British Government, and that it would be time enough when the Government of the United States refused to admit a claim formulated and pressed upon them by Her Majesty's Government to have it made the subject of reference to a conference. The question was undergoing diplomatic investigation between the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain, and although my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had, with his usual industry and assiduity, collected all the facts, a very considerable time was necessarily involved in preparing such a clear and succinct statement on the part of the British subjects of Canada of the injuries that have been inflicted on them, and it was only very recently that full and complete information was placed in the hands of Her Majesty's Government so as to enable them to state what amount of claim they made against the Government of the United States. My hon. friend must have noticed the remark made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the Government of the United States, in carrying out what they hold to be the law in reference to this matter, have applied it both to American subjects, to subjects of their own Government, and to British subjects, so that the case was not exactly one of a nation taking a ground against the claims of another nation distinct and apart as between the claims of American subjects on the one side and British subjects on the other. That the position taken by the Government of the United States is one entirely unfounded in justice, that it is one entirely unsupported by the original treaty between Russia and Great Britain, upon which this claim must rest on the part of the United States and from which they seem to be entirely estopped from proceeding, because, as the junior member for Victoria (Mr.

Prior) has already informed the House, the United States were as strong in their denunciation of the claim in reference to Behring's Sea set up by Russia, under the treaty between Russia and Great Britain, as was Great Britain herself. No doubt they were entirely estopped from setting up any such claim, and the result of this must be that the Government of the United States will be obliged to make full and ample reparation for all injuries done to British subjects in Canada, in connection with these matters, I entertain no possible doubt; but I merely rose to explain that we were precluded from pressing it by the statement of the Administration of the United States that, until the claim had been distinctly formulated by Her Majesty's Government and had been refused by them, it could not properly be taken out of diplomatic negotiation, and its consideration entered upon by a conference arranged for the settlement of the difficulties between the two countries.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Has the Canadian Government any right to a voice in the negotiations?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not exactly understand the purport of the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman said negotiations were now proceeding. Who are carrying on the negotiations?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I now understand the question asked by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and I am happy to be able to tell him that Her Majesty's Government alone are the parties who can negotiate with respect to this question and settle the question between the United States and Great Britain. But Her Majesty's Government, on this, as on all occasions in which the interests of Canada are affected, are obtaining the fullest and most complete information from the Government of Canada, which, I think, has been as anxious as it was possible for any Government to be to collect the most full and complete data to place before Her Majesty's Government, so as to enable them to obtain complete redress for the injuries inflicted; and I can only assure the hon. gentleman that the greatest anxiety has been exhibited by Her Majesty's Government to obtain the most full and complete information; and I have no hesitation in saying that I am satisfied it will be found that they will urge the question of redress quite as promptly as it would be possible for any government to urge the settlement of a question upon another government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I should like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. The hon. gentleman says that the matter was not sufficiently matured, nor had they the necessary specific information to deal with the subject at Washington. The hon. gentleman will, however, see that there are two distinct questions: the right to compensation to be made to parties who have been injured, and the question of jurisdiction. The question of jurisdiction over the waters could not at all be dependent upon the specific wrongs that have been done. Were the United States willing to consider the question of jurisdiction?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. I may say to my hon. friend that the United States Government declined to have that subject referred to the conference, on the ground that that question, which is the one on which finally the question of damages must rest, was at present a subject of diplomatic negotiation and communication between the Governments of Great Britain and the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me that the explanation of the Finance Minister is anything but a satisfactory explanation to the country, and is equally unsatisfactory to this House. The point taken by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is a good one. The answer which the

Minister gave as coming from the United States Government to the British portion of the Commission was, that the claims for injuries, which the hon. gentleman states were undoubtedly committed, which were undoubtedly outrages committed by the Americans upon the Government and people of this country—that those claims formulated on the part of the British commissioners could not be submitted to or dealt with by the Commission, because they had not been formulated in a sufficiently distinct way in such a specific form that the conference would be justified in taking them up and dealing with them. But that is an entirely different point from the question of jurisdiction, to which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has referred. These outrages are going on to-day; the Americans are still exercising jurisdiction over that sea; and I would like to ask the Finance Minister whether that feature of the question was brought before the conference by Her Majesty's commissioners at Washington or not? It is quite clear, if what the hon. gentleman says is true, that this outrage by a neighboring nation to attempt to exercise control and jurisdiction over a sea 400 or 600 or 1,000 miles from the shore, this attempt to exercise that jurisdiction, at the very moment they are claiming the right to come within three miles of our shores on the Atlantic, is preposterous, and turns the whole affair into a burlesque. The people of British Columbia have a right to expect not only that Her Majesty's Government will take the matter in hand and carry out the negotiations without delay, and see that no injury is done to our people on the Pacific coast, but also that this Government will press, and press continually, on the British Government the necessity of prompt, speedy and immediate action to prevent outrages being continued. The question of compensation for outrages already committed is entirely outside of the question we are discussing to-day. That these people will get compensation for their damages, either from Her Majesty's Government or from the United States, on the proper settlement of the matter, no one can doubt, if our rights to the common use of Behring's Sea is recognised. But are we going to allow that nation quietly to go on and continue to commit outrages, to place additional cruisers in that sea, to seize and destroy our traffic and trade during another season? It is the duty of the Government to protest against that state of things being continued, and if difficulty exists let them exercise the right for which Canada is contending, that her people should be allowed to exercise the right of catching fur-bearing animals or fish in those seas on the Pacific coast. Let both parties, and let this country press upon the British Government the necessity of placing those pretensions of the Americans in abeyance, until the whole question can be dealt with by a commission as this other Fishery Commission has dealt with the fisheries on the Atlantic coast. This Government have not done their duty if they have not protested strongly against the injuries that have been committed in the past, and an attempt to exercise those rights which are in dispute in the present or in the future. That is the point to be taken and considered in the question before the House. I am not condemning this Government. They may have done everything that lies in their power, and I am not going to say they have not, for I will reserve my judgment on the case until the papers come before the House. Perhaps when those papers do come down they may not be complete, and we may not be able to judge even then, for the Government may think it unwise in the interests of Canada to bring down all the papers even to justify themselves. It is the duty of this House, and let the gentlemen who control the interests of Canada know it, to press these matters on the British Government, as they have been pressed on a former occasion in relation to the Atlantic fisheries. The hon. gentleman says that he has no doubt the British Government have used every

Mr. MITCHELL.

means in this matter. I cannot think so. We have some experience in this country of how the British Government treated Canada in neglecting matters connected with her fisheries, and I have no hesitation in saying that there has been an amount of tardy action again on this question. Those unjust assumptions to the right of those seas on the part of the United States have been allowed to go on for two years, and so far as we know no definite action has been taken to arrest or stay the exercise of that authority. Take the document before this House which I read the other day, where a protest was made against the rights of Canada being in abeyance for a single moment in 1870, or take the despatch which led to the Washington Treaty, and which was read here. Take them and you will find a forecast of what was going to happen when our fisheries were frittered away—those rights which came into operation in 1866 when a subsequent treaty expired. It was then predicted that if we allowed the Americans to use our fisheries, as they afterwards were permitted to use them under the strong remonstrance of the British Government, the result would be that our interests would be frittered away, and our whole case given away as the matter stands to-day. It will be the same thing in this case. I warned those British Columbians who support this Administration, that it is their duty—and I believe their constituents will hold them responsible for it—to press upon the Administration the necessity of urging the British Government not to repeat on the Pacific coast what they carried out on the Atlantic.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that the conduct of the British Government—and I do not now refer to the conduct of the Canadian Government in this matter—has been exceedingly unfair and prejudicial to the just rights of Canada. Every man of common sense who considers the nature of our claims in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the coasts adjacent, and of the American claims in Behring's Sea and the coasts adjacent, must see that it was in the highest degree in the interest of Canada that these two questions should be considered together, for they had reference to subjects of precisely the same character—with this difference, that every argument that the Americans could advance to substantiate their claims as regards the St. Lawrence fisheries, could be brought to bear with tenfold and hundredfold greater force against their claims to exclude our people from the Alaskan seal fisheries. I cannot but feel that, in dealing with any other country whatever, the British Government would never have consented to allow one section of the same question to be treated of, and that section, it must be remembered, the section in which the claim was against us, while they ignored entirely our just claims as regards a similar dispute at the other end of our Dominion. Considering the lapse of time, and considering the extraordinary character of the outrages as stated to us by the hon. members for British Columbia, I think that the British Government have been guilty of great laches towards us. I think, Sir, it is another proof, and a substantial proof, of the statements made again and again from this side of the House, that the British Government from various causes are not by any manner of means so well qualified to deal with those questions as the Government of Canada, and that we would be better off—the hon. the Finance Minister of the country notwithstanding, certainly we could not be worse off, in my opinion, than we are now—if we had to deal directly with the Administration at Washington. Here, Sir, we find, as it has been stated on the floor of this House again and again, that British subjects, pursuing their calling on the high seas a hundred miles from shore, are violently arrested by American cruisers, their ships confiscated, or, at all events, laid up, and they themselves cast into prison and severely fined. We find that after two years have elapsed all the consolation we

get is that the claim is not formulated in sufficiently definite character. This is a repetition of what occurred in the case of the first Treaty of Washington, when the Americans were pressing their claims for damages done by the *Alabama*, which claims could not have been recognised, they ignored at the same time the just claims of Canada for compensation for far grosser outrages committed on Canadian territory by American citizens. We know what happened then. We know, to satisfy the interests of certain American politicians and to conciliate certain votes that they were desirous of securing, that Canada's just claims were ignored. Exactly the same thing has been done in this case. Canada's just claims have been ignored. We find that concessions have been made on our part and no recognition has been had or obtained, and not likely will be had or obtained for years to come of far juster claims of Canadian seamen and fishermen carrying on their industry in waters where they have enjoyed undisturbed privileges for nearly half a century. I cannot say how far the Government have gone, but I do say the Imperial Government have acted very unjustly by us in this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see that at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see how the British Government, from anything that has appeared in this House or from anything which appears to the public, is in any way to be blamed. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the two questions are identical. The conference that took place at Washington was by virtue of mutual correspondence and agreement in order to settle the construction of a treaty between the two nations and affecting especially Canada. That has been settled. It would have been very well, I think, if the United States had agreed to have this question about their jurisdiction in the Behring Seas submitted to the same conference, but they did not agree to that, and it was no portion of either the unofficial or semi-official correspondence between Mr. Bayard and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, or no portion of the subsequent correspondence.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why was it not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because this Atlantic question pressed specially upon us here, and because the question respecting the Behring Sea is not exclusively a Canadian question as that was. The one affected the trade along Canadian coasts, in the construction of the convention of 1818, and the subsequent commissions which were alleged to have affected and varied that convention of 1818. It was altogether a Canadian question. The other question about the Behring Sea is as much a matter of interest for all the marine powers, as it is for the United States, for Canada or for England. English whalers are in every sea, in the Arctic ocean and in the Antarctic ocean, and England is as much bound to see that the freedom of those seas is preserved, as if a Canadian vessel never sailed there. So is France, so is Holland, so are all those nations which send whalers into any sea in the world. These are alleged captures in the open sea. It was alleged that certain Canadian vessels were seized while pursuing their lawful avocation in the open sea. That allegation was either true or false. Those vessels were brought by American cruisers and put under the jurisdiction of local courts, and it appears they were condemned by the local courts. The owners of those vessels complained to the Canadian Government, and I have no doubt they also complained directly to Her Majesty's Government in England. The Canadian Government lost no time in calling the attention of Her Majesty's Government in the strongest terms to the necessity of an enquiry into this matter. England, I presume—because we have not the papers before us, and we cannot well discuss them

with any particularity—said: Well, give us authenticated statements of any such breaches of maritime law and the law of nations, and we shall press them upon the attention of the United States; and ever since that time that process has been going on. But there seems to be a disposition to suppose that England is neglecting her duties towards us. I am quite sure that when the correspondence is brought down, it will show, first, that the Canadian Government, as soon as possible and as earnestly as possible, pressed the claims presented to us, and next, that Her Majesty's Government is fully conscious of its duty to her Canadian subjects and has been as energetic and earnest as the Canadian Government. That there have been delays is true, but we have delays on the Atlantic coast. We find vessels hung up there for two years, I suppose; there is the law's delay. The appeal from the course taken by the local tribunals has been made in the strongest terms; but the nations must proceed by diplomatic action, and not declare war against each other. We certainly will not declare war because there has been some delay, not in having enquired, but in having adjusted these various claims. That the claims will be settled, I have no doubt; that ample compensation, with interest, will be made to those people who have suffered, I have no doubt; but it is futile in us to attempt to interpose any argument, I may almost say discussion, like this, into a subject which is now solemnly being discussed by two great nations, the United States and England, and I would not be at all surprised that, when the papers are brought down, it will be found that other maritime powers have taken up the question as well, and that it is a matter for diplomacy among all maritime powers, and not exclusively between England and the United States. However that may be, I think I may venture to state to this House that it will answer no good purpose to throw out merely imaginary charges or complaints against Her Majesty's Government for negligence and delay that has not taken place.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the hon. gentleman is quite justified in characterising the charges formulated to-day with such great clearness by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) as imaginary charges.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say they were imaginary charges.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Nor is he justified in making that charge against the complaints which have been alleged on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman has hardly, I think, stated the case as fairly as he ought to have done. There is no disposition to prejudice the action of Great Britain in this matter; but hon. members on either side of the House cannot shut their eyes to the facts plainly before them. These grievances about outrages committed on our vessels in Behring's Sea, were grievances existing concurrently with the grievances the Americans claimed they had suffered in the Bay of Chaleurs, the Bay of Fundy and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Diplomatic correspondence was going on between the Governments with reference to those several grievances. There is a very marked and important distinction between the private claims which the parties who owned those ships may have against the Government for wrong done to them, and which may be recognised, and the general right of the Dominion of Canada that its citizens shall have preserved to them the right which they always supposed they had of fishing in the high seas. If the United States maintained their contention on the general subject, it is perfectly clear that private citizens cannot get compensation at all. If the United States have a right to seize vessels 100 miles from land in the open sea, it is clear that the owners of those vessels cannot receive compensation. The two subjects are entirely distinct; and while the private claims may not have been formulated, either through the inadvertence or negligence of the

parties themselves, or through the inadvertence or negligence of some department of this Government or the English Government, or while those claims might be left in abeyance, the great question of the right of the citizens of the Dominion of Canada to fish in the high seas of either ocean was one that we say should have been pressed upon and settled in the conference at Washington, which met to settle the fishery questions between the two countries. It is well enough for the hon. gentleman to say that they confined their settlement to the difficulties arising in connection with the fisheries in the Gulf of St. Lawrence; but our contention is that diplomatic action should have been taken by Great Britain on the question as it existed in Behring's Sea as well, not only in 1885 and 1886, when those difficulties arose, but as the hon. gentleman has shown, in 1887 as well. The whole fishing interest is being paralysed because the United States are insisting on the right to drive our vessels off the sea altogether. If they get that right, private citizens will obtain no compensation at all. But what we insist on is that there does not appear to be that determined and persistent action on the part of the British Government which the outrages committed on our citizens require, and which, if insisted on as persistently and determinedly as the United States insisted on her case, would have brought about a settlement before the Fishery Commission at Washington. There appears to have been gross delay on the part of the British Government. The hon. gentleman who brought forward this motion pointed out that those rights, which to the ordinary mind appear to be so perfectly clear, were maintained by the United States themselves before they bought Alaska; and if Great Britain had sent one or two of her cruisers there to preserve the rights of her subjects, I do not think those outrages would have been continued. If Great Britain had shown one-half the desire to protect the rights of her fishermen there that the United States did to protect her fishermen in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, there would have been none of these difficulties. But the matter appears to have been managed in such a way that our fishing interests are in danger of being destroyed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask whether the Government have requested the Imperial authorities to put a cruiser there for the purpose of protecting the Canadian seal fishermen?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it is in the public interest to make any statement of the course that has been taken by the Government in carrying on these diplomatic arrangements.

Mr. McNEILL. I venture to think that it would meet the approbation of this House, and also the approbation of this country, if hon. gentlemen would refrain from accusing the Imperial Government of misdeeds or negligence of the interests of the people of this country, until they had some evidence, however slight, that such misdeeds and such negligence really exist and are chargeable to the Imperial Government. There is not an hon. gentleman on the other side who has risen to speak on this question, who has not hurled accusations of that kind against the Government of the mother country. If the home Government have been neglectful of our interests, it is only right we should state so fearlessly, frankly and fairly in this House; but when we are assured by hon. members of the Government of this country, who are responsible to the Canadian people, that such statements are absolutely unfounded—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. McNEILL. The right hon. the First Minister has said so, the hon. the Minister of Finance has said so; and yet, despite the assertions of these hon. gentlemen, we have these charges repeated, without variation, by every hon. gentleman who rises in his place on the other side.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

These hon. gentlemen do not accuse the United States Government of negligence; on the contrary, they have always for the Americans words of praise, but for the people or the Government of the mother country they cannot find one good word to say. I do not believe that hon. gentlemen opposite really have in their hearts this feeling which their language in this House would indicate they had; I do not believe that, in private conversation, they would give expression to such feeling. I believe, on the contrary, they are better disposed in their hearts to the mother country and its Government; but it is unfortunate that they should allow their politics so far to run away with their sense of right as to lead them to make these statements in the House. We have heard a great deal of the manner in which the Government of the mother country have sacrificed the interests of the Canadian people with reference to our fisheries on the Atlantic coast, and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has not been at all careful to measure his words when speaking on that question. But distinct statements have been made by members of the Dominion Government to the effect that these attacks on the home Government were unfounded.

Mr. MITCHELL. We have given the evidence.

Mr. McNEILL. And that the Government of the mother country have been most careful of our interests.

Mr. MITCHELL. I gave evidence that they were not.

Mr. McNEILL. I am speaking of recent negotiations with regard to the fisheries. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, understood me to refer to what has passed in by-gone times.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes.

Mr. McNEILL. There is a certain amount of truth in the statement that politicians of the mother country in by-gone times have paid almost as little respect to Canadian interests, which were unrepresented there, as Canadian politicians have paid to distant and unrepresented interests in Canada itself. I am speaking now, however, of the question before the House, that is, with reference to this Behring Sea fisheries and the observations that fell from some hon. gentlemen opposite, a moment or two ago, with regard to the betrayal of our interests lately by the mother country in the fishery negotiations at Washington. I have said that members of our Government have declared that the home Government were especially anxious to guard our interests, and I was met with cries of "No," from the other side. Now, I wish to say that if they think those statements were not sufficiently explicit, I am authorised by the hon. the Minister of Justice—with whom I had a conversation some three or four weeks ago on the subject, and whose permission I asked and was kindly given to use the information he then gave me—to make this explicit statement. The hon. gentleman is present and can correct me if I, in any degree, misrepresent what he then said. He told me that, so far as Mr. Chamberlain was concerned, had he been a patriotic native-born Canadian, he could not have shown more earnest desire to safeguard the interests of Canada than he did, and the hon. gentleman authorised me to say further that the main object of Mr. Chamberlain seemed to be to discover what the wishes of his Canadian associates were and to carry out those wishes to the utmost.

Mr. MITCHELL. What about his speech before he left England?

Mr. McNEILL. If those statements are not sufficiently explicit—

Mr. MITCHELL. What about his speech before he left England?

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman does not like to be always interrupted himself. I think it is very unfor-

tunate that the hon. gentleman, knowing that to be the fact, should continue, notwithstanding the statements I have made on the authority of one of the members of the Government, to reiterate charges which are absolutely and utterly void of truth.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not so.

Mr. McNBILL. Mr. Chamberlain, as every one knows, who knows anything of the history of the matter, is one of those men who are pervaded with the spirit of Imperial unity. He is one of that body of men—a rapidly increasing number, I am glad to say—who believe and hold that the interests of Canada and the colonies are identical with the interests of the mother country; and when hon. gentlemen tell us that Mr. Chamberlain came over to Canada to give away the interests of Canada, they tell us virtually that he came over to do what he believed would be to give away the interests of the mother country.

Mr. MITCHELL. He did it anyway.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I congratulate the First Minister on obtaining a mouthpiece to convey information to this House.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has constituted himself the champion of the British Empire in this House for some time past. It would seem as if, in his opinion, the British lion was utterly decrepit and utterly unable to take care of itself, because, in season and out of season, he rises in this House to take the part of the British Empire against Canadian interests. I wonder how long native Canadians on both sides of the House are going to be lectured by that hon. gentleman without giving him an answer. There are Canadians on both sides, who, I am sure, are perfectly satisfied that they understand what loyalty in Canada is perfectly well, without the hon. member for Bruce—a very recent importation in Canada—telling them what it is. I hold it would be well, if the hon. gentleman must lecture somebody on loyalty, that he should leave native Canadians alone for a while, and go back to his native Ireland, where, from his point of view, they can afford to be lectured on loyalty a little more than we can. The hon. gentleman does not seem to understand, what most of us do in this House, that native Canadians have a strong feeling deep down in their hearts for the land of their birth, and although we give hearty welcome to all strangers who come to us from England, Ireland or Scotland, or anywhere else, we native Canadians on both sides of the House have a fellow feeling, and do not want to be lectured, in season and out of season, on our loyalty to England.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not rise to make any lengthy remarks upon the subject which has been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior). I only wish to say that I think it does not become the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) to make any imputation against the loyalty of that part of the British Empire which happens to be located in the Emerald Isle. The people of Ireland have been agitating for Home Rule, and, if I mistake not, the hon. member for West Ontario voted for a resolution in favor of Home Rule. It is, therefore, rather out of place for him to call the agitation for Home Rule a disloyal agitation, he himself having voted in favor of it.

Mr. BAKER. I regret exceedingly the turn this discussion has taken, and feel in a measure personally responsible for it, because had I risen at an earlier period of the debate to speak, I think I would (as I have on my desk material enough for a six-hour speech) have choked off all discussion of this nature. I was reluctant to speak at an earlier stage of the debate for two reasons, one being that I did not really feel equal to the task which I had for myself undertaken, and the other, because I thought it was

more essentially necessary, and better calculated to be productive of good to my constituents, and to the whole of those interested in the seal fisheries of British Columbia, that a discussion should arise of a legitimate nature in this House, which would be beneficial to them, and would serve as a guide for the future as to what would be likely to be done in regard to protecting this industry. I do not think there is anyone who occupies a position on the floor of this House who can speak more feelingly on this subject than I can, for the simple reason that I am financially interested in the matter. I was very anxious to hear what other members might say on the subject, and to listen to the opinions of the Government and hon. members on both sides of the House. It is of vital importance, not only to the Province of British Columbia from which I come, but to Canada as a whole, that the subject should be fairly and freely debated, and I do not think that the discussion should partake of the nature of party politics at all. I am sorry to say that very frequently matters which come before this House, which should have the freest possible discussion, and in regard to which the opinions of everyone in this House (who cares to speak upon them) should be listened to, are discussed from the point of party politics rather than from a point which is relevant to the matter under discussion. I do not accuse hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of this more than I do those belonging to the party of which I am one of its humblest members. In regard to the matter which the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon) has brought before the House, he has moved for certain papers to be brought down, but I think that is, according to the practice in other cases, for the purpose of engendering a discussion upon a question which is considered to be of interest to hon. members and to the public generally than for the actual perusal of the papers themselves. In introducing this motion, the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon) spoke generally on the subject now before this House. My hon. colleague (Mr. Prior) has traversed the ground and placed before you many matters of interest, more particularly as regards the early history of Alaska, the treaty which was entered into, and the rights, real or imaginary, which the Alaska Commercial Fur Company has under its charter from the United States; and he has also generally mentioned what has taken place in the Behring Sea in regard to the seizure of Canadian vessels. I think, however, that I have a few matters which will be of interest to this House, which have not been mentioned by previous speakers. In the first place, there are 16 or 17 vessels that go up every year to the Behring Sea. In 1886, some of the vessels which went up there, with the names of their captains, and their registered tonnage were as follows:—

Name.	Captain.	Tonnage.
<i>Carolina</i>	James Ogilvie.....	32
<i>Onward</i>	Daniel Munroe.....	35
<i>Thornton</i>	Hans Guttormsen.....	33
<i>Alfred Adams</i>	W. H. Dyer.....	69½
<i>Anna Beck</i>	Louis Olsen.....	41
<i>W. P. Sayward</i>	Geo. R. Ferey.....	136½
<i>Dolphin</i>	J. D. Warren.....	174
<i>Grace</i>	Wm. Petit.....	182
<i>Ada</i>	Jas. Gaudin.....	65

The mates of the *Carolina*, the *Onward*, and the *Thornton*, were respectively James Blake, John Margotich and Harry Norman. Out of these vessel, the names of which I have given, three were seized in 1886, in the latitude, longitude and distance from shore which is shown in this statement:

VESSELS SEIZED IN 1886.

Name.	Lat.	Long.	Distance from Unalaska.
<i>Carolina</i>	55 50 N.	168 53 W.	139 miles.
<i>Onward</i>	54 52 N.	167 55 W.	68 "
<i>Thornton</i>	54 52 N.	167 55 W.	68 "

The vessels seized in 1887 (and their distance from shore) are shown in the following statement:—

VESSELS SEIZED IN 1887.

Name.	Lat.	Long.	Distance from Unalaska.
<i>Alfred Adams</i>	54 48 N.	167 49 W.	62 miles.
<i>Anna Beck</i>	54 58 N.	167 26 W.	66 "
<i>W. P. Sayward</i>	54 43 N.	167 51 W.	58 "
<i>Dolphin</i>	51 38 N.	167 03 W.	42 "
<i>Grace</i>	55 03 N.	168 40 W.	92 "
<i>Ada</i>	54 09 N.	168 40 W.	15 "

The *Alfred Adams* eluded the vigilance of the cruiser, and escaped to Victoria. So hon. members will notice that the nearest point to any United States territory at which any one of these vessels was seized was 15 miles, and some of them were seized at a distance of about 140 miles. No doubt, it will be of some interest to the House to know what crews manned these vessels, to learn something in regard to their outfit, the amount which they are paid, and also something in regard to the season's catch. The crew usually consists of a master, mate, cook-steward, and 4 men to navigate the vessel. Each vessel carries from 6 to 8 boats, each boat has one hunter and two pullers; each hunter gets \$1.50 per skin, each boat puller 50 cents per skin; so that the number of men on board any vessel would vary from 22 to 30 men. Where Indians are employed the number will exceed these figures by about 50 per cent. Each skin therefore costs \$2.50 for the hunter and his crew. To this must be added the cost of outfit, wages of master and crew, and interest on capital invested. The master is usually engaged upon what is known as a "lay out," which combines wages (which range from \$50 to \$65 a month, some range as high as \$100 per month, according to reputation and experience of men in command) with practically a commission on the catch, amounting to about 25 cents or 30 cents a skin. One case will fairly illustrate the many:—Hans Guttormsen, master of the *Thornton*, left Victoria Harbor on the 15th February, upon what is known as a sealing and fishing voyage and cleared at the custom house for the Behring Sea, put into Clayoquot Sound on 25th May, thence west of Vancouver Island to Behring Sea, entering said sea about the 6th June. The vessel which he commanded was seized on the 1st August, and in addition to the forfeiture of vessel and skins, he was fined the sum of \$500 and imprisoned 30 days. He was, in addition to that, robbed of his sextant—for I can use no milder term—valued at \$50, and a chronometer, worth \$125. His instruments were his personal property, and in addition to the loss of his vessel and skins, he individually loses the remainder of the season's catch in which he is interested, and the remainder of the wages, which cease directly his vessel is seized, and he also loses the prospective employment of the vessel and what his wages would be under that prospective employment. I mention these facts, Mr. Speaker, to show that not only has he lost the cost of the vessel's equipment, her outfit, her apparel and provisions, ammunition and small arms, and the kit, and everything belonging to the men on board the vessel, but the ship-master and the mate lose, in addition to what they had on board and their wages, and their interest in the season's catch, the prospective employment of the vessel during the winter months. Now, the value of the three vessels and outfits that were seized in 1886, amounts to \$22,000; the wages and "lay out" payable to the crew amounted to \$17,100; the value of the skins on board was \$10,423; value of the probable catch was estimated at \$21,000 for each of the vessels, which would be \$63,000; legal and other expenses, \$3,000; loss to the schooner *Favorite* through having received orders to quit the sealing, and to get out of Behring's Sea, \$3,000; the indemnity claimed for the masters of the three vessels, namely: Munroe, Guttormsen, and Ogilvie, and the mates, Margotich,

Mr. BAKER.

Norman and Blake, were respectively \$8,000 for the masters, and \$5,000 for the mates; therefore the total amount at risk, when these vessels were seized, foots up the nice little sum of \$154,523. Now, this will show to the House the amount of money that it is necessary to have to embark, even in a small scale, in the Behring Sea fishery, and if it had not been for the interference of these American revenue cruisers, a very large number of vessels would have fitted out, and would have considerably enhanced the value of the sealing industry of British Columbia. The ground covered by the sealing fleet previous to going into Behring Sea is, roughly, 1,500 miles. The distance from Victoria to Cape Flattery is 63 miles; from Cape Flattery to Queen Charlotte Islands, 400 miles; from Queen Charlotte Islands to the entrance of Behring Sea, 1,100; making a total of 1,563 miles from, we will say, Victoria harbor to the entrance of Behring Sea. Some of these vessels were warned outside the group of islands known as the Aleutian Islands, not to go into the Behring Sea, and if I am not greatly in error, one vessel had her skins taken from on board outside the Aleutian Islands, and not within the Behring Sea at all. Now, it will be interesting to this House to know that previous to these vessels going into the Behring Sea, they made what is called their preliminary trip, down south in the direction of San Francisco, 750 miles, to the south of Vancouver Island. They go down as far as Cape Mendocino, 500 miles from Cape Flattery, they then work up on the north-west coast towards Vancouver Island, then strike across to Queen Charlotte Islands, and then on the north-west coast to the entrance of Behring Sea. Several vessels have made large catches without going into Behring Sea at all. When these vessels got into Behring Sea, it was impossible for the revenue cruisers to discriminate between what skins were actually taken south of the Aleutian Islands, and what skins were the result of the kill in Behring Sea, but all the skins on board the vessels at the time were seized. As many as 1,826 skins have been taken by one schooner outside the Behring Sea altogether. Now, there is another little matter which will be interesting to members of this House, while on the subject, and that is the distance from point to point and place to place in and about Behring Sea. Now, from Unalaska Island to the south-east point of St. George's Island, is 182 miles; from the north-west point of St. George's Island to the south point of St. Paul's Island, 36 miles; north point of St. Paul's Island to south-east point of St. Matthew's Island (*i.e.*, Cape Upright), 197 miles; north-east point of St. Matthew's Island to south-west point of St. Lawrence Island, 178 miles; from south-east point of St. Lawrence Island to Cape Prince of Wales (Alaska) in Alaska territory, 140 miles; total distance, as a vessel would probably make it, from the island known as Unalaska to the Behring Straits (entrance of the Arctic Ocean) that is, entrance of Behring Sea to entrance of Behring Straits is 733 miles. I want hon. gentlemen to understand that there is a difference between Behring Sea and Behring Straits, therefore I give these distances. The total distance from the centre of Unimak Pass, passing 10 miles west of Nunivak Island, to Cape Prince of Wales, at the east entrance of Behring Strait, is 700 miles. The width of Unimak Pass, that is, from south-west point of Unimak Island to east point of Akun Island, the usual pass used is from 22½ to 25 miles. There is another pass called the Amukleta Pass, between Amukleta and Siguan Islands, which is 37 miles wide. The Akutam Pass, between Akutam and Unalaska Islands, is only eight miles wide, that is the narrowest entrance between that point and Behring Sea. The width of the entrance of Behring Straits from Cape Prince of Wales to Cape Kregugin, is 70 miles; width of entrance of Behring Straits from Cape Prince of Wales, in Alaska, to East Cape, on the eastern shore of Siberia, is 51 miles. A line dividing the straits of Behring Sea, passes

within 23 miles of Cape Prince of Wales, and 47 miles from Cape Kregugin, and 25 miles from Cape Chukotski, or Chukotski Nose. The Aleutian Islands cover a width, as hon. gentlemen will see, of 900 miles, that is, from the North East Bay, with a sweep up to the north-west, is a distance of 900 miles, all inside of which is the Behring Sea, which will give hon. members some idea, if they have not already looked at the map themselves, of the immense volume of water there is in that sea, and the enormous amount of salt water territory, so to speak, which is claimed by the United States as an inland sea. The sealing grounds in the Behring Sea are principally between 55 and 60 parallels of latitude, and 165 and 175 meridians of longitude (latitude 54° to 57° north; longitude 164° to 172° west). The foregoing information is taken from United States Coast and Geodetic Survey of Alaska and adjoining territory, 1884, by J. E. Hilgard, Superintendent; C. O. Boutelle, assistant in charge of office, as reissued with additions up to April, 1884—Compiled from all accessible data by W. H. Dale, assistant, U.S.C.S., and including results of recent explorations by Capt. Beardslee and Lieut. Perry, U.S. Navy; Lieuts. Kay and Schwaka, U.S. Army; Capt. Hooper, U.S. Rev. Mar.; the officers of the *Vega* expedition and of the Coast Survey and other well-known surveyors and hydrographers, giving data to October, 1883. It is a little peculiar, Mr. Speaker, when we take into consideration the contention of the United States on the Atlantic shores, that they should make, or attempt to make, Behring's Sea a closed sea, especially in view of the liberty enjoyed by United States whalers from New Bedford in Hudson Bay, which is wholly surrounded by our Canadian territory and is entered by passing through an archipelago by channels less than 30 miles in width. I have shown that the channels entering into Behring Sea are respectively 37 miles in width, 51 miles (the principal channel), and the one least used eight miles. Hon. gentlemen will remember the contention of the United States in regard to our bays on the Atlantic coast. Some of those bays are as follows:—Bay Chaleurs, New Brunswick, 15 miles wide; Miramichi Bay, 14 miles; Egmont Bay, 17 miles; St. Mary's Bay, Nova Scotia, between Long Island and Bryer Island, nine miles; Barrington Bay, eastern entrance 7½ miles, western entrance 6½; Chedabucto Bay, Gut of Canso, two entrances; nine and ten miles respectively; St. Ann's Bay, 17 miles; Mira Bay, five or seven miles; Placentia Bay, Newfoundland, 22 miles; Hamilton Sound, 12 and 16 miles; Fortune Bay, 23 miles. Now, if the United States contend that they have the right, or that the concessions should be granted to enter bays of such narrow width, equally, I think, and indeed with greater force, can we contend that we have the right to pass through the narrow entrances to Behring Sea, because, in passing through any one of those entrances, a vessel does not, or need not, approach within 15 miles of the shore. It has been said by some hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this subject that great indifference has been shown either by the Federal Government or by the Imperial Government. I certainly do think, with all deference to hon. gentlemen who have spoken, that there has been an inertness and lassitude, apathy, or indifference, amounting, to use the mildest term, to apparent neglect on the part of the Imperial Government—and I speak as an Englishman proud of the British flag, and proud of holding a seat in this House as a Canadian—because I must say that from 1st August, 1886, to 25th April, 1888, there has been ample time for some one upon whom the responsibility rested to have promised, at least, that there should not be a recurrence of the seizures. I am quite convinced that, so far as the Canadian Government are concerned, every legitimate and persistent endeavor has been made, all the persuasive eloquence that could be brought to bear has been used, by telegram and letter, to induce the Imperial Government to take that step which we would like

to see taken yet, and have a reasonable right to demand, namely, to send there an armed vessel, and, if necessary, recapture our vessels, as was done in olden times, with shot and shell, if stern necessity demanded it. That is about the only way to stop such piracy on the high seas and uphold the honor of our flag. As far back as 30th March, 1886, I received a letter from a gentleman named T. Lubbe, who was interested at that time in the sealing fleet sailing from Victoria:

“VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA, 30th March, 1886.

“DEAR SIR,—The enclosed clipping explains itself.

“The question I wish to ask you is: Can the United States claim the easterly half of Behring Sea as ‘American Waters?’

“The British schooners *Mary Ellen*, *Favorite*, *Onward*, *Grace*, *Dolphin*, *Ann Beck*, *Wm. P. Sayward*, *Mary Taylor*, *Caroline*, *Alfred Adams* and *Active* intend to follow the seals into Behring Sea at the end of the seal fishing season, off the British Columbia coast—say 20th May next. These schooners would spear and shoot seals upon the high seas, and have no occasion to go within thirty miles of any land. You are aware that the British schooner *Mary Ellen* has already made two successful voyages to Behring Sea; the *Favorite* made also a successful voyage during 1885. Both these vessels were spoken by an American revenue cutter in Behring Sea last summer, but not in any way molested.

“Would it not be well for you to obtain from the Minister of Marine in Ottawa a written opinion, and further, would you be good enough to communicate to me the substance of such opinion by wire?

“Please act promptly and oblige.

“Yours truly,

“T. LUBBE.

“MR. EDGAR CROW BAKER, M.P., Ottawa.

“The letter referred to in my letter dated 9th April, 1886.

“EDGAR CROW BAKER, M.P.”

“OTTAWA, 9th April, 1886.

“SIR,—I have the honor to transmit herewith a letter just received from Mr. Theodore Lubbe, the managing owner of our British Columbia sealing fleet, and dated 30th ult.; the newspaper clipping attached thereto fully explains the matter embodied therein, and as will be at once seen, it is a matter of vital importance to our fishing industry and commercial enterprises generally, that the same should engage the attention of the Government at the very earliest possible moment, in order that the owners may be apprised with as little delay as possible how they are to act.

“I would therefore respectfully urge that the whole subject be referred to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, so that I may be informed as quickly as is reasonably possible what reply to telegraph; should this mode of procedure be irregular or undesirable, then I would most respectfully ask that such other steps be taken in the premises as to you may appear necessary or expedient so as to avert trouble in the closely approaching season alluded to, and remove all doubt as to the rights of the parties on the “high seas” or otherwise, as may appear to be reasonably consistent.

“I have the honor to be, Sir,

“Your most obedient servant,

“EDGAR CROW BAKER, M.P.,

“Vice-Pres. B. C. Board of Trade.

“To the Honorable the Secretary of State.”

I consider that that telegram was really the firing of the first shot in defence of our rights as Canadians to fish anywhere we please on the high seas, including Behring Sea. I was requested at that time to get the matter before the Government, which I most promptly did. That telegram, which was dated 12th May, 1886, simply said:

“Has the Minister of Justice not yet decided?”

“T. LUBBE.”

To that telegram I sent the following reply:—

“The Minister of Justice gives opinion in your favor and against American contention. He has recommended attention of Imperial Government being called to the subject in order that views of Canadian Government be therein sustained and enforced.

“E. CROW BAKER.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, no less than 23 months have passed since the Federal Government sent either a telegram or a very emphatic and unmistakable letter to the Imperial Government, urging the enforcement of the position taken by the Government of Canada, namely, that our rights should be protected on the high seas, and up to the present nothing practical or tangible has been done. The reason why we in British Columbia are anxious at the present time that something should be done, not only in the matter of restitution for seizures

that took place in 1886-87, but in reference to our rights in Behring Sea, is because a certain amount of uncertainty and scepticism prevails as to whether the United States will continue to make seizures of vessels or not. Had it not been for that feeling I am quite confident that to-day, instead of there being 17 or 18 vessels sailing from Victoria to Behring Sea, there would have been at least three times that number, and even to-day we are not assured that protection will be given to our vessels. If we were assured of protection being given to the vessels, I think by this time there would have been a vessel flying the British flag somewhere in that vicinity, but until the Union Jack of old England is seen flying there so long will the American Eagle, represented by the Stars and Stripes, pounce down on our vessels and take them to Alaska, under the conditions of their contended "exclusive jurisdiction," an epitome of which I will hand to *Hansard* for publication;

"JURISDICTION.

"The first pretension to any control of Behring Sea was contained in the Russian ukase of 1821, which forbade the approach of any foreign vessel within 30 leagues of the coast of Russian-America; this provoked a storm of remonstrance in Great Britain and the United States, as the vessels of both places had been in the habit of trading and freely traversing these waters since their discovery. The matter was discussed with great heat in the United States Congress and protested against by the United States Government. J. Quincy Adams, United States Secretary of State, 'expressed the astonishment of the President at these claims and assumptions of the Russian Government, and desired to know upon what circumstances they were founded,' (25th Feb. 1822). Two Russian vessels were, however, sent to enforce the ukase, and the United States brig *Pearl*, of Boston, for Sitka, was seized; this state of affairs was brought to a close by the Conventions of 1824 and 1825 between Russia and United States, and Russia and Great Britain, respectively; the convention with the United States stipulated 'that in all parts of the Great Ocean, commonly known as the Pacific Ocean, and its adjoining seas to the south, the citizens and subjects of the high contracting powers may engage freely and without opposition in navigation and fishing, &c. (Contemporary maps show that Behring Sea was then considered a part of the Pacific Ocean.) In the same year (1824-1825) the United States brig *Pearl* was released and a *suitable indemnity* for the owners exacted from Russia by the United States Government. To show that neither the United States nor any other power acknowledged the exclusive jurisdiction of Russia over Behring Sea, we have only to refer to the great whaling industry which was carried on in that sea; and later, when the whales had been driven further north in the Arctic Ocean, entered by Behring Straits. Thus, in 1842, the Russian Governor Ekeolen reported that United States and other whalers were fishing north of the Aleutian Islands, and requested his Government to send cruisers to preserve Behring Sea as a *mare clausum*; the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs replied that the treaty with the United States gave the right to citizens of the United States to engage in fishing everywhere in the Pacific Ocean. In 1850 Okhopk an Behring Sea and neighboring waters contained 300 foreign whalers, a large proportion being United States bottoms. In 1854 there were 525 whalers, in 1855 there were 468 whalers, in 1856 there were 366 whalers, and in some years as many as 600. The value of the catch having risen as high as \$14,000,000. The great diminution which occurred in later years arose only from the decreased number of whales, but whaling has never ceased to be an important industry, and if the United States Government has the power to prohibit it, sealing in the Behring Sea, it may also at any time prohibit whaling and fishing of all descriptions, as well as close Behring Straits, which has been from the time of its discovery a *free route* to the Arctic, and is in fact the only way by which the coast of a portion of this dominion can be reached by water. It can easily be shown that no exclusive claim to Behring Sea was set up by the United States before the Government of that country came under the pernicious influence of a 'trading monopoly,' viz.: 'Alaska Commercial Company.' Bancroft, the historian of the Pacific States, writes in 1886: 'The whaling grounds of the North Pacific, though of course open to all nations, are now in the hands of Americans, and were so, practically, before the purchase of Alaska, &c.,' (vol. 33, p. 670). Still more authoritatively, however, is the recorded decision of United States Secretary of Treasury, George S. Boutwell. In 1872, five years after the purchase of Alaska by the United States, T. G. Phelps, Collector of Customs at San Francisco, wrote officially to Boutwell, stating that rumors were abroad 'that expeditions were to be sent from Australia and the Sandwich Islands to take fur seals on their annual migration northward, particularly in the vicinity of the Pass of Unimak, in the Aleutian Islands,' and asking that a steam revenue cutter should be sent to protect the fishery. To this request Boutwell replied as follows:—'A very full conversation was had with Captain Bryant upon this subject while he was at the department, and he conceived it to be entirely impracticable to make such an expedition, inasmuch as the seals go singly or in pairs, and not in droves, and cover a large region of water in their homeward travel to these islands (i.e. St. Paul and St. George), and he did not seem to fear that the seals would be driven from their accustomed resorts, even if such attempts were

Mr. BAKER,

made. In addition, I do not see that the United States would have the jurisdiction or power to drive off parties going up there for that purpose unless they made such attempt within a marine league of the shore. The seizure of British sealers on the high seas appears to be justified, by reference to an Act of United States Congress which, however binding upon United States vessels, can have no bearing on those of other nations. The new interpretation which it has been attempted to enforce with regard to the rights of the United States over seals in Behring Sea and *pari passu* over all fisheries of that sea, is well exemplified by the following remarks of H. W. Elliott, which form part of an official report included in the last United States census: 'The fur seals of Alaska, collectively and individually, are the property of the general government * * * Every fur seal playing in the waters of Behring Sea around about the Pieboloff Islands, no matter if found so doing 100 miles away from the rookeries, belongs there, has been begotten and born thereon, and is the animal that the explicit shield of the law protects; no legal scepticism or quibble can cloud the whole truth of any statement.' (N.B.—It may be remarked that Elliott is generally understood to be a paid agent of the 'trading monopoly,' hereinafore mentioned.) It would appear that the United States revenue cutters are acting on some absurd contention of this kind in their seizures of British vessels in the Behring Sea."

The following are the authorities:—

Particulars as to Sealing, &c, refer to "Fur Seal Islands of Alaska," by Elliott, United States, 10th Census, Vol. 8.

Particulars respecting Treaties, &c, refer to Bancroft's Works, Vol. 33. R. Greehoid, North-West Coast of North America, 1840, p. 176.

Executive Documents of United States, 1875-1876, Vol. 10.

Particulars re Whalers in Behring Sea: Seaman's Narrative of Voyage of Herald, London, 1853.

Only the other day an item appeared in one of the San Francisco newspapers, having an appearance of authenticity, to the effect that all vessels operating within certain limits set forth would be liable to the penalties prescribed by law against the killing of fur-bearing animals. It is equally possible that all vessels sailing from Victoria Harbor or any other port in British Columbia, if they did not see this notice at the custom house in San Francisco, had it communicated to them by agents there; so that at the present moment vessels fitted out in Victoria and going into Behring Sea have no guarantee that they will not be seized as were other Canadian vessels in 1886-87. In fact everything shows that such will be the case. I do not know that anything more can be done so far as the Canadian Government are concerned. They have urged the matter up to a point which is satisfactory to the Imperial Government, themselves and us, and their position is supported by facts of which we are in possession, and I have no doubt there may be some very good reasons for the Government not laying certain diplomatic correspondence before the House until a certain period has passed; but what we really want, practically, in British Columbia and in the vicinity of the Behring Sea are two things: We want compensation for the vessels seized and the damage done, and we want a prevention of the recurrence of such a thing in future. I will not weary the House by reading the Alaska Commercial Company's charter from the United States Government or the Act for the prevention of the extermination of seals in the Behring Sea, but I will simply give a reference to them so that hon. members can refer to them themselves. The Act for the prevention of the extermination of seals in the Behring Sea will be found on No. 120 of that little blue book issued last year when the correspondence was called for. While I am referring to the matter of extermination of seals in the Behring Sea I will take this occasion to repudiate a statement which has got wind, to the effect that one of the reasons for preventing persons from killing seals in the Behring Sea is that they kill indiscriminately; that they kill the female seal with pups, and seals under two years old. I have taken the trouble of critically going into this matter, and I have enquired from masters, officers, mates and the crews of these vessels as to what percentage of the seals killed would come under that category. I have the very best of assurance that out of possibly 2,100 or 2,200 seal skins brought down by each vessel from Behring Sea to Victoria Harbor, that there will not be 2 per cent. of them belonging to seals such as should not

be killed, which is a very small percentage indeed. Then, as regards the Commercial Company's lease, dated 3rd August, 1870, that will be found a little further on in those papers of last year, to which I have already alluded. Although I have lots of material here that I would like to refer to and place on record, the ground has been so well covered by those who have spoken that the patience of the House must have been fully tested upon this subject. The only excuse I can offer for taking up so much time of the House is that British Columbians do not usually occupy the time of the House, unless it is some important matter having particular reference to their own Province, such as a question of this kind, in which possibly some of us have an individual interest, as I have already stated I have. There are many matters which come up before this House, such as the Fishery Treaty, and some hon. gentleman may say: Why do not British Columbians speak on that subject? One very good reason may be given for this and that is that on some subjects "silence is golden." There are some questions which come up which immediately it would be in the interest of British Columbia to adopt, but which in the near future I rather apprehend it would be in the interest of the Province *not* to adopt, and considering the *future* and the *present* and the conflict of effect between them it is just as well to say as little as possible. Upon this particular subject I think I can voice the sentiment of every man in British Columbia when I say that the rights of Canadian vessels on the Pacific can fairly claim as much protection, and that their case should equally be urged on the Imperial Government, as the rights of our vessels upon the Atlantic Ocean have been urged and listened to. It is, I think, a matter of regret that this question was not referred to the United States plenipotentiaries, so that the necessity of calling for the papers in this House would have been avoided.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF ARCHIBALD CULBERTSON.

Mr. BURDETT moved for:

Return of copies of all correspondence, charges, papers and orders touching or relating to the dismissal of Archibald Culbertson from the office of Indian Councillor of the Mohawk Band.

He said: I should like to say a few words in respect to this motion affecting the status of the Mohawk band. I believe, according to a statute of the Dominion, chap. 43, sec. 75, the Government have the power and have exercised that power of permitting the bands to elect councillors to manage their local affairs. They have, under the same statute, the right to remove those councillors for four specified reasons, viz., dishonesty, intemperance, immorality and incompetence. I may say here that if the Government possessed this power in all cases, as well as those referring to Indians, and if they exercised it as they have used it in this case, we would possibly have a pretty large political house-cleaning. This man, Archibald Culbertson, has been, I am told, elected for a number of years, and has served with efficiency and zeal the band to which he belongs. Last winter before the election, he writes me, that he was told if he interfered punishment would be meted out to him. After the elections similar threats were made, and they were carried out, and he was summarily dismissed from his position. He made enquiries of Mr. Dingman, an officer of the department, and asked if any charges were made against him, and if there were he asked that they should be furnished to him. Mr. Dingman said no charges were made, but if the Government directed him to do so he would make enquiries. Archibald Culbertson informs me that on the 11th of August he received a letter summarily dismissing him from his position as a member of the council. I understand that this man occupied an analogous position to an alderman or a member of a municipal or

township councillor, and ought not to be dismissed without specific charges and for good cause. The courts are open and persons found guilty may be removed for proper cause and on proper grounds. We were told here in the Queen's county election case that the courts were open and that those who objected to Mr. Baird's election could move in that direction. I think it would have been highly proper if the courts had been moved in this case instead of the Executive at Ottawa. This gentleman writes me that he was dismissed without accusation, without a charge and without an opportunity of defending himself before his accusers, or to show his innocence or justify his conduct. If this be true it rests with the Government, in justice to this man, to show why he was dismissed and for what cause and on whose complaint. In support of these assertions I have two letters written him from the department. The first is as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 19th October, 1887.

"SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 10th instant asking to be furnished with copies of certain papers, &c., connected with the Order of His Excellency the Governor General in Council deposing you from the chieftainship of the Tyendinaga band of Indians, I have to inform you that the department declines to furnish you with the document asked for.

"R. SINCLAIR,

"Acting Deputy of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs."

The second letter is as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 2nd January, 1888.

"SIR,—With reference to your verbal request on the 4th instant to be furnished with copies of the papers containing charges against you under which you were deposed from the chieftainship of the Tyendinaga band of Indians I beg to refer you to the letter from this department of the 19th October last, informing you that the department was unwilling to furnish you with the document asked for.

"L. VANKOUGHNET,

"Deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs."

I cannot understand why a man who occupies a position like this, to which he has been elected by the people, should be deposed without having an opportunity to answer his accusers. Even the French translators had that opportunity. I am told that the Irishmen on the Lachine Canal had not the same privilege. They were also summarily dismissed without cause. Possibly it is only Irishmen and Indians who are denied the right which is granted to Frenchmen and Canadians—the right to know and answer their accusers. This is the first occasion on which I have known a man to be removed from a position that he has acceptably filled without some cause or reason being given. There may have been good cause for his dismissal; I do not know whether there was or not; but I do say that, in justice to him and to his people, he ought to have had an opportunity to answer those charges. Further, he informs me that although he was dismissed on the 11th of August, in a summary manner, nothing was done to fill his office until the 22nd of January. We find that when it became necessary, through death, to fill vacancies in this House, in the cases of West Hastings and Missisquoi, there was no delay, but in the cases of Prince Edward, Kent, Russell, Shelburne and Yarmouth, considerable and unnecessary delay occurred. Delay also happened in the election of the successor of this man. He also informs me that although his dismissal did not imply disqualification, men in the employ of the Government reported that the Government would not accept him if he ran and was elected. He tells me that the person who nominated his opponent would have supported him if he had known that he was not objectionable to the Government. It was bad enough to be dismissed without cause and without charges, but it was still worse to have it circulated that he could not be re-elected, and would not be acceptable to the powers that be. I do not believe the Government authorised anybody to say that he would not

be acceptable to them if he was re-elected. In conclusion he writes:

"It seems to me very unjust to allow any man to prefer a charge against another, and the answer not to be delivered, and the accused not to be allowed to defend himself."

It is only right to say that he informed me that some of them said he was dismissed for intemperance—because he had, in common language, got "tight." That may be true or it may not be true; but if the Government have decided to dismiss officials in their employ for intemperance, I am glad to hear it. I hope that the application of that principle will not be limited to Indians alone. If the Government state that they will dismiss all in their employ who can be proved not only to get "tight," but to go on a common everyday "drunk," we will give them more employment. If this rule is to be applied, it will be more effective than any Scott Act can be to clear the country of intemperance, and if they do decide to undertake that work, I will give them a few subjects to act on. What I say is that this man, who was a ward of the Government, complains to me that he was dismissed without any accusation being made against him, and without a chance to answer, and that others, in order to deprive him of an opportunity to be re-elected, stated that the Government would not accept him if he were re-elected. I say that the Government should place themselves right on this matter, and should let those men know, now that they have the franchise, that they have a right to exercise it freely and without fear of molestation from the Government or any of their officials.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know little or nothing of this case myself, but I am quite sure that the head of the department, in acting as he is alleged to have done, in the first place, acted according to what he believed was within the scope of his duty, and in the second place, believed that he was acting in the interest of the band of whom Mr. Culbertson is stated to have been a councillor. The hon. gentleman is right in stating that the charge brought against him was intemperance and violence, extreme violence, during the time he was so intemperate, and that not in a few but in many instances, and in the interest of the band and the cause of good order he was removed. However, I cannot speak of the particulars because they are not before me. The papers will be brought down.

Mr. BURDETT. The law provides for the punishment of an Indian for intemperance; but it is the duty of the Government not only to punish the Indian, but the person who gave him the liquor. If this man is to be removed for intemperance and violence, he writes me in reference to his successor, whom the Government seem to accept as satisfactory, in these words:

"Jacob B. Brant was the man that went home drunk, broke his stove, cut up some of the furniture and some of the house, and run his wife away from her home, and she was obliged to have him committed to jail, and who will get drunk whenever he gets an opportunity."

The rule that the Government have applied to Mr. Culbertson ought to apply to his successor, and if the hon. gentleman thinks he has not served in jail, he can search the jailer's book in Belleville.

Motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Dominion Plate Glass Insurance Company.—(Mr. Holton.)

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Keystone Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Mr. BURDETT.

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Annapolis Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Buffalo, Chippawa and Niagara Falls Steamboat and Tramway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 86) to authorise the construction of Bridges over the Assiniboine River at Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie for Railway and Passenger purposes.—(Mr. Watson.)

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. McCARTHY moved the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Canada Temperance Act. He said: This Bill, I may say, is a formal one, and perhaps, to a great extent, its usefulness is already gone—it has gone, at all events, so far as the county from which I come is concerned, as quite recently the Scott Act has been repealed in that county by a large majority. But there are still a number of counties where the Scott Act is in force, and the object of this measure is to simplify and make plain the voting, either for the repeal or the introduction of the Scott Act. At present the voter is very much puzzled to know when he is voting for the petition to bring the Act into force, or voting for the repeal—he is puzzled to know whether he is voting for or against the measure. The object of this Bill is to enable the elector to understand what he is voting for. He knows, of course, if he votes for the Act it is for the purpose of bringing the Act into force, and he ought also to know that if he is voting against the Act, it is for the repeal of the Act so far as it affects his constituency. Now, the Bill is framed with that object. I do not anticipate any opposition to the measure from any part of the House. I think all must agree that it is important that the electors should have the matter made as plain and simple as possible, and they should understand whether they are voting for the Act or against it. But it may be important, perhaps, that I should bring this matter up that it may be embodied in this Bill and a provision be inserted that, in counties where the Act has been repealed, it should be brought into force at the earliest possible date. In no less than nine counties, including the unions, and I believe represented in this House, by no less than fifteen members, the Scott Act has been repealed and repealed by very large majorities, but under the provisions of that repeal it cannot come into force for one year yet. The result is that for a year to come this law against which the people have pronounced is practically paralysed. It has ceased to be of the slightest effect though it is still technically in force, but there is no public opinion behind it, and I do not think any person will take the slightest trouble to enforce its provisions. Practically free trade in liquor will prevail in those counties. I think we had better at the earliest possible moment, in those counties where the people have pronounced upon this question, bring this Act into force and allow the Crooks Act or the license law for the regulation of the liquor traffic to be carried into effect. However, in this Bill I am simply dealing at present with the matter I have mentioned.

Mr. JAMIESON. The mover of the Bill has made a very candid confession in regard to it, and that is that its usefulness is gone. My own impression about this Bill, and I do not place myself as a very good authority, is that the last clause of the Bill is the only one that is going to be of any service. I think that what my hon. friend has said in reference to a change in the ballot is quite true, and that a change in that respect would be an advantage not only to those who are in favor of the law but to those who are opposed to the law. My hon. friend may be quite right in regard to the effect of the vote which took place on Thursday last and with regard to which I shall have some further

remarks to make in the course of the evening, but my impression of the law is quite different to that which my hon. friend holds. I have not looked into the matter carefully, but my impression is that the Act will become repealed and the license law of the Province will go into effect at the expiration of ninety days; that is that the Order in Council revoking the Act can be passed at the expiration of sixty days after the vote in favor of the repeal of the Act, and after the expiration of thirty days from that time the Act will be repealed. I do not know whether my hon. friend proposes to move the House into committee to-night, but so far as I am concerned I think the last clause is the only one that is of any importance, and in regard to that I would suggest, and no doubt my hon. friend will make no objection, that the form of the ballot prescribed should be made applicable not only to the adoption of the Act but to the repeal of the Act, and I think the affirmative should be placed first, that is for the Act. So far as the other provisions of the Bill are concerned I think my hon. friend will concede that no difficulties have arisen on that score so far as the repeal votes that have already taken place are concerned, and no difficulty is likely to arise in the future. They seem to have adopted the provisions of the law according to the statute, *mutatis mutandis* for the repeal, and I think the only provision in this Bill which should be considered by the House, and I think my hon. friend will not dispute this, is the one in regard to the change in the ballot.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understood the hon. gentleman he confined his remarks to the last section of the Bill, that is to say to the section in regard to the ballot. I notice that the first section is to amend clause 96 of the Act. Will the hon. gentleman kindly give the House any explanation he has to offer in regard to the proposed amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no change contemplated in the law.

Mr. LAURIER. Then what is the object of the amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. The object is to make it plain and clear in connection with the repeal of the Act. The hon. gentleman will understand that the procedure for bringing the Act into force is the procedure in the original statute. The procedure for the repeal of the Act is stated in a general way, that *mutatis mutandis* the forms are to be adopted for the repeal of the Act. That has created a good deal of confusion, especially in regard to the ballot. The form of the ballot is for the petition. The change is proposed with a view to make it clear to a voter whether he is voting for or against the Act. Clause 96 reads in the original Act, in substance, the same as in the proposed amending Act. Clause 96 is as follows:—

"No Order in Council issued under this Act shall be revoked until after the expiration of three years from the date of the coming into force under it of the second part of this Act."

I have put these provisions into separate sections. Section 96 is repealed and the following substituted for the first part of the section:—

"Sections five, six, seven and eight following and the forms in the schedule to this Act shall be read as if embodied in the first part of the said Act, but shall relate to proceedings for revoking the Order in Council which has brought the second part of the said Act into force."

Section 5, which has reference to part of Section 96, provides as follows:—

"A petition to the Governor in Council praying for the revocation of any Order in Council, passed for bringing the second part of this Act into force, may be in the form O of the schedule hereto or to the like effect."

Section 6 is as follows:—

"Such petition may be embodied, as in form O in the schedule to this Act, in the notice in writing addressed to the Secretary of State of Canada and signed by electors qualified to vote at the election of a

member of the House of Commons in a county or city, to the effect that the signers desire that the votes of such electors as under the provisions of the said Act are entitled to vote for the bringing into force of the second part of the said Act, be taken for and against the revocation of the Order in Council bringing the second part of the said Act into force."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I desire some information in regard to an observation made by the hon. gentleman. I understood the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to say that in those counties where the Act has been repealed the Act will still operate for one year, notwithstanding the vote taken. As I understood the original law—I have not examined it in the Revised Statutes—there was no possibility of taking a vote in regard to the Act until at the expiration of three years.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not correct.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That was the original provision.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Act must remain in force three years; but there was no provision on the Statute-book such as the hon. gentleman has mentioned. An Order in Council was passed providing that the Act when adopted should remain in force for three years; so the vote did not take place until March or April. But the hon. gentleman will find, now that the Act has been repealed, sixty days must elapse before the proclamation can issue, then either 30 or 60 days after that again before the law comes into force, and then again not to become operative until, as I understand it the next license year, although there may be some doubt with regard to that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that the spirit of the law was to bring it into operation and then take a vote to ascertain public sentiment, but not until the three years had about expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. We cannot help dealing with things as they are.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Public opinion might change before the time expires and people might take a different view. Clearly the intention of the law is that a vote should be taken at the close of the period.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. McCARTHY moved that the House resolve itself into committee on the Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no. Yes, yes.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest that the Bill should be taken later on.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let us go into committee now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has suggested amendments and provisions that are not in the Bill. I think it is only fair that the House should have an opportunity of considering them. It might be desirable that further amendments would be proposed. The hon. gentleman will see that when we go into committee that our opportunity for consideration would have expired when the committee rises.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You have the third reading and concurrence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The right hon. gentleman knows, from an experience of 20 years, that the opportunities in concurrence are not very great. The proper time to consider them is in committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let us do so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says: Let us do so, but has the hon. gentleman considered the subject? If he had he would hardly have taken a vote of the people on the repeal of the Bill twelve months before it should be repealed.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, no.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says: "No." The hon. gentleman himself has admitted that repeal of the Scott Act has been carried in several counties although the Act has still a year to operate. Unless Parliament interferes that Act will continue to operate, although the people have decided it ought to be repealed. The intention of the law was that an Order in Council authorising a vote to be taken ought not to have been adopted until the three years had about expired. Clearly it never was the intention of Parliament that there should be a vote taken on a measure that is actually in operation, before the time has expired or about to expire within which that measure is to operate. The hon. gentleman says we can consider it in committee. He has not considered what he has done himself and the least that can be done is to give us an opportunity of considering the Bill. I do not say it is to be opposed. I say it is highly mischievous to have a law in operation after the people have condemned it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No doubt of that, but it is a remarkable condition of things that the people should be called upon to say whether they approve or disapprove of a measure, which the statute says should operate for another year. The Government administering the law have not carried out the intentions of Parliament.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman either does not know what he is talking about or he is misrepresenting what the law is, because if the Government had waited five years before they submitted it to a vote of the people they would have to wait another year before it could come into force. The facts are that they did wait three years, less fifteen days, in every one of those seven counties, or united counties, so that at the time of the vote there was only fifteen days to wait. If you waited five years you would still have to wait another year according to the explanation of the law given by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). If the hon. gentleman will take up this Bill he will see it has been distributed for over a month, and if the hon. gentleman had not time to consider it he ought to have found time. The member in charge of it has considered it. I think the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has shown no cause for delay and that we should go into committee at once.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let me remind the hon. gentleman the mover of this Bill proposes certain conditions which are not in the present Bill at all.

Mr. TISDALE. That is not the question. It is whether we are to go into committee or not.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what provisions he proposes to make to prevent a vote being taken until the three years has expired. The hon. gentleman sees there is no such provision in the statute.

Mr. McCARTHY. You had better move it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, it is the hon. gentleman's Bill. His hon. friend beside him has fully considered the subject and has no doubt an amendment ready.

Mr. TISDALE. If I have I will move it at the proper time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The time has come now. The clause in the Bill reads thus:

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

"No Order in Council issued under this Act shall be revoked until after the expiration of three years from the date of the coming into force under it of the second part of this Act."

The hon. gentleman certainly must see that it is highly desirable that the Bill should not remain in force and continue to operate after the people have voted in favor of repeal, and therefore such vote ought not to be taken until after the time expires.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no doubt a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman says, but that does not interfere with this section. The hon. gentleman will see I am copying from his own Bill, for he was a member of the Government that brought in this Scott Act.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman ought not to go back on his own measure. As I explained before I am distributing this section 96 into three or four sections without altering the Scott Act in any way. I am quite willing the hon. gentleman should make such a motion and speaking for myself am quite willing to adopt it as far as I can; that the vote for the repeal should not take place until a certain limited time within the three years; but that need not at all conflict with this section, which means that the Act cannot be repealed by Order in Council until after three years.

On section 8,

Mr. TISDALE. Owing to the vote that took place the other day in no less than nine counties in the Province of Ontario, a very anomalous state of law exists. Although by a very large majority the qualified electors decided that the Scott Act is not law, it will still remain law for a year. I think as a matter of principle that is wrong, and it will put all those counties in this extraordinary position, that there will be no possibility of a license being issued, while the Scott Act, after the people have said they do not want it, will be comparatively impossible of enforcement. Therefore, in my opinion, it is the duty of this House to pass some legislation that will prevent this state of things. In moving the amendment that I have in my hand, I wish to state that last year when the motion was brought into the House for the repeal of the Scott Act, I was one of those who, though opposed to that Act, felt that we should not repeal it, on the ground that we should not take from the electors the right to say whether an Act should be law or not after Parliament had delegated that power to them. Now, the electors having said in those different large counties, by thousands in the aggregate majority, that they wish no more of that Act, I think it is wrong to leave those counties in this position, that they cannot get rid of it for a year. Therefore I move:

That in all counties in which a petition for the repeal of the Canada Temperance Act has been adopted by a vote of the qualified electors, and in the manner and according to the provisions of the said Act, the Governor in Council may forthwith, after the adoption thereof, pass an Order in Council declaring that the said Act is repealed in the said county, and the said Act shall, from the publication of the said Order in Council in the *Canada Gazette*, be repealed accordingly.

I wish to add one word in moving the resolution—one word which, I think, after all, so far as an individual is concerned, is the strongest sort of evidence—my own observation as to the effect that will follow in my own county, if some such provision is not adopted. While the Scott Act was in force, so far as the temperance cause is concerned, I regret exceedingly to say that in my opinion it did more harm than good. At the time the petition for the adoption of the Act was before the people, I was so staggered myself by the earnestness and the statements of the advocates of it, that I did not vote. But during the years that it has been in existence, particularly during the late elections for the Local Legislature and for this House,

I was surprised and grieved, as I went through the county, to find the state of affairs that existed, as contrasted with the condition of the county a few years before, when we were under the License Act; and I believe things will be worse now unless we take some steps in this House to provide that, as soon as the people vote to repeal the Act, they can return to the license system.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him under what section of the Act he pretends that the Act will remain in force one year after its repeal is voted by the people?

Mr. TISDALE. Under several sections of the Act. I confess that, although in my own opinion a reasonably fair lawyer, I do not understand the Act; and I have conversed with several legal gentlemen who I thought knew better than myself, and they all arrived at the conclusion that it is uncertain; some say a year and some say ninety days. At all events the consensus of opinion that I have been able to gather in consulting eminent legal gentlemen, without respect to their political opinions, is that it will be a year before a license can properly be issued under the laws of Ontario. It can do no harm if I am wrong; but when there is such a consensus of opinion, will the hon. gentleman tell me there is no doubt under that Act, under the license laws of Ontario, that we can get a license within a year?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not answering the question.

Mr. LAURIER. That is not the fault of the Act; it is the fault of the law of Ontario.

Mr. TISDALE. It is an effect of the law. I propose to deal with principles, and I say it is a question of principle, and a most important principle, so far as nine counties, at all events, are concerned. I do not want to see a state of affairs continue to exist, which, for the past two years especially, have existed in some parts of the riding I have the honor to represent; and to prevent that I want to see that no doubt shall remain under this law, and that after the sense of the people has been proclaimed by a large majority in favor of repeal, we shall be able to go back to the old state of things, or to a better state of things.

Mr. LAURIER. I did not put the question with the view of carping at the amendment, but only to obtain information. I do not pretend to be familiar with the Act. The hon. gentleman has affirmed that the amendment together with the effect of the legislation, such as it exists, will be that when the Act will be repealed by the vote of the people, it will still remain in force for one year. I ask him to give me the section on which he bases that assertion, and he tells me it is the result of several sections. Those are the very sections concerning which I would like to be informed. The hon. gentleman must be familiar with them since he has undertaken to remove them from the statutes and replace them by something else. The hon. gentleman says that he cannot say whether the Act will remain in force for a year, but that at all events it will for ninety days.

Mr. TISDALE. No doubt of that.

Mr. LAURIER. I ask him to point to the sections which would have that effect?

Mr. TISDALE. It is sometime since I examined the Act, perhaps two or three weeks ago, before the vote took place, and I cannot now remember the sections or the particulars.

Mr. LAURIER. A moment ago my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) asked that the Bill be postponed until another sitting, in order to consider it, but the hon. gentleman said he was quite ready now, and rather taunted my

hon. friend for not being ready. He said he had had the Act for a month in his hands, and was quite ready now to discuss it, and I inferred from that that he was quite ready to give the information I asked for.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me there are entirely too many doctors about this patient. We have heard a good many opinions expressed on this Act, and a little time has been asked by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). What I think ought to be done is this: It is a public Bill which affects public interests, and the hon. the Minister of Justice should look into this point, and let the House really know what the effect of the law really is, as it stands, and what would be the effect of the proposed change. We ought not to go blindly into a question that may lead to endless litigation. Before dealing with an Act about which there are so many conflicting opinions, we ought to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice as to the position we will be in should this legislation be adopted.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps I may be able to point out the meaning of the law, as I understand it, and the effect of the proposed amendment. The hon. the leader of the Opposition will find that the latter part of section 96 provides that the vote upon the repeal shall take effect, *mutatis mutandis*, according to the preceding sections 94 and 95 of the statute. It is as follows:—

“And each and all of the provisions of the preceding sections of this Act shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to every case of a petition and notice for the revocation of an Order in Council under this section and to the proceedings to be had and taken thereon, and in respect of the powers to be exercised and the offences that may be committed, and the penalties that may be incurred in the course of and in connection with such proceedings.”

Therefore, we have to look at sections 94 and 95 to see when this petition, having been adopted by the people will become effective. Section 95 says:

“When any petition embodied, as aforesaid, in any notice and in any proclamation under this part of this Act, has been adopted by the electors of the country or city named therein and to which the same relates, the Governor in Council may—”

That has taken place with regard to the repeal. The petition has been adopted.

—“at any time after the expiration of sixty days from the date on which the same was adopted—”

That is the first delay of sixty days. There is a delay of two months before the proclamation can issue.

—“by Order in Council published in the *Canada Gazette*, declare that the second part of this Act shall be in force and take effect in such county or city upon, from and after the day on which the annual or semi-annual licenses for the sale of spirituous liquors then in force in such county or city will expire.”

Of course there are no licenses in force in such county or city; but if there were, they would be in force for the year ending next April. The consequence is although the proclamation may be made two months hence, that proclamation has to declare the law shall not become effective until the expiration of the license year. The difficulty created in the construction of the statute is by sub-section 2, between which and the section I have just read there appears to be a contradiction. Sub-section 2 says:

“If, in any county or city, there are no licences in force when the petition mentioned in the first part of this Act is adopted, the second part of this Act shall become and be in force and take effect in such county or city after the expiration of thirty days from the date of such Order in Council.”

That makes the ninety days that are spoken of. So that it is either ninety days from the time the Act is adopted or it is the year of the license. In either case, the mischief we are seeking to avoid will exist. In the one case it would exist twelve months and in the other case three months. My hon. friend proposes in amendment that the law should come at once into force, that the Governor in Council should have power to proclaim that a petition has been adopted and that

the repeal should become at once effective. It would then be the duty of the provincial authorities to issue licenses; or, if they find that they cannot issue licenses, the provincial liquor license law, which is quite as stringent as this law, should be enforced, and we will not have the case of the people having determined that the law should not govern them and yet have that law in force. I would, however, suggest to my hon. friend that perhaps the amendment should better follow the words of the Act, so as to prevent any confusion or any of that litigation which the hon. member for Northumberland seems to desire so properly to avoid. Therefore, I propose that the amendment should read as follows:—

"And when any petition embodied, as aforesaid, for the repeal of the Act, has been adopted by the electors of the county or city named and to which the same relates, the Governor in Council may, at any time after the adoption, by Order in Council published in the *Canada Gazette*, declare that the second part of this Act shall be no longer in force."

Mr. TISDALE. I do not care how the amendment is worded; it is only the principle I care about.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that the amendment is quite appropriate, but I think the word "forthwith" is perhaps not the best that could be used under the circumstances. The object of the delay, as I understand it, was to allow any party that had petitions to present to the Government against putting the proclamation in force, to present them.

Mr. McCARTHY. We will say "thirty days" instead of "forthwith."

Mr. FISHER. I think it is requisite that another addition should be made to this amendment, if this amendment be carried. I am not prepared to say that such an amendment ought not to be passed. I quite appreciate the difficulty which the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has explained might occur, and, if the people of a county desire that there should be licenses in their midst instead of the Scott Act, I am quite prepared to grant them that right. But there has been in days past a great deal of difficulty in regard to the period at which repeal votes might be taken. An interpretation has been given to the Act which would allow a repeal vote to take place within a very short time after the original vote adopting the Act had been passed; and, although section 96 says that:

"No Order in Council issued under this Act shall be revoked until after the expiration of three years from the day of the coming into force under it of the second part of this Act."

Still, under certain conditions and circumstances, a vote upon a repeal petition has been allowed very much before the three years have expired. If the amendment is passed, unless some change is made, there might be a vote taken upon a repeal petition within a year after the adoption of the Act, and the repeal would come into force immediately after the vote was taken. It was an essential principle of the Act originally that no repeal should or could take place until the Act had been tried for three years. I am aware that quite recently the Government have issued an Order in Council by which a repeal vote cannot be taken until within fifteen days of the expiration of the three years, and I quite agree with and appreciate the motive of that Order in Council; but, if this amendment were to be made part of the Act, and a change were made in the Order in Council, which the Government are quite competent to make at any time, without reference to Parliament, and according to their own will, they might make a repeal vote competent to be taken within a very much shorter time, and the Act might be repealed just after it was adopted, which would be entirely contrary to the principle of the Act. Therefore, if this amendment is to be adopted, there ought to be incorporated in it a declaration that no repeal vote shall take place until within fifteen days of three years have elapsed

Mr. McCARTHY.

from the time of the coming into force of the Act. If that decision is come to, and is embodied in the Act, I shall be very glad to support the amendment, but otherwise, if the Order in Council were to be revoked or changed in any way, I point out the danger which there would be in the adoption of this amendment, and I warn the temperance people in this House of the great danger there would be of the Act being repealed very soon after its adoption, and thus one of the first principles of the Act as originally adopted would be completely obliterated.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I must congratulate the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) on the extraordinary legal knowledge he showed in regard to the statute which is under discussion. He had the frankness to inform the House that I knew nothing of the subject under discussion, but if the House let him have an opportunity of showing what he knew he would convince the House that he was thoroughly familiar with it, that he knew as much about it as he did about his alphabet. He got up, and, with great confidence and great legal learning and familiarity with the statute, he said he was familiar with it a fortnight ago, but that now when it was under discussion he had forgotten all he knew before. I think he would have exhibited better taste if he had shown a little more modesty. When he assured the House that he was so thoroughly familiar with the subject, he ought to have informed us how it was that no change could be made in the law for a year, although the people had voted for its repeal. I ask the attention of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), whose Bill is now under consideration, to the provision of the law which he has quoted, which it seems to me is not applicable to a repeal of the Act, but has simply to do with the bringing into operation of the Canada Temperance Act. Section 95 says:

"When in any county or city one-half or more of all the votes polled have been against the adoption of any petition embodied as aforesaid in any notice and in any proclamation, under this the first part of this Act, no similar petition shall be put to the vote of the electors of such county or city for a period of three years from the day on which such vote was taken."

That clearly refers to bringing the Act into operation for the first time. It has no reference to the repeal. The next section says:

"When any petition embodied as aforesaid in any notice and in any proclamation under this the first part of this Act has been adopted by the electors of the county or city named therein and to which the same relates, the Governor General in Council may, at any time after the expiration of sixty days from the day of which the same was adopted, by Order in Council published in the *Canada Gazette* declare that the second part of this Act shall be in force and take effect in such county or city upon, from and after the day on which the annual or semi-annual license for the sale of spirituous liquors then in force in such county or city will expire."

Now it is clear what the provisions of the law are and what the intention was. Here is a licensing system in operation at the time the vote is taken, and the law simply provides that the licenses must expire before the Act goes into operation. While that puts restrictions upon the law, as far as bringing it into operation is concerned, it in no way imposes any restrictions on the repeal. It is true that it may be in operation in some Provinces where licenses might not be in operation, but this section refers only to the bringing of the Act into operation. It is said that these licenses may not expire for some weeks, and it is provided that, until the time has expired during which they are to operate, the Act shall not be in force. That is the provision, and it is clear that that is the intention of the law; and, when the hon. gentleman said that a year must expire before a licensing system could be brought into operation, he stated what, under this section, is not the fact.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman has tried to show that he is capable of sitting upon a young member of this

House, but I do not feel at all sat upon, to use a common phrase. The Act I referred to was the Act of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and I say that it is so simple that any gentleman can understand it. The Act which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) accuses me of not understanding is an Act which he drew himself, and I do not think that any other legal gentleman understands it except himself—that is, the Canada Temperance Act. I had to acknowledge to the leader of the Opposition that I did not understand it, that I could not make head or tail of it. I believe in endeavoring to legislate upon principles, and not to attempt to split hairs. I think it may have been unintentionally confused, and I do not think I am as well able as the hon. gentleman to deal with matters of that kind in which hair-splitting is required, but I propose to deal with material principles, and not to take up so much time in order to see whether one hon. gentleman or another expresses himself clearly or not. It was the principle I was after, and that, I think, should be the foundation of all legislation. I am very glad the hon. leader of the Opposition made the suggestion with regard to the 30 days. I think his suggestion is better, and that the Government should be limited to a certain reasonable time to allow other parties to be heard. I am perfectly willing to accept that amendment and the amended phraseology as suggested by the hon. member in charge of the Bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. With regard to the observations of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), I think his suggestion is very well worthy the consideration of the committee. It appears to me it would be well to provide by statute, instead of leaving it to Order in Council, that the vote should not take place for a repeal until within a short period before the Act may be brought to an end. It is not, however, at all germane to the proposition now before the Chair. I think it would be better, if my hon. friend would frame, as I suggested to him privately a moment ago, another clause with that object. I propose the following, if my hon. friend from South Norfolk will agree to allow this to be substituted for the amendment he has put into your hands :

When a petition for the revocation of an Order in Council for the bringing into operation of the second part has been adopted by the electors of the county or the city named therein, and to which the same relates, the Governor in Council may, at any time after the expiration of 30 days from the date on which the same was so adopted, by Order in Council published in the *Canada Gazette*, declare the second part of this Act shall no longer be in force.

I do not propose to answer my hon. friend from Bothwell about the construction of the law. It appears to me that it bears that construction, but to so high an authority I will not attempt, on any immaterial matter of that kind, to waste the time of the committee. All I think the hon. member for South Norfolk meant to say was, that he had forgotten more about this Bill than ever the hon. gentleman for Bothwell knew.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I have an amendment which more properly applies to the second part of the Canada Temperance Act. It is within the knowledge of some hon. members that all suits under this Act are brought under the Summary Convictions Act; and there is a clause in that Summary Convictions Act to this effect :

"Every one who aids, abets, counsels or procures the commission of any offence punishable on summary conviction, may be proceeded against and convicted either in the territorial division or place where the principal offender may be convicted, or in that in which the offence of aiding, abetting, counselling or procuring was committed."

I desire to introduce an amendment that will prevent a witness, on being asked if he had, at a certain time, bought any liquor of any person, from refusing to reply, taking advantage of that clause and saying that he does not wish to

criminate himself. There is just such a clause that applies to the first part of the Canada Temperance Act, which, however, does not apply to the second. I can see no reason, and other legal gentlemen can see no reason why a witness should be allowed to take advantage, on being placed on the witness stand, of that part of the Summary Convictions Act, refuse to answer questions and say that he does not wish to criminate himself. Therefore I copy the wording of the clause in the first part of the Canada Temperance Act, and would move this amendment :

No person shall be excused from answering any question put to him in any action, suit or other proceeding, in any court or before any judge, justice, or justices of the peace, stipendiary magistrate or other tribunal touching or concerning any infraction of the provisions of this Act, on the ground of any privilege or on the ground that the answer to such questions will tend to criminate such person; but no answer given by any person claiming to be excused on the ground of privilege or on the ground that such answer will tend to criminate himself, shall be used in any criminal proceeding against such person other than an indictment for perjury, if the judge, or justice or justices of the peace, stipendiary magistrate, or president of the tribunal, gives to the witness a certificate that he claimed the right to be excused, on either of the grounds aforesaid, and made full and true answers to the satisfaction of the judge, justice, or justices of the peace, stipendiary magistrate or tribunal.

I desire to have this amendment made, because in the constituency I represent, this Canada Temperance Act is in good working order, and it has been countenanced by the municipality, which has given an unlimited license, so far as funds are concerned, to carry out the provisions of the Act; and a firm of solicitors have been employed to see that the prosecutions are carried on in a proper manner. I may say that they have been very successful in that county in carrying out this Act, and the selling of liquor is reduced to a minimum. You can hardly find a shop in the county where liquor is to be sold, and if any infraction of the law is discovered, it is promptly put before the inspector, who just as promptly brings it before the proper tribunal. The inspector in that county has called my attention to this discrepancy in the Act, and I was asked to bring it before the House and to secure the proper amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that amendment properly belongs to the next Bill, which is one for the amendment of the same Act, in the hands of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). I am afraid this provision would conflict with the amendment which my hon. friend has submitted to the committee. We had better deal with one thing at a time. I could not vote for the amendment. My feeling would be to expunge the clause from the Act compelling people to commit perjury or criminate themselves. But we had better not interfere with that matter in the present measure. I purposely dropped out from the Bill of last year everything of a controversial character, and this Bill is to simplify matters and is introduced practically with the consent of both sides and of all parties in the House.

Mr. THOMPSON. I desire to offer a suggestion in regard to this subject, and it is this: that there should be no procedure under this Act with respect to the mode of trial, the giving of testimony and the summoning of witnesses which does not apply to every other kind of conviction. I would rather suggest to the hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat, not in the line taken by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that this amendment belongs to the next Bill, but rather that it belongs to the Summary Convictions Amendment Act, and I have a Bill to amend that Act which I will introduce to-morrow, and it could come into that Bill more appropriately. If the principle is admitted and adopted, it should apply to all summary convictions, and if it is not a wise provision in regard to Summary Convictions Act it should not be adopted in regard to this Act.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. FISHER. I move an amendment as follows:—

No provision for the revocation of the Order in Council which declares the Canada Temperance Act in force shall be submitted to a vote of the electors more than fifteen days before the expiration of three years from the date of the Order in Council, which declared that the Act was in force in such county or city.

I have followed as closely as possible the wording of the Order in Council passed by the Government last summer, which fixes the date I have given, namely, not more than fifteen days before the expiration of the three years. I also propose that the amendment should come in before section 4. I move it after consulting with the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who accepts the amendment, and agrees that it should be inserted at the place I have indicated.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be very convenient in those Provinces where there is a fixed date for issuing the licenses, that there should be a provision in the Bill that the vote either for bringing the Act into operation or for its repeal should be taken very near the time at which licenses issue. The hon. gentleman will see that it would be highly convenient wherever there is a fixed date to issue the licenses to provide that voting on the Act shall take place immediately preceding that time. In Ontario, the date for issuing licenses is 1st May. Suppose the Act was repealed in July, what would be the condition of things from that month until May following?

Mr. McCARTHY. The law will come into force on 1st May, whatever time it may have been carried. The amendment provides that the vote for the repeal must take place during the last fifteen days of April, so that the mischief which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) thinks may happen, cannot possibly occur. There might be an advantage if the voting took place on 1st January at the time of the municipal election, but on the other hand there would be a hiatus between January and 1st May when the law would not be in practical operation in the event of repeal.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. IVES. I move:

That in cases where a county is divided for municipal purposes after having adopted the Canada Temperance Act of 1864 or the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, the vote for the repeal of the same or either thereof may be taken precisely as it might have been taken if said county had not been divided.

The difficulty is this: That under the Canada Temperance Act of 1864, sub-section 13 of section 4, provides for the case of repeal. It says that a by-law so approved or adopted, as the case may be, may be repealed by a by-law of the council of the municipality affected thereby and such by-law shall be submitted for approval to the electors in the manner and with the formalities provided by the foregoing sub-section. In the case of the division of a county into two parts after the adoption of the Canada Temperance Act of 1864, there is no provision in the law for the passing of a repeal by-law or for a vote being taken to repeal that by-law. I am quite sure that if the committee or the House appreciates the difficulty they would be willing to adopt an amendment which would remove the difficulty in a case of this kind. Take the case of the county of Richmond, one of the counties which I represent. A by-law was passed by the county of Richmond several years ago under the old Dunkin Act, or Canada Temperance Act of 1864, and since that by-law was adopted the county of Richmond has been divided for municipal purposes, and the town of Richmond has been incorporated as a municipality and has been separated entirely for municipal purposes from the county of Richmond. Legal gentlemen have advised that, under the Act, there is no sufficient machinery by which a repeal of the by-law can be passed upon at all. The council of the town of Richmond cannot adopt a by-law

Mr. THOMPSON.

and have it submitted either to the town or county of Richmond, and the county of Richmond cannot adopt a by-law and have it submitted either to that part of the county which remains after deducting the town of Richmond from the county, nor can they submit it to the whole county as the law now stands. What I desire is that the county which originally adopted this by-law should be permitted to repeal it, and that machinery be provided by which the whole county as it originally stood at the time this by-law was adopted, may vote upon the question of its continuance or repeal. I once before introduced a resolution to this House on this subject and in that case I think my resolution was that the town of Richmond should be permitted to repeal the Act for the town of Richmond. That was refused by the House. At the present time I can see no good reason why the House should not be willing to afford a remedy in this case. I think there should be no disposition on the part of the House to condemn the county of Richmond to remain forever under the Act if the people did not wish to do so. I presume there is no disposition on the part of anyone to take advantage of a defect in the law, or the machinery, as it now exists. I am quite sure that the committee would be disposed to permit the whole county of Richmond to vote for repeal, and that it would be willing to have an amendment to this Bill passed which would enable the whole county to vote upon the question of repeal. I, therefore, place this motion in your hands, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JAMIESON. I would point out in the first place that there is no Canada Temperance Act of 1878 in existence, and in addition to that I think a very great difficulty may arise if that amendment is passed. It may not arise in connection with the territory to which the hon. gentleman from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) refers, but I know of some counties in the Province of Ontario where, if that amendment were adopted, it would be utterly impossible to repeal the law. Take for instance the counties of Lennox and Addington. If the county of Lennox under that amendment could repeal the Scott Act, which they probably could do, because there is a sheriff and registrar's office in that county, but in the county of Addington there is neither a sheriff's nor a registrar's office, and there would be no place to deposit the petition, so that the Act would remain in force in perpetuity in one or other of those counties. That is the difficulty I see in connection with the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives).

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask my hon. friend for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) if there has been any judicial decision upon the difficulty which he has just referred to? Has there been a decision from the court at Sherbrooke?

Mr. IVES. There has been a decision to this effect: the Local Legislature, in incorporating the town of Richmond, permitted, by the Act of incorporation, the town of Richmond to issue licenses. The courts declared this to be *ultra vires* of the Local Legislature, and the state of affairs there now is that the council are granting certificates to the hotel-keepers, which the hotel-keepers are paying for, and the Local Government are refusing to issue licenses, and the sale of liquor is going on under municipal certificates without licenses. A legal opinion has been obtained from several legal gentlemen, to the effect that under the Canada Temperance Act there is no machinery by which a vote can be taken. The law says a council may pass a repealing by-law, but there are two councils in this case. The first difficulty is that there is no council that has power to pass a repealing by-law. Then the law says the municipal officer shall be the returning officer, but there is no officer in common with the town and the county. Therefore there is no machinery for holding a poll, even if it were possible to get

the repealing by-law passed. So the county is in a deadlock.

Mr. LAURIER. It strikes me that the objection is not so serious as the hon. gentleman would lead us to believe. If it were, it would follow that it would be in the power of the Provincial Legislature altogether to defeat the legislation of this Parliament. Now, I do not conceive that anything can be done by a Local Legislature which would have that effect. It is true, legal gentlemen may have given their opinion in that way, but legal gentlemen have also given the opposite opinion, and it seems to me it would be better to leave the question to be settled by the courts than to attempt to do it by new legislation, which I think would only make confusion worse confounded.

Mr. IVES. I would ask leave to withdraw the amendment I proposed, and to substitute this one, which has been kindly suggested to me by the hon. Minister of Justice:

The provisions of section 97 of the Canada Temperance Act shall be applicable to counties which have been divided for municipal purposes after the adoption of the Temperance Act of 1861.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the hon. Minister of opinion that this meets the objection?

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand from the discussion that the difficulty has arisen under section 97 of the Canada Temperance Act, owing to an opinion having been given from the bench that the provisions of that section can only be made applicable to the municipality that adopted the by-law, and that, therefore, they are not applicable where a county has been divided. I cannot conceive of any other objection than that arising, and it may be that that is the true construction of section 97, although I would hardly say that it is.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not say that the amendment may not be necessary, but in consequence of the Provincial Legislature—

Mr. IVES. In consequence of the division of the county.

Mr. LAURIER. Divided under the legislation of the Provincial Legislature, and it would therefore be in the power of the Local Legislature to defeat any Act of this Parliament.

Mr. THOMPSON. That might have been the effect, as the body that had power to pass the repealing by-law no longer exists.

Mr. LAURIER. It opens up a very large question.

Mr. McCARTHY. That seems to be the effect of clause 97. An amendment of this kind is necessary so far as the Dunkin Act is concerned, but not so far as the Canada Temperance Act is concerned. We ought to recognise the divisions made by the Local Legislature, and allow the council of a county formed out of any portion of an old county to petition. Since the adoption of the Act, the Muskoka portion has been taken from the county of Simcoe, and also from Victoria, and it has been formed into a new municipal district; and it appears to me that the principle we ought to follow is this: that where a new county has been created by the provincial body, that county ought to have the power to repeal the Act. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) shakes his head. I do not see why one county should be obliged to retain the Act by a vote of the majority in another county with which it was formerly connected. If it is separated from the old county for one purpose, it seems to me it ought to be separated for all purposes.

Mr. FISHER. I shook my head on this account: that the Canada Temperance Act comes within the electoral divisions established by the Acts of this Parliament, and has no reference whatever to either provincial or municipal divisions. In the Province of Ontario, it was not the

electoral division established by the Local Legislature which voted on the Scott Act, but the Gerrymander divisions established by this Parliament. I do not see that it is necessary to have any reference whatever to the municipal or provincial divisions which may arise.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend is in error. The petition comes, not from the electoral divisions, but from the county. For instance, the County of Simcoe embraces a part of Muskoka for other purposes, and there are four or five electoral divisions in that county. I presume that my hon. friend's objection will be withdrawn, as it was made under misapprehension.

Committee rose and reported.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. JAMIESON moved second reading of Bill (No. 10) to amend the Canada Temperance Act. He said: I trust that this Bill will receive the same kindly treatment which has been given to the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). In my opinion the measure is a far more important one, and one that should have received the attention of the House long ago. In fact many of its provisions were adopted by this House three years ago, but unfortunately the Upper Chamber would not consent to pass the Bill, at all events in the shape in which it left this House. I propose, in the first instance, to give a very short explanation of the provisions of this Bill, and then to make some remarks on the present position of the Canada Temperance Act. The first provision is for the purpose of remedying a defect which was discovered in the application of the law. Those conversant with the law will recollect that a petition has to be deposited either in the registry office of the county or in the office of the sheriff of the county; and in the county of Perth, where a petition was deposited in one of the registry offices, there being two in the county, the result was that the people lost their petition. Now, I think that the purposes of this Act will be served if the petition is simply deposited in one registry office, and it is proposed to amend the law in that respect. The second and third clauses of the Bill are for the purpose of making the Canada Temperance Act applicable to the Province of British Columbia, where, I understand, there are no municipal counties; and in order to make the Act applicable to that Province, we have provided that the petition shall be deposited in the office of the registrar of voters in the electoral divisions, as constituted for representation in the Dominion Parliament. It is not necessary for me to make any further reference to that point, because I think it was the original intention of Parliament that the Act should apply to the whole Dominion. We also propose to make it applicable to the temporary judicial districts in the Province of Ontario, and, when such exists, in the other Provinces also, as there is no reason why, if the people of these temporary judicial districts wish to adopt the law, they should be deprived of it. The fifth clause of the Bill is no longer necessary, because the hon. member for Brome has embodied the same amendment in the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe which has just passed through the committee, so that I shall have to ask the committee to allow me to expunge that clause. Now we propose making a change in section 94, but we think it will answer the purpose better to repeal the section and remodel it altogether rather than make changes by interlineation. We propose, in the first place, in repealing the old and enacting a new section, that medical men may prescribe in any quantities they think proper. At present they can only prescribe in quantities of a pint and over, and I never could understand why the law was framed in that way. Frequently it is necessary for medical men to prescribe small quantities of liquor, but under the

present law it is impossible for them to do so. In addition to that we propose that a penalty shall be imposed on medical men giving colorable certificates. I do not think any respectable, honorable medical man can take offence at any provisions of this kind. But there are unfortunately in the medical as in other professions black sheep who will prostitute their position for the purpose of pecuniary gain, and who delight in evading the law. We propose also to repeal section 103, and to re-enact it in a simpler form. In the original Act, it will be observed, there is a special rule made for each Province. I am referring now to the judicial or magisterial authority before whom prosecutions may be brought, and it is proposed to simplify the procedure so that there will be one joint rule for the whole Dominion. Two or three of the following sections are simply for the purpose of making the law conform to the amendment to which I have just directed attention. One of the most important provisions of this Bill is in reference to the search clause. Difficulties have arisen in my own Province in reference to the administration of the law under section 108. Our courts have held that a search warrant, notwithstanding the provisions of that clause, cannot issue until after there has been a conviction. If the search clause is to be effective at all, it must be obvious that provision should be made by which a search can be made at any time and prior to a conviction. We propose to change the law in two respects. We propose that, on the oath of a credible witness that he has good cause to suspect and believe that liquor is kept for sale in violation of the second part of the statute, a magistrate may issue a search warrant; and we propose to extend the right of search to any hour. Perhaps some objection may be taken to this by hon. members of this House, but a much stronger provision than this exists in the license law of my own Province. I am not familiar with the license laws of the other Provinces, and I cannot speak in reference to them on this point, but I know that in my own Province there is a provision in the law by which search may be made at any time; and, moreover, the right which is given under that law is so strong that a police officer, or constable, or inspector may at any time enter into any place where liquor is reputed to be sold, without any search warrant at all. Then, there is a provision in reference to the destruction of the liquor, and we propose also to provide a set of forms for the guidance of justices of the peace. There are some amendments which I shall be compelled to ask for when we go into committee. Lastly, I will refer to the last clause of the Bill, which provides for the application of the penalty. I think it is only reasonable and proper that whatever authority—be it provincial or otherwise—undertakes the burden of enforcing the law should also have the benefits to be derived from it. That is all I have to say by way of explanation of the Bill, but I have some further remarks to make, and I shall proceed now to make them. It may be said, perhaps, that, after the result of the voting which took place on Thursday last on the Canada Temperance Act, its usefulness has gone.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JAMIESON. It is hard to understand what is the meaning of those "hear, hears," but, if the Canada Temperance Act has become unpopular, it is largely in consequence of its not being enforced properly, and I am afraid that the responsibility for that rests not so much upon this House as upon the Upper Chamber, where reasonable amendments to this law have been repeatedly refused. I believe there are other reasons which exist for the unpopularity of the law, and one is that the law has not been efficiently enforced. I am now speaking in reference to my own Province. I may

Mr. JAMIESON.

take, for instance, my own county. We had two inspectors appointed by the Ontario Government. We also had a police magistrate appointed. Shortly after the Act came into force a police magistrate was appointed by the Province of Ontario, but the courts held that the appointment, as far as the Canada Temperance Act was concerned, was invalid, and consequently he could act no longer, he could adjudicate on prosecutions no longer. What should have been done, in my judgment, was that he should have been re-appointed in a proper way. In the first instance, he was only appointed for each riding separately, and he should have been re-appointed for the whole county; but, instead of that being done the matter was allowed to stand in that loose way for some months, until practically the law was a dead letter on the Statute-book. All through the Province of Ontario we have had difficulties arising in connection with the enforcement of the law of this nature, and my contention is that, until a very recent period, if at all, the law has not had fair play as far as my own Province is concerned; but, if the law has not been effective, that is the greater reason why proper amendments should be made to it, so that, if it can be made effective, those who are promoting the law may have some reasonable means of operating it and standing behind it. It is quite true, and I recognise the fact, that, on Thursday last, a very serious blow was dealt to the Canada Temperance Act, and it may be possible that a series of disasters may follow; but the fact remains that, for another year at least, in from 50 to 60 counties in this Dominion, this law will be upon the Statute-book, and I believe it is the duty, not only of this Parliament, but of every subject in this Dominion, to do all in his power to aid in enforcing the law. Further, this law, as far as the temperance people of this Dominion were concerned, was of a tentative character in the first instance. I have stated before, and I repeat, that in the first place the temperance people of the Dominion never asked for a local option law, or at least not for the Canada Temperance Act. I am not sure but that, in the first instance, they asked for the old Dunkin Act. In 1875, the temperance people of this Dominion asked for a *plebiscite*, for a popular vote on this subject throughout the whole Dominion. The Government of that day refused to grant that request, but, in lieu of it, they offered this improved local option law. Well, the temperance people, of course, did not think proper to refuse it. They did not get all they wanted, but they accepted what they were offered. Now, when, in 1883, this Parliament was very largely petitioned in favor of the principle of general prohibition, we were told on every hand that we had a law on the Statute-book and it was our duty to operate that, that we could sound public opinion in regard to prohibition in that way, and that, in any case, we could have prohibition in any section where the people were favorable to it. Possibly that was a reasonable ground for Parliament to take. The temperance people immediately afterwards laid hold of the Canada Temperance Act. They adopted it over a large area of this Dominion, and, if the Canada Temperance Act has not proved as satisfactory as the friends of temperance could have desired, it is not the fault of the temperance people, and they are now in a position to come back to Parliament and say: "We have done what you told us to do, and now we make a further demand, and that is the demand of general prohibition." In my judgment, Sir, the vote which took place on Thursday last is no indication that the temperance or prohibition sentiment in this country is waning in any degree. It is quite true that an unfavorable gale has struck the prohibition ship, and she has lurched for a time, but we live in hope that a favorable gale from heaven will soon fill her sails and wait her on to the destined haven.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is only blessed spirits which come from heaven.

Mr. JAMIESON. I am not prepared to admit that the Canada Temperance Act has been a failure. I am prepared to admit that so far it has not realised the expectations of those who framed it; but that it has been a failure in every sense of the word I most emphatically deny. I have some figures here that I intend to give to the House, which satisfy me, at all events, that the Act has proved effective in curtailing the traffic in intoxicating liquor. I refer to the license report published by the Provincial Secretary for the Province of Ontario. From that report I take 20 counties in which the Canada Temperance Act is in force. I take the number of convictions or commitments to prison for drunkenness in 1884, when the Canada Temperance Act was only in force in one county in the Province of Ontario, that is, the county of Halton; and I take the number of commitments for the year 1887, when the Canada Temperance Act was in force in 20 and more counties in that Province. In those counties the number of commitments in the year 1884 was 756; in 1887, in the same counties, under the Canada Temperance Act, the number of commitments was only 214, or a deduction of 542 cases. Now, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this indicates in the strongest possible way that the Canada Temperance Act has, to a certain degree, been effective in preventing drunkenness. It has been said that there has been an increase in certain counties, and Brant, Carleton, Frontenac, and Middlesex have been instanced as counties in which the Scott Act was in force, and the number of commitments for drunkenness has increased. Now, Sir, those who used that argument have not been honest in doing so. The fact must not be overlooked that these counties have attached to them cities of considerable size in which the Canada Temperance Act has not been in force. For instance, the county of Brant has the city of Brantford attached to it; the county of Carleton has the city of Ottawa attached to it; the county of Frontenac has the city of Kingston, and the county of Middlesex the city of London. Now, I would refer to the commitments for drunkenness in some 13 counties in which the Canada Temperance Act has not been in force, and compare the year 1884 with the year 1887. In 1884 the number of commitments was 3,280; in 1887 the number was 2,851. It will be seen there was a decrease of a little over 400, or a decrease of about one-seventh in the counties in which the Canada Temperance Act was not in force, whereas there has been a decrease of about one-third in those counties in which the Act has been in force. Then, again, I shall refer the House to a few figures in reference to the consumption of spirits since 1880 up to the present time, for the purpose of showing that the Canada Temperance Act, or some other good influence, is decreasing the consumption of liquor. It will be observed that from 1850 up to a certain period, the consumption of spirits in this Dominion increased, whereas, since 1886, there has been a decrease. In 1880, the quantity of spirits manufactured for home consumption was 2,296,987 gallons; the quantity imported for the same purpose was 1,445,009 gallons. In 1881, there was a slight decrease. In 1882, the quantity ran up to 4,029,067 gallons manufactured for home consumption, and the imports were 1,666,173. In 1885, the quantity manufactured for home consumption was 4,274,722 gallons, and there were imported for home consumption 964,181 gallons. In 1886, when the Canada Temperance Act came into force in a large section of this Dominion, the quantity of liquor manufactured for home consumption fell to 2,478,098 gallons, and the imports fell to 906,019 gallons. Last year again there was a considerable decrease. Now, Sir, in my judgment the good influence that has been at work is the operation of the Canada Temperance Act, which has reduced the consumption of liquor in this Dominion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a few more remarks to make before I sit down. I was placed in a very embarrassing position on

Wednesday last in reference to this question in this House, and this is the first opportunity I have had of entering into an explanation of my connection with it, and I am quite sure the House will indulge me for a short time while I make reference to it. I was charged by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) with having obstructed, rather than advanced, amendments to the Canada Temperance Act; and he referred to the occasion, last year, when an effort was about to be made to advance the Bill out of its proper order in the same way that was done three years ago; and the hon. member for Bothwell charged me with having opposed that movement. Well, Sir, I made an explanation a week ago, on Monday last, in this House, as to the manner in which we have co-operated on both sides of this House in temperance legislation. I stated, in answer to the hon. member for Bothwell, that the action I took on the occasion to which he refers, was the result of a conference had between the temperance men of the two political parties in this House. I now make that statement just as emphatically as I made it on that occasion. Unfortunately the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) had forgotten a meeting to which I made reference. The Bill was not introduced last year as soon as it might have been under other circumstances. The circumstances which preceded the introduction of the Bill were these: The Dominion Alliance, which has advised us all through, was held when the House was in Session, and I was not requested until the meeting of the Alliance was held to introduce this Bill last Session. It was down on the Order Paper in the ordinary way. When it was found impossible to reach the measure in the ordinary way, I had a conference with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), and we concluded to call a meeting of the friends of temperance in this House—we had called them together on former occasions—not a large meeting but a few of those who took some interest in the cause of temperance. I was to notify hon. members on my side of the House and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) was to notify hon. members on his side of the House. That meeting was held. There are, I think, in the House, I do not know whether they are in the House to-night or not, but I can give the names of the gentlemen present at that meeting, and it may refresh the memory of the hon. member for Brome. I would not enter into this explanation if it were not for the fact that in the public press I have been grossly misrepresented in this matter, and I am resolved, with the indulgence of the House, to put myself right. The hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) was present at that meeting, and I think he will corroborate what I say in regard to it. The hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry), was also present. The hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Freeman), was also present. Senator Vidal presided at the meeting. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) was present, and the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), who sits on the other side of the House, informed me the other day that he was present at the meeting. I do not charge the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) with wrong-doing in the matter, but I think it is unfortunate, so far as I am personally concerned, that his memory is at fault, because the meeting was certainly held and my action in regard to this Bill was governed entirely by the action of that meeting. I have no desire to allow the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to misrepresent me before this House. I can tell that hon. gentleman that I have a record upon this question to which he cannot point. When the Dunkin Act was submitted in my county I took the platform in favor of it and it was adopted. Afterwards when the Scott Act was being promoted in my county I pursued a similar course, and in so doing gave offence to a large number of my political supporters; I risked my seat in the House on that question, and I am not prepared to submit to any taunt from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in

regard to my course upon the temperance question in this House. I should like to ask if the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has in his capacity as an elector of the Dominion ever cast a vote for the Temperance Act? I should like to know if that hon. gentleman ever stood on a public platform to advocate the cause of temperance, more especially in the interests of the Canada Temperance Act? I should like to know what course that hon. gentleman pursued in this House last Session when the question of prohibition was before the House? When that question was introduced into the House by myself, at the request of the Dominion Alliance, there were several amendments proposed to it. There was a wine and beer amendment, there was a repeal of the Scott Act amendment. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) stood his ground and voted upon those two amendments; but when the crucial question came, the question of compensation and the main motion in reference to prohibition, where was the hon. gentleman to be found? Not in this Chamber—he slunk out of the Chamber.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. JAMIESON. I say he slunk out of the Chamber. He beat the record of Maud S. in getting out of the Chamber when the prohibition vote was before the House.

Mr. MILLS. I voted.

Mr. JAMIESON. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) stood up valiantly twice, but I have no doubt that the old poetic adage that—

“He who fights and runs away,
Will live to fight another day;”

occurred to him, and he retreated and was not to be found when the main motion and the money compensation amendment were disposed of by this House.

Mr. MILLS. I voted on it. I voted against prohibition.

Mr. JAMIESON. No; I beg your pardon. It is not in *Hansard*.

Mr. MILLS. I was here and voted, and my vote was recorded.

Mr. JAMIESON. I have little more to say on this question, but I am resolved that, at all events, I will place my position before the House and I trust to some extent before the country, because my record is clear upon this question, and I am not open to the charge of inconsistency which was hurled across the floor on a former occasion this Session when the question of prohibition was before the House. I will refer to one other matter. Because I voted against the resolution or rather an amendment introduced by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in reference to the reformation or reconstitution of the Senate, forsooth I must be charged with voting against temperance. I referred the other day to the fact that, in 1874, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) introduced a resolution into this House and submitted a motion in regard to the reconstitution of the Senate, that resolution received the assent of this House or of the House then assembled. But the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) afterwards entered the Cabinet of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and he did not take one single step in the direction in which the resolution pointed. If he were sincere upon that question he ought, while a member of the Cabinet, while his friends were in power and in a large majority, to have placed in some practical form upon the Statute book of the country his scheme in reference to the reformation of the Senate. I am at one with him in reference to the constitution of the Senate, but the hon. gentleman excused himself the other day on the ground that he believed the course he pursued last year was the proper course in bringing up a matter of that kind. But the hon. gentleman forgets that last year

Mr. JAMIESON.

he placed upon the notice paper a similar resolution to the one which he introduced in 1874 in reference to the constitution of the Senate. So that, on two occasions he introduced the question as a substantive motion and only on one occasion as a motion of a want of confidence in the Government. But I said then—I believe I was misrepresented in regard to the last motion which the hon. gentleman made in this House—on the amendment moved on going into Committee of Supply that I did not vote against the amendment on the ground that it was a motion of want of confidence in the Government. I voted on the ground that it would be a breach of the understanding which has existed for years between the temperance men in the two political parties in this country. It is an understood principle, a fundamental principle on which the Dominion Alliance is based, that all action in reference to the temperance question shall emanate from that Alliance and that they shall receive the support, as far as possible, of the temperance men of both sides of this House. The other day when I voted against the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) I voted consistently. I voted on the lines laid down by the Dominion Alliance and if I had voted otherwise I would have been voting want of confidence in the Dominion Alliance of which I am a member. I have no hesitation in saying here tonight that the course that the member for Bothwell has pursued has been a most disastrous one for the cause of temperance in this country. A paid agent of the opponents of prohibition in this House could not have pursued a course more detrimental to the interests of temperance than the course pursued by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I have placed my views on this question before the House and I am sorry I was obliged to go into this personal matter, but there was considerable provocation, and, perhaps, this is the only occasion on which I will have an opportunity of doing so. I believe that I have succeeded in showing, in the judgment, at all events, of every reasonable man, that my course upon the prohibition and temperance question has been a consistent one, not only in my own county, but also in this the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I rather regret that this personal question has entered into the discussion at so early a stage, upon the second reading of what I believe to be a very important measure in the interests of the people of Canada. After the words which have fallen from the lips of my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) and since my name has been mentioned so often by him, I think it necessary that I should say a few words upon this point. In the first place I wish to allude to the discussion which occurred here a little while ago upon the motion for total prohibition, moved by that hon. gentleman. On that occasion my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was speaking to that motion and in the course of his remarks he alluded to the action of my hon. friend from Lanark. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), interrupting him, made some remarks which, I confess, I did not thoroughly understand nor catch. In those remarks he made reference to my name. I did not then make any reply, but later on, in the course of that debate, I did make use of a few words which I will now read. I said:

“What meeting are you referring to?”

“Mr. JAMIESON. The one that was called last year to bring up this question. You recollect it.”

I replied:

“I am not aware of any meeting at which it was decided that we should not push the temperance question as fast as we can.”

I think those words explain themselves. In case they do not completely, I may say this: I understood the member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) to imply that the temperance members of this House connected with the Alliance had held a meeting at which they decided not to push the Scott

Act amendments then before the House. I denied that, because I knew they had no meeting at which the members of this House, representing the Alliance, came to any such conclusion as that they would not push their own Bill as far as possible. I find, on reference to the *Hansard*, that the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) when he made reference to that meeting stated that that meeting had decided that we should not ask the Government to take up the Bill we had before the House. I misunderstood him. Had I understood him I would have agreed with him that there was a meeting of members of the Alliance which had decided not to ask the Government to press that motion. I may say in reference to that question that I, myself, was desirous of asking the Government to take up the Scott Act amendments of last Session and make them law. When I found, as I did find, that the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) and other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House were prepared to vote against such a motion asking the Government to take up the measure, I did not wish to make any split between myself and those hon. temperance gentlemen who are working with me, and, therefore, I did not propose the resolution or the question at the meeting under reference. I, myself, believe it would be in the interest of the people of this country that the Government should take up those amendments to the Scott Act, and I would be glad to see them do it. When I did arrange, as I had arranged in the earlier part of the Session, to work in conjunction with several gentlemen on the lines of this Temperance amendment Bill, I was anxious that there should not be any split between us on the motion before this House. As far as I was concerned I, therefore, refrained from making any motion or urging any motion which would make a split between the temperance members of this House who belonged to the Dominion Alliance. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) has just now alluded to the motion of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) which was made this Session, and I must take most serious exception to some of the references he made in regard to the Dominion Alliance. It is true, Sir, that those hon. members of this House, who are members of the Dominion Alliance, met together for the discussion of their business and their work before this House. In so far as these gentlemen are members of the Alliance, I believe it to be their duty to work in harmony and to support such motions as may be authorised, and as may be introduced into this House by them, as members of the Dominion Alliance. But, Sir, when the hon. gentleman goes further and intimates that temperance people in this House are only to work on the lines which the Dominion Alliance lays down I most seriously differ from him and emphatically say that I cannot allow such an inference to go abroad, or such a statement of the opinions of the Dominion Alliance to go on record here in Parliament, for such is not the case. The Dominion Alliance has certain views, and the Dominion Alliance, by means of the members of that body who are members of this House, introduced certain resolutions or motions. As far as those motions are concerned, I, as a member of the council of the Dominion Alliance, felt it to be my duty to support them, and to act in accordance with the spirit of them, but as far as my action on temperance matters as a member of this House is concerned, and as representing a constituency in this House, that I shall allow myself or my motions or my speeches to be trammelled by the Dominion Alliance, or by the council of the Dominion Alliance, I emphatically deny. I do not believe for an instant that is the temper or the spirit of the council of the Dominion Alliance. Last Session of the Alliance when the council held their meeting in Ottawa the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) made some such statement. I denied it there, and I informed the council of the Alliance that if that was their opinion,

and their views on my duty as a member, I must withdraw from the council. But, Sir, did the council endorse my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson)? Not a bit of it. They sat silent and did not endorse his action, but they practically accepted the explanation of their views and their objects which I laid down, and did not for an instant suggest that his interpretation of their views was right. This motion, which is now before us, is a motion which has been framed in the lines of the Dominion Alliance, and as such I had, in former years, the pleasure of seconding the motion moved by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) in the introduction of a similar Bill to this. It happened this year that I was out of the House when the member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) moved for leave to introduce this Bill, and my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) acted as seconder to the motion. I am glad to see it so. Although I am not to-day the seconder of the motion, as I have been in times past, I thoroughly endorse it, I thoroughly concur in the views expressed in this Bill, and I trust it will pass the House and become law. I may say that last winter, before this House met, having had in view the experience of the members of the Alliance who had introduced this Bill previously and that when we introduced it it was late in the Session and could not become law; I took upon myself as one interested in this question to write to a member of the Executive Council of the Dominion Alliance and I urged that gentleman that the council should ask Mr. Jamieson to introduce this measure before the council met in Ottawa pointing out the fact that if the council of the Dominion Alliance wished afterwards to make any amendment or introduce any changes in the Bill, that might be done when the Bill went into committee. I am glad that the executive committee of the Dominion Alliance followed out that plan of action, and wrote to Mr. Jamieson requesting him to introduce this Bill as early in the Session as possible; and I am glad to know that the hon. member for Lanark did introduce the Bill very much earlier than it has generally been introduced into the House, and I trust that in consequence of this fact, the Bill may become law this Session. I will not now go into the details of the Bill. My hon. friend from Lanark, I think, has carefully and successfully explained them, and, perhaps, in the unsatisfactory state of my voice, I would not have made those remarks had I not deemed it necessary that some correction should be made of the statements made by the hon. member for Lanark.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think, before this House is asked for exceptional legislation in the promotion of a movement which certainly does not stand before the country as well as it did some time ago, its advocates should at least settle their own quarrels, and not take up the time of the House with them. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) endeavored to explain the reason why the Scott Act has been rejected in nine counties in the Province of Ontario; but I do not think he at all touched the real reason, which is, in my opinion, not only that the Act has not been effective, but because the people of this country have determined that they will not submit to the sort of tyrannical dictation that has been sought to be forced upon them by those who have been advocating what has been erroneously called the temperance movement. I deny the right of these gentlemen to that name, because temperance and total abstinence are two different things. I claim for myself, as well as for the majority of this House, and perhaps every man in it, the right to be called temperance men, but the claim of total abstainers to that title is an assumption that cannot be too often condemned. Temperance does not consist in total abstinence; it does not consist in denying oneself absolutely; but it does consist in using things in a manner consistent with the exercise of the various faculties given to us, and in obedience to the laws

of this country. I say the real cause of the rejection of the Scott Act is that the people have revolted from the spiritual dictation which women of the Christian Temperance Union and the various total abstinence bodies have put upon them during the last few years. Will any one tell us that the failure on the Dominion Government to do what they were called on to do, or the failure of Ontario magistrates and inspectors to enforce the Act, could have brought about a change of 1,400 majority in favor of the Act in one year to a majority of 3,000 against it three years afterwards? I do not think the cause can be found in any of these sources. The cause of the failure, I believe, is that the people have come to the conclusion that the whole attempt to force total abstinence upon them by law is a mistake, contrary to common sense, contrary to experience, contrary to the reasoning of every man who exercises his reason, and also due to the fact that those who have had control of this Act and have had ample power to carry it out, have failed to do so, and the Act has been inoperative. In the county of Simcoe, from the very first month that Act was nominally in force, it was not carried out. During the whole of those three years, with the exception of a few months, liquor has been sold openly in every bar in the county. In the town of Barrie, near where I live, there has not been one month during those three years during which liquor has not been openly and avowedly sold without any attempt at prevention. Of course, a few prosecutions have taken place, and the hotel-keepers have been fined, but not having to pay for licenses, they could afford to pay the fines inflicted, and even very much heavier ones. But the fact is that those who voted for the Act were apparently indifferent whether it was carried out or not, and they made no serious attempt to carry it out. They did get a magistrate appointed to carry it out, and he was not in office more than a few months when, strong partisan as he was, the Ontario Government dismissed him for malfeasance. I think, under these circumstances, it will be folly in us to give the advocates of this measure any greater powers than those they now possess. Last year, when this question was up, I thought it was only fair, considering that the Act had been passed in a great many counties, that those who advocated it should have every opportunity to carry it out, and I for one voted against its repeal, not because I had any faith in it or thought it could be effective, but because I thought its advocates should have every opportunity to carry it out. Now, Sir, they have had their three years, and they have failed ignominiously. I venture to say that in every county in which it has been adopted there has been more liquor sold, more drunkenness, and from my own observation I can say there has been more perjury and ill-feeling created by the Scott Act than by any other law that we have ever had on the Statute-book of this country. If the Act merely failed to stop the sale of liquor, that would be comparatively a small thing; but when we consider the perjury and prevarication which it has caused, and the nefarious means resorted to by its advocates to get prosecutions, it has brought the law into contempt. What is the effect of having a law that the people will not respect? It has the effect of making them disregard all law. Therefore, I think this House is justified, after the experience the country has had of this legislation, in saying that it will not be any further extended. The evils that it has caused are far greater than any good it has effected. It has had this effect, that there has practically been free trade in liquor. Where liquor was sold in ten or a dozen houses before the Scott Act came into force, since it has been in operation it has been sold in fifty or sixty places without any restriction whatever. We know that the inspectors, men appointed by Mr. Mowat himself, and supposed to be competent to carry out this law, occasionally, for the sake of making a little show, bring up the proprietor of a respectable public house and fine him, but they never attempt

Mr. O'BRIEN.

to enforce the law in the fifty or sixty places where liquor was known to be sold in much larger quantities than it would be in respectable houses. To show you how unfairly the Act works, in my own constituency there were two public houses within two or three miles of each other. In one of them, when the Scott Act came in force, the publican said he would sell no more liquor, he closed his bar, disposed of his stock and did not sell another glass. Another man, three miles off, set the law at defiance, and sold more liquor than he ever did before. The consequence was that the first man, a friend of mine, who stopped selling liquor and kept a temperance house in obedience to the law, lost his business, was starved out, and had to shut up his house altogether, while the man who continued to sell liquor has been going on selling it ever since. Two or three prosecutions were brought against him, but they failed; and even if he had been fined two or three times, he could well afford to pay the fines because he made more money under the Scott Act than ever he did before. Knowing from experience that this law has not only been inoperative but has done an immense deal of mischief and been the cause of any amount of ill-feeling and false swearing, and brought all law into contempt, and has failed in every respect to secure its object, this is not the time of day for the advocates of that measure to ask for increased legislation. Holding these views, and not being afraid to act up to my convictions, I move:

That this Bill be read this day six months.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I intend to say but very little with reference to the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman, and desire only to make a few observations with regard to the speech which was addressed to the House by this hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill. The hon. gentleman said that I am not so zealous a supporter of the cause of prohibition as he. He declared that he has taken the platform in favor of prohibition outside of the House, that he has supported prohibition here, that whenever he opposed it he had good reason, and he assures the House that when the Bill was before the House last year I shirked the vote. I knew that statement was not correct; I knew that the hon. gentleman, with his usual accuracy, whether in speaking of himself or somebody else, addressed to this House observations that were not warranted in fact. I hold in my hand the Journals of the House of last year, and I find in them that the House was called on last year, on the 13th June, to vote on this question. Four divisions were taken on the subject. On the first division 38 voted yea and 145 nay. My name is recorded as one of the 145. On the second division 47 voted yea and 136 nay, and I find my name recorded as one of the 136. On the third division 91 voted yea and 88 nay, and I was one of the 91. On the fourth division 70 voted yea and 112 nay, and my name is one of the 112. These are all the divisions that took place, and in every one of them I voted. Yet the hon. gentleman not only informed us that I shirked the vote, but informed us with what celerity I left my place when I shirked the vote on that occasion. The House will fully appreciate from this that although the hon. gentleman may be a zealous advocate of temperance, he has not a very great regard for accuracy in any statement he may make. The hon. gentleman's observations, in criticising my actions last year, are, as the House will see, as worthy of credence as the hon. gentleman's declaration that he is a zealous supporter of temperance. I have said that the hon. gentleman supported the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who is notoriously opposed to this Bill, and I believe the hon. member for South Lanark supported the hon. gentleman who professes to be a zealous advocate of prohibition. I said that they hunted in couples, that the hon. member for South Lanark brought the support of those opposed to

prohibition to the hon. gentleman, and the hon. gentleman secured the support of the prohibitionists to the hon. member for South Lanark.

Mr. JAMIESON. If the hon. gentleman will excuse me,—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not intend that the hon. gentleman shall interrupt me. If he wishes to make any more incorrect statements, he can take some other occasion to make them. There was a local election in the hon. gentleman's constituency, and the president of the prohibition committee, and a member of the Temperance Alliance, was a candidate. Whom did the hon. gentleman support in opposition to that candidate? He supported a party who was notoriously opposed to prohibition; and yet the hon. gentleman comes here and poses not only as an apostle of prohibition, but as the very Messiah of a measure of that sort. The hon. gentleman tells us he is a zealous, warm and sincere advocate of the cause of temperance. I remember, not long ago, being at a railway station in the city of St. Thomas, where there was a party who seemed rather the worse of something stronger than cold water, and he was assuring a clergyman standing by that he was a very zealous advocate of prohibition. "Well," said the clergyman, "let me tell you a story. A friend of mine on the Mohawk had a tame woodchuck which could occasionally stand up beside him and seem to say: 'I am your woodchuck.' Well, said he, there was a little animal with white stripes down its back, which stood up and seemed to say: 'I am your woodchuck;' and when I kicked him out of the way, I found he did not smell like it." So the hon. gentleman may be a zealous advocate of prohibition, but his conduct in and out of the House does not look like that of a prohibitionist. The hon. gentleman said that my statement the other night in reply to him was incorrect. Why, when the First Minister proposed to take Wednesdays as Government days, I proposed that the hon. gentleman should put his motion on the Government Notices in order that it might be reached, and I asked my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) to make a motion to that effect. He told me he had gone to the hon. gentleman and asked him to propose to put this Bill on the Government Orders, and what reply did he make? He told him he would serve his party first.

Mr. JAMIESON. There is not a word of truth in that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He said more. He said: If the Government would not agree to such a proposition, he would vote for the Government and against the proposition to put his own motion on Government Orders. That is the authority for my statement. The hon. gentleman came here and told me that at the time. The hon. gentleman would not come into the House and ask the First Minister to put his Bill upon the Government Orders, because the Government were taking a day from private members. While he wished to appear before the country and to pose as the apostle of temperance, he was not prepared to take the first step to carry it out. The hon. gentleman asks what the member for Bothwell has done for prohibition—has he ever appeared on a public platform in regard to it, has he ever spoken at a public meeting in favor of it? Well, Sir, I have told my constituents my views on this subject, and, as a member of the Government, I assisted in putting upon the Statute-book the only measure which has been put there by a government. The Dominion Alliance stated that it was the duty of the Government to deal with the subject. The Dominion Alliance employed Mr. Watson, who was afterwards, I believe, taken in as a Government official, to lecture the people in regard to it, and in every speech he made Mr. Watson declared that it was the duty of the Government to take up that subject and to deal with it. We agreed with that, we did take it up, and we dealt with it, but when we suggested that the men whom the

hon. gentleman supports should deal with it, and should deal with it as public opinion had shown it was necessary to deal with it, what course did the hon. gentleman take? He voted against the proposition we made, in which our sincerity was shown by our having done what we suggested that they should do. In what position does the hon. gentleman appear before the country? He appears before the country as the impeder of the temperance movement. If there is any sincerity in what he says, why did he not vote for the amendment, why did he not say that the Government whom he supports, and to whom he has given his confidence, should act in this way? The people have voted in favor of this measure in many cases, they have actively put it into force, and he was entitled to ask the Government, of which he is a supporter, either to repeal the measure or to adopt such amendments as experience had shown to be necessary. He did neither. He went before the Alliance and said: Our measure has been rejected by the Senate, and I am henceforth in favor of an elective Senate. But, when I proposed that we should make the Senate elective, what did he say? Notwithstanding the pledge which he had given to the Alliance, notwithstanding his statement that he would seek to change the constitution of that House which stands in the way of progressive legislation, he said, I will stand by my party and vote against my convictions and against my principles, and I will not vote for any change in the constitution of the Senate. What excuse did he offer for his course in that matter? That it was a party movement. If we agreed with the hon. gentleman in every view he has ever expressed, he is ready to support those with whom he does not agree; because it is a party question, and he would vote against his principles in order to support his party. Yet, the hon. gentleman says, he is here as the apostle of temperance and as the exponent of the views of the Alliance. The hon. gentleman talks as if this House had no right to deal with the temperance question, unless the Alliance is allowed to dictate to it the measure it should support, and the kind of legislation which should be carried through. I do not admit any such doctrine. If any special class of the community is aggrieved, I am ready to listen to their grievance, and, if the grievance is well founded, I am ready to be the exponent of justice in the matter, and to redress the wrong; but when any portion of the community proposes a measure to affect the community at large, then I say that their voice is merged in that of the whole community, and I decline to be the exponent of a particular class. We dealt with this matter as a government. We investigated the matter for ourselves, we framed our own measure and carried it through on our own responsibility, taking the risk of defeat; and, if the hon. gentleman's colleagues, or his masters rather, were to deal with the matter, I am sure that they would judge for themselves and would not consent to be merely the mouthpiece of an alliance. Those gentlemen are entitled to respect, but, when the hon. gentleman comes here and professes to speak for the Alliance, and for the Alliance alone, he does not sit as a member of Parliament, he does not vote as a member of the Parliament of Canada, but he professes to vote and act as something altogether different from a member of this Parliament. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) says that he is opposed to this legislation altogether. He says it has not been efficient or operative. Why not?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Because public opinion was against it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If public opinion was against it, it would not have been adopted. It is only where public opinion favors it that it comes into operation, and the hon. gentleman knows well that the chief difficulty in the operation of this law is the refusal of the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches to assume the responsibility of legislating on the subject in the way which experience has

shown to be necessary. The hon. First Minister knows that the House at the other end of this building is his creature; he created it; the members are the sheep of his pasture; they will do what he bids them, and, if he proposed any legislation on this subject, there would be no difficulty in carrying it through that House. It is true that a majority might not agree with the legislation he proposed, but we know that nine times out of ten the majority on the other side of this House do not agree with the legislation he proposes, but they vote for it nevertheless.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They say "no," but there have been cases in the past month in regard to which hon. gentlemen on that side have changed two or three times, and the hon. gentleman who sits beside the First Minister has proposed that they shall change again. I do not intend to discuss that matter, but I simply refer to it in order to show the extraordinary power which the hon. gentleman and his colleague possess over the members on that side of the House. The hon. the First Minister possesses even still more power over the Chamber at the other end of this building. Therefore it was necessary that the hon. gentleman should have proposed this measure and carried it through this House, and, my word for it, there would not have been the slightest hesitation in carrying it through the House at the other end of this building. For that reason especially, for that reason more than any other, I thought it important to press upon the House the propriety of the Government taking this question up. If the Government think the law is wrong they ought to propose its repeal, and if they do not, the hon. gentleman from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) ought to propose an expression of regret that the Government have not proposed its repeal; but if the Government agree with the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), they ought to propose the amendments which are necessary to the measure, and ought to assume the responsibility of carrying them through that House through which alone it will be carried by the aid and support of the Government.

Mr. FREEMAN. I beg to say to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down that he has been talking as though he had made a motion in this House tending to prohibition or to the amendment of the Scott Act. I never heard of such a motion from him. If he had done so, I certainly should have voted for it; I could not have voted against it; but, if I understood properly what he proposed, he wanted some one else to take it up, he wanted the Government to take it up. Now that is a very nice way for people to get rid of doing a thing they do not like to do themselves, to call upon somebody else to do it. Had the hon. member for Bothwell moved amendments, had he made a motion to that effect, he would have found every temperance man on this side of the House with him. Now, he says that the First Minister can have this House to follow him wherever he chooses. I wonder if anybody follows the hon. member for Bothwell. What did he do the other night when he wanted to press the Government to do that which they did not wish to take upon themselves? Hon. gentlemen opposite voted solid for him, if I recollect correctly. Certainly some of them are not temperance men; they do not generally vote with us upon this temperance question, but they followed him because he was their leader for the time being, they followed him just as closely as any body of men could follow their leader. Why, then, does he find fault when we follow our leader? But what he says with regard to the following on this side is not the case. I mean to say distinctly and emphatically that the statements made in that regard are wholly incorrect. Now, I wish to say a word with regard to my vote on that occasion. The hon. gentleman tries to mystify the matter very much. I was at the Dominion Alliance the day on which the hon. member for

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Bothwell brought in his resolution. I formed one of the committee on legislation, and as we sat at the table the question arose whether we should press the Scott Act amendments upon the Government, and the committee decided that the Government should not be asked to take them in hand, but that the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) should take charge of them. That was the action of that committee of the Dominion Alliance. And we could do nothing else. If we wanted to act like men at all in the matter, after having decided the course we should pursue in this House, it was our duty to pursue that course, and we did it. At the same time, if the hon. gentleman for Bothwell had stepped in and taken the matter out of the hands of the hon. member for Lanark, I dare say the hon. member for Lanark would not have found any great fault; I am sure he would not, and that he would have voted for him. But the hon. member for Bothwell did not do that, and now he is trying to get into the position of a leader of the temperance party in this House, as if he had done all that was to be done, and that we were faithless because we did not follow him. I do not know the hon. gentleman's record upon this temperance question, but I cannot learn anything of it that would lead me to follow him very closely. I have made enquiries and I have asked: "What position has the hon. member for Bothwell occupied in this temperance reform for the last 50 years?" I said: "Did you ever know him to be a foremost man; what has he done; has he stood out upon the platform and vindicated the cause of temperance when we had scores and hundreds of just such men as the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) opposed to us? When we were weak, few and despised? Did the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) then stand up with us? But, to-day Sir, when it has become somewhat fashionable, he wants to make favor with us. And, Sir, no man in the country would hail him quicker than myself as one of our leaders if he would come out with us heart and soul and not stand in the position so many hon. gentlemen stand in to-day, saying: "I am a very temperate man, only, mark you, I am not a fanatic." Those kind of men had better stand away from us. I think the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) takes a much more creditable course than some others. He says: "I am opposed to you, I am opposed to your pulpits, I am opposed to your ministers, I am opposed to your women societies," and I do not know but that he is opposed to the women also. When we deal with that hon. gentleman we know where we are. Now, Sir, I will come to the point in hand. I beg to say to hon. gentlemen that I am not here to make sport for anybody. I am arguing in the cause of justice and right. I am arguing for what I believe is of more importance to this country than anything that has ever been before this Parliament. I believe this prohibition cause is one upon which the prosperity of this country in a large measure depends. The lives of hundreds of people are hanging upon this very question. There are thousands of orphans to-day that are crying for bread, because of this rum traffic, which we are denouncing, and it is not a cause for mirth to me, at all events. It is a cause that is to-day making the hearts of many men and women to grieve, and making them to bow their heads in anguish. Now, in relation to this Temperance Act, there are some hon. gentlemen who wish to hurl their shafts against prohibition. We will not quarrel with the hon. gentlemen about the word "temperance." We know what the meaning of the word "temperance" is, but the total abstainers have adopted that word by which their principles of total abstinence are understood. I hope hon. gentlemen will not find too much fault with us about that. We say distinctly that by temperance we mean total abstinence; if they do not, we will not quarrel with them. But they do not mean the same kind of temperance that we mean. I say that when they

hurl their shafts of ignominy and ridicule at the Canada Temperance Act, I beg them to remember that we do not think them at all damaging to the cause of prohibition. Now, because of the repeal of the Canada Temperance Act in several counties of Ontario, they tell us that we must collapse, that this whole temperance reform of ours must go back, that we are defeated. Sir, I do not think so at all. For my part I am very little discouraged from the fact that those seven counties have repealed the Act. You have to remember that a few years ago they adopted the Act by a large majority, and they are only to-day going back to where they were before. Now, what has the Canada Temperance Act done since it was first brought into operation? The House will bear in mind that it was not forced on any county, it cannot be forced on any county, or on any section of the people, or on any riding, as you call counties in Ontario. Any county that chooses to adopt the Scott Act, will do so; and any county that prefers not to adopt it, will not do so; so it is altogether a local option Act. But what has it done during the last eight years? Nova Scotia has 18 counties and one city, of which 13 counties have adopted the Act. New Brunswick has 14 counties and two cities, of which ten counties and two cities have adopted the Act. Manitoba has five counties and one city, of which two counties have adopted the Act. Prince Edward Island has three counties and one city, all of which have adopted the Act. Ontario has thirty-eight counties and union of counties and 11 cities, of which 25 counties and two cities have adopted the Act; one of these has repealed it. Quebec has 56 counties and four cities, five counties of which have adopted the Act. British Columbia has five parliamentary constituencies, none of which have adopted the Act. In all, up to the present time, 81 cities and counties have voted upon the Scott Act, and 63 have adopted it. Nine counties and cities voted twice and five three times, making an aggregate of 95 contests, out of which we have been victorious in 73. I do not think we need be ashamed of this showing or that it should cause us to be much discouraged. The leaders and friends of the liquor traffic in getting seven counties to repeal the Act have not so very much of which to boast. Let them crow and rejoice, but I think rejoicing will not be for any lengthened period of time. I have examined the leading papers of the Upper Province, the exponents of public opinion, the *Globe*, the *Mail*, the *Empire*, and also the *Montreal Gazette*, and I fail to find any of those papers attribute the repeal of the Act to a falling off in temperance sentiment throughout the Dominion or in those individual counties. They give various reasons, and all through there are political reasons mixed up with others. The *Globe* points out that it is due to the abominable Franchise Act; then the roads were bad and the farmers could not get in to vote, and such reasons. Papers on the other side gave other reasons. The Ontario Government was said to be false, and they had the appointment of the officials, who were said to have done all they could to prevent the Act from being carried out—and thus political prejudices seem to prevail. It is difficult to get at the real cause, but in no case have I seen it stated that the Act was repealed because of decline in the temperance sentiment. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said that the Act had never been enforced. Let us see how it has been enforced in one county at all events. In East Simcoe, according to a statement of the convictions and fines imposed in the license district of East Simcoe, between the 1st day of May, 1886, and 7th April, 1888, the amount of fines imposed was \$4,950, number of convictions 96. Probable gain to the county \$2,263. If there were 96 convictions in that county it was surely a good attempt to enforce the Act. Dundas county was prepared to carry out the Act, and it has done so with beneficial effect. I read:

"The Scott Act is being vigorously carried out in this county at present, and is having a very beneficial effect. The efficient enforcement of the Act during the past few months will greatly help the temperance people in the coming contest for repeal. Mrs. Rocky-ault, of Irene, a noted character, has been fined for two convictions of the Act and it is expected she will be brought up for a third offence in a short time. She has become thoroughly frightened and has promised faithfully to break the law no more. This lady has been selling whisky in defiance of law for a number of years. Before the Scott Act came in force she sold without a license in defiance of the Crooks' Act, but managed to escape detection, although an honest attempt was made by the license inspector to convict her."

Here is a fair test as between officers of the Scott Act and officers of the license law. It would appear that an old offender under license law, who could not be got hold of by the Scott Act officers. I have a number of other cases with which I will not, however, weary the House. A casual examination will show that there has been a good deal of enforcement of the Scott Act. There have been difficulties in the way. I am not prepared to give an opinion in regard to these counties, but the temperance body of the Dominion will not regard the repeal vote in the different counties during the week as a matter to discourage them. On the other hand, I believe the defeat will nerve them to renewed effort. Of what material do hon. gentlemen think temperance men are made when they express the opinion with pleasure that since these reverses the temperance movement is finished? They mistake the character of the men altogether. When we had but a handful of men fighting for this reform, when we had fashion against us, when we had, to some extent, the pulpit against us and the leading men of the country against us, when strong appetites and habits were against us much more than they are now, we fought the battle of temperance. We contended for those principles, and to-day we can hardly find a man who does not want to be acknowledged as a temperance man, and to-day the great majority of the people are in favor of prohibition, and, instead of being frightened out of our senses by the repeal of the Scott Act in those counties, the next effort that will be made will be an effort to obtain total prohibition. I for one feel that such an effort is necessary. As a prohibitionist of some years standing, and I believe an honest friend of the cause, I believe that in order to be successful we must have the body of the electors behind us, we must have a large measure of public sympathy with us, the people must be with us in this work if we are to succeed in prohibiting this traffic, and it will be a question for the temperance reformers seriously to consider whether the people are so fully at their backs as to enable them to press for a prohibitory measure. If not, then I advise them to go on in the same way as they have been going and to use such efforts and appliances as they have been using, and which have brought them up to their present grand position. Let us rely more on moral effort and less upon law. But I believe this country wants a prohibitory law; I believe such a law is necessary to put down this terrible evil of drunkenness. I am not going into the consideration of this evil. I might show that it is now sapping the very life of this country, how the use of liquor in the old country is destroying 28 per cent. of valuable lives there, and that the lives in this Dominion are being destroyed in the same proportion by it. I could show how it is destroying the families of the people, how it is bringing discord into the homes of the people which should represent heaven. I could show these facts but they do not enter into this question. All we ask to-night is to obtain amendments to the Scott Act which are necessary to make it effective in the different counties throughout the Dominion in which it is now in operation. The complaint against the Scott Act is that it is not effectively enforced. There have been many difficulties in the way of its enforcement. I need not enumerate them, but provisions are found for the removal of them in the Bill the hon. member for Lanark (Mr.

Jamieson) has introduced. We ask this House to give us these amendments, and if the Scott Act with these amendments cannot be worked, then perhaps other counties will repeal it. Let us see what can be done with an amended Act. I appeal to every man who desires to see the drinking habits of the country lessened, I appeal to every man who desires to see good order in the country, I appeal to every man who wants to assist us in this good work. It is a measure which will not conflict with the drinking habits of any one. They can go and take their glass of brandy if they wish it and they can go on and indulge to any extent they please. I appeal to you to give the temperance people the amendments to this Act which we ask for here to-night and let us have the Act in a workable condition. If I would turn to the *Hansard* I could show you that the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, the then leader of the Government, declared when he introduced the measure that he believed the sentiment of the country demanded it. He believed it was in answer to the demand of the temperance sentiment in this country that he gave the people the Scott Act and he also indicated it was but a step towards a larger and fuller measure, a measure of prohibition. I believe that hon. gentleman desired the Act should be perfect, I believe it was in his heart to make the measure as perfect as it could be made. From time to time the friends of temperance have been before Parliament asking for amendments, and sometimes they have succeeded and more times they have failed. While this House has been willing that those amendments should be passed they have been blocked in another chamber. This has aroused a feeling in the minds of the temperance people of this country which at the proper time will find such an expression, as will wake up in the country the slumbering embers of dissatisfaction that lie in the breasts of the people, at the action of the Legislative Chamber referred to in this matter. I trust that the reasonable demands of the temperance people may not be refused again. I hope their reasonable requests will be listened to, and that these amendments will pass the House and become the law of the land. I do not think it necessary for me to say anything more on this subject, but before I sit down I would say that I regret exceedingly that there should have been so much political animus in this discussion. I have regarded it with a great deal of regret for I think it is possible for the two political parties in Canada to fight their political battles without dragging the temperance question into those battles. I believe that the Opposition will get into power just as quickly and that the Government will retain power just as long without dragging this temperance question into politics. I believe it will be wise of both political parties to let that question lie outside of politics altogether. Let hon. members on both sides of the House take hold of it as a great moral question, and deal with it as a question in which we have all a mutual interest, and in which our families and our children after us are interested. Let us cast politics aside, and let us vote as men of principle, let us vote as manly men, men who desire to see our country prosper, men who desire to see the evils of intemperance reduced to a minimum, men who desire to see all the floodgates of vice opened by the liquor traffic closed up forever and our country prosperous whether under a Conservative or a Liberal Government. Let us throw aside political feelings and vote on this question as accountable beings, accountable to our country, our children, and our God.

Mr. JAMIESON. I wish to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). The first statement that I made that he had shirked a vote was made on the authority of *Hansard*, which is the official record of the House. If the hon. gentleman examines *Hansard* he will find that it is not there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will find my name in the Journals of the House. I told him I voted and he made a statement that was not true.

Mr. JAMIESON. Both are official records recognised by the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I stated that I had voted.

Mr. JAMIESON. I made my statement on the authority of the official *Hansard*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The *Hansard* is not the official record of the votes.

Mr. JAMIESON. There are a few remarks I would like to make in reply to statements made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), statements which are as untrue as it is possible for them to be. In the first place he states that I have supported and taken part in the elections of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). I wish to make the statement that I never cast a vote. I never attended a meeting, I never took part in any shape or form in a political contest in South Lanark in my life and for the good reason that the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) does not require my assistance or that of any other outsider in order to secure his election in that county, so that the hon. gentleman's statement in that respect is entirely without foundation. So far as my position in North Lanark in the local election is concerned I may tell the hon. gentleman that just before the last local election took place there was a sort of temperance convention held in North Lanark. At that convention it was proposed that two temperance candidates should be put in the field—there were two in the field at that time—and it was resolved that they should be supported. One Conservative moved and another seconded a motion to that effect, but there was not a single individual belonging to the Liberal party who would say he would support the man. The candidates for the Local House were there; they were quite prepared to give their support to the local candidates, but of course when it came to the candidate for the House of Commons they were not prepared to do it.

Mr. HAGGART. That was a horse of another color.

Mr. JAMIESON. That was a horse of another color. Under those circumstances we supported the man who was pledged to temperance legislation—just as much so as the Liberal candidate in the north of the county. The hon. gentleman pretends to ignore the Dominion Alliance. I am not prepared to say that the Dominion Alliance is entitled to dictate over all the members of this House or to the Government of this country, but when the Government, of which the hon. gentleman was a member, was in power in 1878, it was not beneath his dignity to consult the Dominion Alliance. In fact, I have a record in my hand, in which it is stated that, at a meeting held in the city of Ottawa, a draft of the Canada Temperance Act was made by a committee of the Alliance and presented to the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member. So that, after all, the Canada Temperance Act was not framed by that Government, but by a committee of the Dominion Alliance. I have here the Year Book of 1883, in which that is stated, and I believe it to be correct. Now, Sir, so far as my position is concerned, it is this: In 1885, at a meeting of the Dominion Alliance, it was resolved to ask the Government of this Dominion to take charge of amendments to the Scott Act. It was resolved that in the event of the Government not doing so, I should be requested to do so, and to press the Bill as expeditiously as I possibly could. My position was this: The moment the Dominion Government refused to take charge of the amending Bill, and it was placed in my hands, I had to carry out the instructions given me by the

Dominion Alliance, or throw up the measure altogether. My position, further, is this: that so long as I act on lines laid down by the Dominion Alliance, it does not rest with any hon. member in this House, or any man outside of this House, to charge me with inconsistency. That is my position, and I am satisfied I shall be backed up by every member of the Dominion Alliance, unless his views are distorted for party purposes. There was a statement made, I do not know whether on the authority of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) or not. If it is, I am only sorry, Mr. Speaker, that parliamentary usage will not permit me to characterise that statement as I would like to do. It is stated, in answer to an urgent request on his part, that I should endeavor to place the Bill, of which I had charge, on Government Orders, that I said I would serve my party first. Sir, the statement is as false as the bottomless pit; I never made such a statement in my life, and the hon. member who says so is stating—well, the House understands what I mean; I will not go any further. This is about all I have to say in reference to this matter. I do trust we shall reach a vote on this Bill to-night, instead of letting it stand over for another occasion.

Mr. HAGGART. As I have some remarks to make on this question, and, as it is evident at this late hour that we shall not be able to conclude this debate to-night, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I do not very often interfere with temperance questions, but I feel that the occasion to-night is one, on which for once as a friend to the temperance cause, I am entitled to say a word. Before dealing with the question on its merits, perhaps I may be allowed to refer to one or two statements that have been made by my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) in respect to the action which is said to have been taken by the Dominion Alliance on a previous occasion. He complains that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) speaks lightly of the Dominion Alliance, and refers to the fact that in 1878 the Government of which my hon. friend was a member had so much confidence in the Dominion Alliance that they submitted to it the draft of the Canada Temperance Act for its approval. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he can refer to the time when his leader, since then, ever proposed any amendments to the Canada Temperance Act, and submitted them for approval to the Dominion Alliance; and I would like to know when he ever got up in his place as a temperance man in this House, and indicated that he was not in party accord with his leader, when his leader was so systematically using his influence to prevent this Canada Temperance Act being amended. I say, so far as his position is concerned, that it ill becomes the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) to refer with a sneer to the action of the Dominion Alliance and the Liberal Government as to their treatment of this question. I have a distinct recollection of how this question came before the House on that occasion. I remember how the petitions were poured in on us, and how this matter was urged on the House and the Government from year to year; and I remember that when it came to be dealt with, by the Liberal Government in 1878, and when the temperance members of the House were asked to meet together and discuss the matter, we had not the presence or aid of a single Conservative to discuss the question or to tell us how a prohibitory liquor law could be put on the Statute-book or made effective; but, forsooth, when they were in Opposition they were the men who were urging on the Government to take action in this matter. Sir, it sounded to me like ancient history when I saw my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson's) notice of an independent motion in favor of prohibition, and in favor of the Government enforcing it. Sir, just let me draw his attention to a resolution worded like that, and adopted by this House some years

ago, and then ask ourselves how much progress these agitators have made in connection with this question. On the 15th of March, 1875, Mr. Schultz, then member for Lisgar, moved:

"That it is the opinion of this House that a prohibitory liquor law is the only effectual remedy for the evils complained of, and it is the duty of the Government to submit such measures for the approval of Parliament at the earliest moment practicable."

That sounds very much like the motion my friend presented a few days ago, to re-affirm the abstract principle, after we have had the Canada Temperance Act for ten years, and have pleaded and implored the leaders of this House to take some action, not that it should be made stronger or more prohibitive, but made fairly operative; and now my hon. friend stands up and complains because we ask the Government to move as his friends asked the Government to move in 1875. I find that on that occasion the hon. Minister of Customs had something to say about this question, and I may say that the Government then were just like the Government now, a little slow to move, and the temperance men had to keep them up to their work. The hon. Minister of Customs delivered himself on that occasion in this fashion, when supporting the resolution of Dr. Schultz:

"The House was as well prepared now as it would be in a fortnight hence, after sixteen caucuses had been held, to come to a direct vote on the subject. The country was as well prepared now as it would be ten years hence, to decide whether it would have a prohibitory law, for the question had been discussed since he was a boy, and was agitated every year. The question should be left with the Government to grapple with."

That was the opinion of the hon. Minister of Customs in 1875, when the difference was just this: that he was on this side of the House, and the Government of my hon. friend from East York was on that side. Now, it strikes me that when our friends opposite talk so loudly about how they had advocated this great moral principle, and what they suffered in the cause of temperance, when it was not so popular as it is now, and how they regret it has been made a political question, would it not be much better if they would stiffen up their backs and say to their leader: We intend to support you on all political questions, but as the price of our support we insist that you give us, not prohibitory legislation, but that you make the law fairly workable. If they would do this instead of coming down here to throw dust in the eyes of the people with these motions which mean nothing and saying it is a great pity a question of this kind should have been made a football of in the political arena, we might have some confidence in their protestations. I was amused at the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Freeman) when he expressed his regret that a great moral question like this should have been made a political question, and which the Minister of Customs, in 1875, declared that the Government ought to initiate legislation of this kind. He forgets that when his friends were out of office, and when hon. gentlemen now on this side of the House showed their faith and their principles by passing legislation, imperfect and contradictory, I admit, but at the moment the best that could be had, not one hon. gentleman opposite lifted a little finger to help them to improve the details of that measure. On the contrary, it had to be passed in the teeth of their active hostility or neutral opposition. Yet these hon. gentlemen to-day say to us that this should not be made a political question. I tell you, Sir, if the electorate would just stiffen the backs of these representatives, by telling them, instead of being Tories first and temperance men afterwards, you must be temperance men first, or we will leave you out at the next elections and put honest men in your places, who will display more zeal than simply move abstract resolutions, that it is the duty of the Government to pass prohibitory legislation, and then quietly strangle out of existence the temperance sentiment by your do-nothing policy, we would find a change in their mode of conduct.

There is another gentleman who owes his position in this House to the stand he took at one time in connection with the temperance movement. I do not wish for a moment to throw discredit on a public man who, in the early days of his public life, advocated temperance principles and was paid for his advocacy; that is perfectly legitimate. But let me quote a few of the sentences which the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries uttered in 1885, when discussing the Bill which the hon. member for Lanark has brought up so often from year to year in the House that it has grown hoary and grey, and yet it is just as far from becoming the law of the land as when he first took these amendments in hand. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had a little tiff with the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) who presides over the Factory Act, which is another measure that is a long time coming to maturity, and there was a little feeling as to which Bill should come first, but finally the Factory Act had to stand back. The hon. the Minister of Marine said, and his words express exactly my sentiments, and I should have honored the man who had uttered such sentiments and stand by them:

"In the first place it is necessary, in order to carry out the good faith of Parliament, which was shown first in the enactments passed in 1878, and which was equally shown by making the law stronger in 1883, under which two pledges the people on 71 different occasions have come up to vote on this Act, and carried it in 59 by large majorities. Of those counties and cities which have adopted the Act, over 40 will be under its operation from 1st May, this year—and are looking to this Parliament—and a population of one million and a half of people are asking this Parliament to do its simple duty in the premises—keep its faith—and take away obstructions—not which the people have placed in the way—but which Parliament placed in the way of the Act and undesignedly too."

Further on he continued:

"If Parliament made a blunder, as in the opinion of the court of New Brunswick it did, and unwittingly cut away the machinery and the power from under that Act, it is in the carrying out of the good faith which should subsist between Parliament and the people that they should remedy that mistake and should give to the people what was asked for—and what was supposed to be given—a fairly workable Act. That is all we ask for."

And again:

"All we ask for, all the temperance people ask for, is that Parliament should carry out its pledged faith with a view of giving them a Canada Temperance Act which is made workable, and if under those conditions it proves a failure, the temperance people will be the first to move for the abolition of that law."

These are, to my mind, words that have the correct ring. They are words that indicate, as far as words can, a hearty and earnest belief in the duty of Parliament to promote temperance by passing these amendments. There was no hesitation in the hon. gentleman saying what he then thought Parliament ought to do. But how is it that since then we have heard no more of these ardent utterances in favor of Parliament taking some action. This was on the 8th of April, 1885, and in December, 1885, the hon. gentleman became Minister of Marine. Is it possible that the yoke was so tight around his neck, since he entered office, that he is no longer able to give utterance to those noble sentiments on behalf of the very cause that warmed him into political existence and made a man of him. I respect a man who honestly changes his opinions, but I despise a man who sells himself for position and goes back on the principles to which he owes his promotion. How did the "blunder" referred to by the Minister of Marine here to be remedied occur? Did it come to pass by the Government consulting the Dominion Temperance Alliance for the purpose of improving the Act? No; it came from the desire of the Government to grasp the power vested in the Local Legislatures and control the licenses for the purpose of giving a stroke at the Premier of Ontario, who stood in the way of the ambitions of hon. gentlemen opposite. It was through that action, it was not by any accidental circumstance, it was by the very decided action of the majority of this House, in

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

the face of the earnest protests of the Opposition, in passing the Liquor License Act of 1883, known better as the McCarthy Act, that the Superior Court of New Brunswick ruled had destroyed the penal clauses of the Canada Temperance Act, which my hon. friend mourned on that occasion, and, as far as I know, has gone on mourning from that day onwards, until the Supreme Court said it was to be swept from the Statute-book and it was not worth the paper it was written on, and thus restored the Act to its original condition. My hon. friends are never done lamenting about the difficulties which surround the carrying out of this Act. I am inclined to join with them in that lament as long as they retain their present position. I do not find any fault with the leader of the Government for not doing better in regard to this Act, when he finds that the professed temperance men around him who profess to support it do not stand up to their principles better than that, when he knows that they will get down on their knees whenever they are told to get down. I think if I was Premier I would do the same thing myself. If I knew that, when I said to my temperance friends, I do not think it is very handy for me to do this now, and you had better postpone it, they would be only too happy to postpone it, I think I would act that way myself, in view of those on the other side of the question. The liquor element is a great power in this country, and the Premier knows it. In the past, as temperance men, we have had to fight for our rights, and I may say that anything that has rallied against the Scott Act is as nothing to the future, but is simply the kindling of a great fire. But, when the Premier knows that, whenever he says to those hon. gentlemen, get down and be still, they will get down and be still, it is not likely that he will do anything to advance the cause of temperance. It certainly does not lie in the mouth of my hon. friend from North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) to speak about the wonderful actions of the Dominion Alliance, when they have accepted so meekly their treatment by the Government. I was once foolish enough to go on a deputation to the Premier. The Dominion Alliance got it into their heads that this Act was not in good working order. No doubt there was something in that, and I was told—for I was not present at the meeting—that they had appointed a deputation to wait on the Government. You see, the Alliance had got accustomed to the Government paying attention to their statements when the Liberals were in office, and they thought that, when our Conservative friends came into office, they would also have some respect for them, and I was told, we are going to wait on the Government, and we want you to go, as we want to have a delegation from the Alliance which will be non-political. I notice that they are very particular nowadays on the non-political question. However, I remember we made a great, big deputation. We filled the Premier's room so full that we had to stand up quite close against him, and there was scarcely room for my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who was the mouthpiece of the deputation on that occasion, to indulge in any flourishing. I never was a worshipper of that hon. gentleman, but I must say that on that occasion he presented the cause of the Dominion Alliance with moderation and firmness and definiteness and brevity, and I thought our cause was well put, and I thought the Premier, as I believe he always is on these occasions, was very courteous to us, very courteous. So I thought our deputation was going to do something, and I remember that the Premier just simply said, in a non-committal sort of way: It seems reasonable that an Act which is on the Statute-book of the country, and was a Government measure, and is not fairly workable, should be made so. I thought that looked reasonable, and I thought our spokesman had put our case in such a fashion as to convince even the Premier. We went away saying that we would hear about it. Well, it passed for a week, and then it passed for another week, and we received no answer. I do not know how others felt, but I began to

feel that we had been sold, and I felt indignant when I saw that, in another branch of the Legislature, the leader of the Government there indicated that they did not intend to take any action in regard to the amendments to the Canada Temperance Act. If those hon. gentlemen opposite felt as indignant as I felt, they would have constituted themselves at once another deputation and would have told the Premier formally that they were in earnest, that they believed these amendments were necessary, and that, in the glowing words of my hon. friend, it was necessary to keep faith with the people and to make this Act workable. But they got down on their knees and accepted the situation, and from that time downwards, the Dominion Alliance and our friends who support the Government, have lost their grip on the temperance question, and from that time it was simply that they must do as the Government saw fit. I do not blame the Government, but I say the men who professed to have temperance principles made a great mistake. Their knees were too weak, and the result has certainly justified the statement of the leader of the Government in the Senate. Again, we find the Dominion Alliance, thought, may be, they might influence the Government by the exercise of some firmness, sending another deputation in 1886, suggesting a readjustment of the fines. I did not go on the deputation that time, but the published report is to the effect that the Dominion Alliance sent another deputation to the Premier to urge certain reasons why there should be readjustment of the fines and penalties imposed under the Canada Temperance Act. Did they succeed any better than before? Let the Order in Council of the 15th December, 1886, show, in which, instead of travelling in the direction the deputation asked, the Government travelled in exactly the opposite direction. But I did not hear that the Dominion Alliance protested; on the contrary they seem to have taken the rebuff with becoming humility. My friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) may have protested, but he did not vote that way, and the man who protests, and then votes for those against whom he has protested, does not amount to much, no matter on which side of the House he is. I do not think the Government, on the whole, have treated the Alliance with the degree of consideration to which they have been entitled, but, as the Alliance have accepted it, I think that justifies the Government, and they are simply getting the treatment they deserve. I think the ground taken by my friend the Minister of Customs in connection with the temperance legislation of the country was the correct one, when he moved when in Opposition, in 1875, that it was the duty of the Government to pass a prohibitory liquor law. I think it is simply trifling with the temperance sentiment of this country, and casting dust in the eyes of the electors for any private member of this House to go on year after year introducing an Act as my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) has been doing, professing to amend the Canada Temperance Act. They may go on in that way till doomsday, they may go on until that Act is grey haired, without getting any further. I want to quote here an authority high up in the temperance ranks, an authority so high up that, every time these gentlemen have anything to do, they put him in the seat of honor and get him to preside over them. That authority is Senator Vidal, who, as an hon. member near me states, is the president of the Alliance. I know he has been identified with temperance ever since I can remember, as president, figure-head, and general showman, and all this kind of thing; but I never heard of his voting against the Government, and until a man's faith is strong enough to lead him to do that, through a sense of right, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the temperance reform is not going to make much progress. Now, the occasion I refer to was one on which the Premier introduced an Act to amend this Canada Temperance Act. It appeared that the original Act was defective in this respect, that the courts

held that where there were no licenses in existence in a county, the Canada Temperance Act could not come into effect, for the simple reason that there was no time on which licenses expired, and the court apparently held that where there was no licenses to expire, the Act never could come into force. The Premier did agree to introduce legislation, and that was amended at his instance. Now, in looking over the Senate Report, I find some remarks delivered by Senator Vidal, on the 4th April, 1884, in connection with the amendment I have referred to. I may say, by-the-by, that the Premier, in introducing that matter to the House, made this remark: "It is quite clear that so long as the Act is on the Statute-book it should be made workable." A very good sentiment, but unfortunately the active operation of that sentiment stopped at about the time he got this amendment passed, and after that he pursued a retrograde course, or rather, as he expressed himself the other day, he did not know the Act required any amendments now. But on this occasion the hon. Senator alluded to spoke as follows:—

"Very earnest letters came to us from Nova Scotia saying we must if possible obtain this amendment. We told them what has turned out to be the case that immediately on the introduction of the Bill in either House in all probability these would be an amendment offered to the Act by some opponent, which while professing to be friendly to it would really be fatal to its very existence. A conference of the members interested was held and we came to this conclusion: That it was no use for any private member to introduce a Bill of this nature. There is a moral certainty that if it is done by a private member it will just meet the fate which has attended former efforts to obtain such an amendment."

Now, these are sentiments uttered by the gentleman who is to-day president of the Dominion Temperance Alliance. Since 1854 have the appointments to the Senate, with one solitary exception, been likely to favor prohibitory legislation or have they been the reverse? Every child in the country knows, every temperance man in the country knows, how grieved he was when certain of those appointments were made—with one exception from Toronto. They felt, so far as the Senate was concerned, that it was hostile to that class of legislation in former years, and that that hostility was being reinforced by recent additions to the Senate. Yet, so hopeless was the position in 1884 that Senator Vidal, an active temperance man, then openly and avowedly expressed the opinion that it was utterly useless to attempt to carry legislation through the House unless it was a Government measure. He went on to say:

"Between 20 and 30 members of Parliament waited on Sir John and his colleagues, stated their case and this Bill was the result. Senator Wark enquired if it was a Government measure. Mr. Vidal said: This is what we understood because if it was introduced by a private member it would fail, and our only object in going to the Government to ask them to introduce a measure was that it should be a Government measure."

Mr. Speaker, could words be more distinct than that? Here was a man who knew of what he spoke, a man who has been in the centre of the temperance reform, and knew all that has been going on in connection with temperance ever since I have known anything of the temperance cause. Yet, here was a man, in 1884, who had been a consistent supporter of this Government and a life-long Conservative, who said that it is utterly idle to attempt to pass legislation in this House unless it is a Government measure. Yet we find the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) going on from year to year, with the consent of this very Alliance of which this Senator is the head in this country, introducing legislation and expecting to get it passed. Now, Sir, I say it is an insult to the temperance men of Canada, it is an insult to the thousands of Conservative temperance men, because there are thousands of them who honestly believe that temperance laws could be enforced if they had a fair chance, and, Sir, to-day we see the result. Worried, worn, hadgered, ired with the fruitless attempts to operate the Act the Government have refused to amend, the result has been that on every recent occasion on which the repeal of the Canada Temperance Act

has been submitted to the electorate in counties where three years ago it was carried by large majorities, those men have, by their vote, censured the Government and those temperance men that have idly stood by and allowed that Act to be killed by its own friends in this House. I have frequently said to my Conservative temperance friends at home: You do not need to leave the ranks of your own party, get your temperance organisation made perfect, just stiffen the backs of the candidates you put in the field, and tell them you are in earnest." Did we not have a sample of the fear of the people a year ago in this House? Look at the large vote that was cast to keep the Scott Act in existence, but the moment you undertook to amend it, that vote dwindled down until they were prepared to do anything rather than amend that Act. That showed that there were a lot of men in this House who knew full well that if they expressed openly their convictions on this matter, and voted for the repeal of the Act, they dared not go back and face their constituents, or they would have been put to the right-about face. Yet this is the way this measure has been played with until the temperance sentiment of the country is worn out, and to day after all this disappointment, the result will probably be that the moment the Scott Act is submitted in these other counties it will be repealed, and then temperance men will be driven to another long and arduous fight to bring the Act up to that position where the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says it could be made fairly workable; when if those amendments had been taken up and passed by the Government when asked by the Alliance, and the Act had then been fairly tried and proved a failure, all parties would have agreed that it was desirable to repeal it. But now, baffled, wearied, betrayed, by the very men who professed to be their friends in Parliament, temperance men are left with an Act unworkable, and confronted with every obstacle that can be put in their way. Yet they come here, year after year, introducing this legislation. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is time the covering was torn off this class of legislation. Let us have some attempt at honestly dealing with this question. Sir, I have not often spoken in this House on the temperance question, but when I came here, in 1873, I made up my mind to be found on the side of temperance, and I hope I shall always be found there, whether it is pleasing or displeasing to hon. gentleman on either side of the House. I expect to be a friend of the temperance cause when the people shall wake up to the fact that they need to send men of better timber on the Conservative side than ever they have sent here yet, and then we will get prohibition. In so far as the operation of the Crooks Act is concerned in Ontario, the temperance people have no reason to be discouraged with the movement of temperance sentiments in the country. There is a steady, solid growth of sentiment in the country in the direction of restriction, and in the direction of reducing the consumption of liquor. I say it is a matter of extreme regret that this Act should not have been put in a fairly workable position. Let me draw your attention to one feature in connection with that much abused Act, called the Crooks Act, but which now even liquor men extol as a good law. I had the curiosity to look into the report of the Ontario Government the other day to see what were the results in connection with the reduction of licenses and the general enforcement of that Act. I find that in 1875, when that legislation was initiated, there were 4,793 tavern licenses issued in the Province of Ontario, and 1,307 shop licenses. In the next ten years ending 1885 when only one or two counties had adopted the Act and when the whole country was still operating under the Crooks License Act, we find that the licenses had been reduced to 3,252 tavern licenses and 675 shop licenses, being a reduction of 632 shop licenses and in 1,540 tavern licenses issued in the various counties of the Province. In ten years the temperance sentiment of the country has shown itself by a

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

steady restriction of the licenses in counties that have not adopted the Canada Temperance Act, and to-day, as a consequence, public temperance sentiment is healthier and firmer in those counties than where the Canada Temperance Act has been enforced under unfavorable circumstances caused by the base neglect of its friends in the House, where it has been placed in a position such as to disgust its friends, and which has resulted in either one or two things as shown by the recent vote: either that its supporters were disgusted and stayed away from the polls, or what is more to be regretted voted for its repeal. I believe in temperance legislation, at all events I should like to see a fair trial made; but I feel that the temperance sentiment of the country has been seriously misrepresented by many of the members of the House who have pretended to represent it, and while I can echo the sentiment of the hon. member for Queen's. N.S. (Mr. Freeman) that the question should be lifted out of the political arena, I tell that hon. gentleman that he and his friends have done more to discourage the temperance cause by being party men first and sinking their temperance principles at the bidding of the Premier, during the last four or five years than all the acts of the liquor dealers during the last twenty years put together.

Mr. FISHER. After the remarks of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) it is not necessary for me to deal with this question at any length; but the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) a little while ago made some remarks in regard to myself to which I must say a few words. I have alluded this evening to what the hon. gentleman has said as to the occurrences at the meeting last year to which he is so fond of alluding. I am not going to take up the time of the House at this late hour by repeating this statement. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) a little while ago said this is a question of veracity between he and I. I should prefer to believe it is merely a question of memory, and I do not wish to impute motives to the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson).

Mr. JAMIESON. I do not recollect stating it was a question of veracity.

Mr. FISHER. I understood so. I have already stated this evening my remembrance of those occurrences, and I have no reason to change that statement one whit or one iota. That may have been, as I said, a question of memory between the hon. gentleman and myself; but in regard to what the hon. member for Lanark has said about the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and his vote and action in this House upon this question, that is not a question of memory at all, but I regret to say emphatically a question of fact. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) a little while ago said that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) did not vote on that occasion last year. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), interrupting him, stated he did vote, and according to the Rules of the House, after that denial of the hon. member for Bothwell, it was the duty of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) to have accepted the hon. gentleman's statement and withdrawn the assertion he made in regard to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). He did not do so. But a few minutes afterwards the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) placed the record of the Journals before the House showing that his name was in each one of the divisions. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) ought then, I say, to have withdrawn his statement. But no; he then tried to hide himself under what he said was contained in the record of the *Hansard*, and he said that the *Hansard* record, which I hold under my hand, and which is exactly the same volume as the hon. gentleman had under his hand, did not contain the name of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I have here the four votes that took place on 13th June last, and

in every one of those votes, in the same volume which the hon. member for Lanark had, appeared the name of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. JAMIESON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; it is not so. It does not appear on the main motion.

Mr. FISHER. I will read the record, and it will show what was the statement when he had this volume under his hands, and when he professed to appeal to this volume and to quote it. First, there is the vote on the amendment of Mr. Cargill, which was for a repeal of the Scott Act. Under nays I find the name of Mr. Jamieson, and further down the name of Mr. Mills (Bothwell).

Mr. JAMIESON. Yes; I said so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; you said I did not vote.

Mr. FISHER. The *Hansard* report to-morrow will perhaps show what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. JAMIESON. The hon. gentleman has an extraordinary memory. I said that he voted on the amendment, but when it came to the main motion his name did not appear. That is what I said.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman will weigh a little more carefully what he is saying, he will find that I will be able to prove that he is wrong even in that statement.

Mr. JAMIESON. I appeal to *Hansard* when it comes out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I told you my name appeared in the Journals of the House.

Mr. FISHER. The next amendment is that of Mr. Girouard, and I find Mr. Mills (Bothwell) voting there.

Mr. HAGGART. That is correct; he said so.

Mr. FISHER. Again, there is the amendment I moved myself, which was to obviate a vote upon the amendment of Mr. Sproule in reference to compensation. I find there also Mr. Jamieson and Mr. Mills again voted on the same side.

Mr. JAMIESON. Turn to the next division.

Mr. FISHER. In the division on the main motion as amended I find among the yeas Mr. Jamieson and among the nays Mr. Mills (Bothwell).

Mr. JAMIESON. I beg your pardon. If that is so, I am certainly mistaken. I examined it carefully and I could not find it.

Mr. FISHER. I regret that the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) should have allowed himself to make such a statement impugning the veracity of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in this House on such a cursory examination of the record as he evidently made.

Mr. JAMIESON. And other members examined it with me.

Mr. FISHER. Then the hon. gentleman was in very bad company.

Mr. JAMIESON. Will the hon. gentleman pass the book across here?

Mr. FISHER. It was the duty of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) to have accepted the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills); but instead of doing so, he chose to deny it, and even to deny the statement of the records of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. Send it over; let us see if it is there

Mr. FISHER. I will not continue this controversy any further. I will simply say this in reference to the motion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) now before of the House, that the Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read this day six months. I must say I am

surprised that the hon. member for Muskoka should have made this motion. He is a member who, I believe, has the courage of his convictions. I believe he sincerely desires to see the Scott Act repealed. I believe he is also glad to see that in his own county the Scott Act has been repealed, and he desires to see it removed from the Statute-book; but if the Act is to remain on the Statute-book he should be willing to make it as perfect as possible. Even those opposed in principle to the Act should allow us on this occasion to amend it. I have but one further remark to make in connection with the statement made by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) this evening, that the action of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was contrary to the declared opinion of the Dominion Alliance. I cannot allow that to go forth as being the truth in regard to the Dominion Alliance. They have made no utterance and passed no resolution whatever in that regard. Neither the member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) nor any of the other gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House made a motion at the Dominion Alliance condemning the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). They had not the courage in the Dominion Alliance to object to that action, or to say that the Dominion Alliance was against the motion, yet long after they come here and they emphatically state that it was contrary to the desires of the Dominion Alliance. They have no foundation on which to make that statement whatever. I think I know enough of the Dominion Alliance to know that the Alliance does not pretend to look upon itself as being the only exponent of temperance people in this country, or to insist that no temperance action should be taken in this House except from that enforcement. I may say also the Dominion Alliance, on many occasions, have made an effort to induce the Government to adopt the Scott Act amendments as their Bill, and they have invariably failed to obtain that action on the part of the Government. I believe, as I have stated over and over again in the council of the Dominion Alliance, that until the Government do take that Bill under their protection and make it their Bill it cannot be law. As a member of the Dominion Alliance I believe it our duty to enforce that action. I emphatically deny that all the members of the Dominion Alliance believe that this is the only way in which temperance legislation can be obtained in this House. The Dominion Alliance has made no utterance whatever on this motion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and I know that the hon. members opposite had no foundation whatever to make the statements which they did here to-night.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to discuss the question of whether the Scott Act is a good Act or not, but I rise to discuss the amendment of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). The effect of that amendment would be to leave things exactly as they are now, and it would merely leave the Scott Act with all its imperfections, which are acknowledged by its friends and opponents and which we all know it possesses. If I were asked for my opinion on the Scott Act as it now stands I must say that the Scott Act at present does not restrain the sale of liquor nearly as much as the Crooks Act in Ontario. I think there is more restriction on liquor selling in Toronto or Ottawa under the Crooks Act than there is in St. Thomas which is under the Scott Act. In Ottawa or in Toronto tavern keepers have to observe certain regulations, while, in St. Thomas, where there are no licenses, there are no regulations, and a man who sells at all will sell any day of the week and at any hour of the night Saturday and Sunday. There is no restriction in Scott Act counties except the fear of getting caught. I verily believe the Scott Act has really led rather to an increase than a decrease in the consumption of liquor in the county which I have the honor to represent and in the city of St. Thomas, the county town. This failure of

the Scott Act is not due to any failure on the part of the local officers. The inspector for West Elgin, which includes the city of St. Thomas, is one of the most devoted temperance men and prohibitionists in the country. He has been frequently complimented by different temperance bodies for his strenuous efforts to enforce the Act, and he has secured a great many convictions, but at the same time the sale of liquor goes on more freely there than it does in Ottawa to-day. That is my impression of the Scott Act as it stands. I do not see how I can vote for the motion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) for it does not remove this inefficient Act from the Statute-book, but leaves it with all its acknowledged imperfections to continue in its failure in the purpose for which it was intended. Neither am I sure that any amendments that can be made to this Act will make it workable; however, I think it is only fair play to give the supporters of the Act an opportunity to show what amendments they propose to make and to convince us, if possible, that those amendments will make it workable, and in reality a prohibitory liquor law. If they fail to show that it will make it a moral Act, I cannot support the amending Bill, and I will reserve my vote for the third reading; but in the meantime, until we see what the amendments proposed in the committee are, I find it necessary to vote for the second reading.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the question is put I just wish to say this: I had a very distinct recollection of my vote relating to the temperance question in the House last year. The hon. member for North Lanark said I left the House with the speed of a "Maud S." The hon. gentleman had a distinct recollection of that fact. I sent out for the Journals of the House and I knew my vote would be there recorded, but the hon. gentleman was not satisfied. He declared there was some other official record than the Journals, and that it was there recorded that I did not vote. Well, Sir, notwithstanding the Hibernianism of the hon. gentleman, I find that even in the official report of the Debates my vote is recorded, and yet the hon. gentleman stood up in this House thinking that nobody else would examine the report, or that we would take his statement for granted, and declare that in the official reports there was no record of my vote. The official report has been examined by other parties. My vote is there recorded and the House now sees how much credit is to be attached to a statement of the hon. gentleman who with a copy of the *Hansard* debates in his hand in which my vote is there recorded attempts to mislead the House on this question.

Mr. JAMIESON. I believe I have made a mistake on this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. JAMIESON. As a member of Parliament and a gentleman it is my duty to withdraw the statement. I am not the first hon. member who has made a mistake. I certainly examined the record and other parties with me, and any gentleman who takes the *Hansard* will see how the mistake occurred. The name does not appear in order. I certainly made a mistake in that way and I wish to apologise.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the speed of "Maud S."?

Mr. JAMIESON. I have made my statement.

House divided on motion of Mr. Haggart to adjourn the debate.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Burdett,

Dessaint,
Dupont,
Fiset,
Grandbois,

Madill,
Marshall,
O'Brien,
Prior,

Burns,
Cargill,
Carling,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cimon,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Couture,
Daly,
Davin,
Denison,

Guay,
Haggart,
Hickey,
Kenny,
Labelle,
Labrosse,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
McCarthy,
McDongall (O. Breton),
McGreevy,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),

Putnam,
Skinner,
Small,
Smith (Ontario),
Tisale,
Tupper (Pictou),
Tyrwhitt,
Wilson (Argenteuil),
Wood (Brockville), and
Wright.—44.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,
Bain (Wentworth),
Barron,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowell,
Boyle,
Brien,
Brown,
Bryson,
Cameron,
Carpenter,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),
Casey,
Charlton,
Cochrane,
Cook,
Davies,
De St. Georges,
Dickinson,
Doyon,
Edgar,
Eisenhauer,
Ellis,
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Fisher,
Foster,
Freeman,
Gauthier,
Gillmor,

Girouard,
Guilbault,
Guillet,
Hale,
Henderson,
Hesson,
Holton,
Hudspeth,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Jones (Digby),
Jones (Halifax),
Kirk,
Kirkpatrick,
Landry,
Lang,
Laurie,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Lister,
Lovitt,
Macdonald (Huron),
McOulla,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDongald (Pictou),
McIntyre,
McLellan,
McMillan (Huron),
McMullen,

McNeill,
Meigs,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mills (Bothwell),
Mitchell,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Platt,
Rinfret,
Robertson,
Roome,
Rowand,
Rykert,
St. Marie,
Seriver,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Therrien,
Thompson,
Trow,
Tupper (Sir Charles),
Tarcot,
Wallace,
Watson,
White (Renfrew),
Wilmot,
Wilson (Elgin), and
Wilson (Lennox),

Motion to adjourn debate negatived.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I understand that there is a general wish on the part of the members that this Bill should go to the committee, and, therefore, with the consent of the House, I am quite willing to withdraw my motion for the six months' hoist.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Amendment (six months' hoist) negatived, and Bill read the second time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.20 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 26th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ACT RESPECTING THE SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 112) to amend the Revised Statutes, chap. 77, respecting the safety of ships. He said: The object aimed at in this bill is to make greater provision for the safety of vessels, chiefly in two ways: first, by providing better machinery for the inspection and surveying of vessels leaving our ports when they are supposed to be, or charged to be unseaworthy; and in the second place, it provides certain rules and precautions in reference to the storage of grain cargoes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister of Marine if it is intended to apply to sea-going vessels, or only to lake vessels?

Mr. FOSTER. To sea-going vessels as well as to lake vessels.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 113) to amend the Summary Convictions Act. He said: The principal objects of this Bill are to give greater facilities for procuring the attendance of witnesses. It empowers Justices of the Peace to issue subpoenas into other counties outside of their jurisdiction, and it likewise contains compulsory provisions as regards witnesses who fail to obey subpoenas. It likewise establishes the competency of witnesses in proceedings under this Act, notwithstanding they have a pecuniary interest, and it provides further for the methods of appeal.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RESOLUTIONS REGARDING THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of Sir Charles Tupper, I beg to move that the House resolve itself into Committee to-morrow to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That in view of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company having agreed with the Government of Canada to relinquish, for the consideration and upon the conditions herein set forth, the exclusive privilege possessed by it in virtue of Article fifteen of the agreement between Her Majesty and the Company, contained in the schedule to the Act 44th Victoria, chapter 1, it is expedient to provide that:

(a) The Government of Canada will guarantee the payment of interest, until maturity, at three and a half per cent on bonds of the Company to an amount not exceeding fifteen millions of dollars; the principal of such bonds to be payable not later than fifty years from their date, and the principal and interest to be secured as hereinafter set forth.

(b) Such bonds shall be secured by deed of bargain and sale to Trustees of all the Company's title to the unsold lands forming part of the Company's land grant under the said Act, and such deed shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

(c) The proceeds of the sales of the lands hereinbefore mentioned shall be paid over to the Government of Canada, together with any other sums which the Company pays over, for the purpose, to the Government, and the whole shall constitute a fund which shall be held by the Government for the exclusive purpose of satisfying the principal of the said bonds.

(d) On the amount so set apart, not exceeding the amount necessary to redeem the bonds hereinbefore mentioned, the Government shall pay to the Company interest at the rate of three and a half per cent., such interest to be applied in satisfaction of interest of the bonds as the same accrues: but if the Company makes default in the payment of any interest falling due on any of the bonds aforesaid, the Company shall, if required by the Government, pay over all interest collected under uncompleted sales, upon the price of lands sold as well as principal realised from sales thereof, and the Government shall allow on the amount of such payments, interest at the rate hereinbefore mentioned, and shall apply the same and all interest accrued on the principal fund towards the payment of the interest on the said bonds.

(e) So soon as the aggregate amount of the said fund, in the hands of the Government, equals the principal of all the bonds of the said issue then outstanding, the Company may pay in a further sum to cover any interest up to date, and thereupon the mortgage shall be discharged, and thereafter all interest on such bonds shall be paid by the Government, as also the principal at maturity, but the Government shall be in no way liable for the payment of any part of the principal except so far as the Company have provided it with a fund for the purpose.

(f) Such Minister as is designated by the Government shall be one of the Trustees under the said mortgage deed, and the appointment of the other Trustees shall be subject to the approval of the Government.

(g) All land grant bonds which form part of the former issue by the Company and are now held by it shall be cancelled, and the mortgage hereinbefore mentioned shall be subject to the payment of such of the said land grant bonds as are outstanding, but all sums due or to become due for unpaid purchase money to the company on account of lands heretofore sold shall be applied to the payment of such land grant bonds according to the terms of the mortgage securing the same.

(h) If the Company, under any powers granted to it, sells or leases the branch of its railway east of Red River, between St. Boniface and

the boundary of the United States, any incorporated company to whom such sale or lease is made, may operate such branch as if it had been incorporated for the purpose, but the moneys resulting from such sale or lease shall be applied either towards the payment of the bonds secured by the railway or towards increasing the security for such bonds by expenditure on the railway, or partly in one way or partly in the other.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the resolution be taken to-morrow? We will have the Budget to-morrow.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is merely a formal motion.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose the hon. gentleman will lay before the House all the correspondence with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that the papers which are laid on the Table containing the correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Imperial authorities in reference to this disallowance question, have yet been printed. If they have not yet been printed they ought to be printed and put in our hands, as it is very necessary we should have them in printed form before the discussion proceeds. Will the hon. Minister see that the proper authorities get this done?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know whether the papers have been printed, but of course we will have the matter looked into at once and the papers brought down, if they have not already been laid on the Table.

EMPLOYÉS OF THE NORTHERN LIGHT.

Mr. WELSH. I wish to ask the Minister of Marine when the balance of those papers will be laid on the Table of this House connected with the men employed on the *Northern Light*?

Mr. FOSTER. I think very shortly. We had to write down to an agent at Charlottetown for the particular items. Just as soon as they come back they will be laid on the Table.

Mr. WELSH. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine if he has not the accounts from the men employed on the *Northern Light* last summer? They must be received in the department before this, and paid for. If those accounts had been sent into the department and paid, what necessity is there to write down for further documents?

Mr. FOSTER. If there was no occasion to write down for further information, it is not probable I would take the trouble to do so. The hon. gentleman was precise in asking a certain minute information, and I propose that he will get all information and get it as minute as it can possibly be.

Mr. WELSH. Those papers were moved for in the first Orders of the House.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 92) to amend chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Customs.—(Mr. Bowell.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 31,

Mr. BOWELL. This is the only clause that was not passed. It was allowed to stand at the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), in order to ascertain how the amendment to section 148 would affect the time given for the entry of an action under clause 147. A careful reading of the two sections will show that section 145 relates to proceedings that may be taken against the indi-

vidual officer of customs, whereas the proposed sub-section to 148, which was purposely worded as far as possible the same as section 145, refers to suits for the recovery of the thing seized. The one section refers to the individual, and the other to the thing. But still, for fear that any misunderstanding might arise in the administration of these two sections, I propose to add to sub-section 2 of section 148, the following words:—

Every such action, suit or proceeding shall be brought within three months after such decision has been given.

This, I am informed by the Minister of Justice, will meet the objection that was made to the sections as they now stand.

Mr. GILLMOR. What time have they now?

Mr. THOMPSON. Three months from the time the offence is committed, and this change makes it three months after the decision is given.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

FRAUDULENT TRADE MARKS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 91) to amend the law relating to Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise.—(Mr. Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 9,

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose that this clause shall pass. I had some doubt as to the propriety of the proviso, as it is somewhat of a novelty in this country. I think this is the only case in which a person charged before a court of summary jurisdiction has the option to demand a trial on indictment for the offence. However, the clause is in the English Act, and I think it is well to have the procedure no more severe here than it is there.

Mr. LAURIER. It is always an inconvenience to have conflicting laws, and I think the hon. gentleman ought to endeavor to have the laws on that subject made uniform instead of exceptional.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is a great deal of force in that view, and I will ask to have the proviso struck out.

On section 10,

Mr. THOMPSON. I had doubts at first as to the right of Parliament to enact a section which treats of the contract of sale, but, on reflection, I am inclined to think it is within our powers. We have, of course, unlimited powers with respect to criminal matters, and this is simply an enactment that when a contract of sale is made it shall imply a guarantee that a crime has not been committed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this is merely a matter of civil rights. The Minister of Justice is not dealing with this criminally at all; he is not dealing with it as an incident of crime, when he declares that a contract made between two parties, where a trade mark is involved, shall have a certain effect, by declaring that the vendor shall be a warrantor that the goods are the goods of the party entitled to use the trade mark. That is clearly a civil right. It is clearly a matter of civil contract, an ordinary matter of sale. Under our constitution, the Local Legislatures, in matters of civil rights, have the right to enact such criminal laws as may be necessary for the proper enforcement of those rights. While the criminal law generally is under our jurisdiction, special offences committed against the jurisdiction and authority or against the public policy of a Local Legislature may be dealt with by the Local Legislature itself. For instance, suppose that a Local Legislature provides for the trial of a general election, and the Province wishes to provide for the protection of the polls and for the punishment of fraudulent votes, clearly it has the power,

Mr. BOWELL.

under the constitution, to give effect to its own legislation and its own policy by criminal enactment. That is specially provided for in the 16th sub-section, and so it would be in a matter of this sort. If a party improperly uses a trade mark, the Local Legislatures may provide that he shall be punished or be held to warrant the goods he sold. That is within their jurisdiction, and it does not seem to me we have the power to extend our jurisdiction over civil matters by undertaking to deal with certain criminal features of it. The Minister would act more in consonance with our rights by abstaining from any legislation of this sort.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have not overlooked any of the points which my hon. friend has urged. They are certainly the views which present themselves on the first examination of the clause, but I cannot agree that the clause is entirely beyond our power. In fact, while I had some doubt on the subject at first, I feel strongly convinced now that the clause is within our power. We are making legislation on the subject of trade marks to this extent: we are declaring that the counterfeiting of a trade mark shall be a forgery; we are going further, we are providing that the goods with fabricated trade marks on them shall be seized by the Customs authorities, and we are therefore depriving the purchaser of his property in those goods and invading to that extent his civil rights. We have a right to go further, and say that the individual whom we have deprived of the right of property in those goods shall have recourse against the vendor, on the principle that the vendor must be taken to have warranted that the crime of forgery was not committed in respect of these trade marks. We have numerous illustrations of the same kind of legislation and of the way in which such legislation may be necessary. Supposing a promissory note were given for the purchase of a vote at a parliamentary election, and that were valid at common law; in the course of our legislation for the prevention of corrupt practices, we certainly not only have the right to punish such a transaction with penalties, but to declare that the civil contract for which the vote was a consideration should be null and void. If we assume that the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors is within our jurisdiction, and we forbid the entrance of intoxicating liquors into, and their sale in the country, we can legislate, with the view of frustrating the sale, that any civil contract made for the purchase of intoxicating liquors shall be null and void. It is with these views that I think the clause is within our jurisdiction; and, if it were doubtful, as I admit it seemed to me at the first blush to be, I would still ask the House to enact this, unless it were clearly beyond our powers, because it can do no practical injury by being enacted. It confers a right in regard to which necessarily litigation must take place for its enforcement, and it will, therefore, come before the courts for adjudication. If the view which I have taken is not upheld, it will be declared beyond our competence, but we should not refuse to enact a provision which is in force in all these other countries, unless it is clear that the clause is without our jurisdiction. If we did not, we would leave ourselves open to the objection that, having undertaken to adopt this convention and having become parties to it, we have omitted the legislation which might be a material part of it, and we might not be entitled to representation at the convention, to be held next year, or to the protection which the trade marks are entitled to in all countries which form the union. For all these reasons, feeling that this can do no harm, even if the view which I take and am strongly convinced of, is not a right one, I think it is wise to pass this section.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) It seems to me that the objection which has been taken has not been answered by the Minister of Justice. The objection, as I understand, is not that by this statute we are creating new offences. We have gone

a step further than we are entitled to go, and have imported into a contract a stipulation, or guarantee, or covenant, which is not placed there under the common law. This section alters the entire import of the contract which the parties have made. It is not, as far as I can see, essential to the purpose of the legislation which is now before us. So far as it was essential, it might be argued that it was within our powers, but here we are going outside of our powers in saying that this contract shall have this additional condition imported into it.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is made criminal.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) That may be all right. I do not understand that my hon. friend called in question any part of the Bill which has that effect. The Bill in regard to this matter says that:

"On the sale or in the contract for the sale of any goods to which a trade mark, or mark or trade description has been applied, the vendor shall be deemed to warrant that the mark is a genuine trade mark, and not forged or falsely applied, or that the trade description is not a false trade description within the meaning of this Act, unless the contrary is expressed in some writing signed by or on behalf of the vendor and delivered at the time of the sale or contract to and accepted by the vendee."

Under the common law, the effect of such a contract would be very different. Here you import a guarantee which is not to be found at common law. You are going beyond your powers, and I feel that it is dangerous for us to adopt such legislation and then to leave to the courts afterwards to determine its constitutionality, unless we are perfectly clear that we are within our powers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). By the 13th clause of the 92nd section of the British North America Act, the Local Legislatures are given jurisdiction over "property and civil rights in the Province." The 15th clause of the same section says:

"The imposition of punishment by fine, penalty, or imprisonment for enforcing any law of the Province made in relation to any matter coming within any of the classes of subjects enumerated in this section."

What are the civil rights? Clearly they are the rights which are regulated by law. It is true that, while generally the Local Legislatures have the right to deal with civil rights, there are certain special civil rights which are left to the jurisdiction of this Legislature. But, as those are named, they are limited. Everything which is not embraced within these specified limits falls within the general provision in regard to civil rights which are controlled by civil law, which the party may act upon so long as he does not interfere with the rights of others. It is clear from the provisions of section 92 of the British North America Act that this Parliament cannot obtain jurisdiction over a subject by declaring that it shall be punishable in a certain sense criminally. If the policy of the law is that the civil right, in order to secure its due enforcement, requires punitive legislation, that belongs, not to this Parliament, but to the Local Legislature; but if the criminal features of the transaction are made the chief features of the legislation, then it falls under the criminal law, and comes within the jurisdiction of this Legislature. The hon. gentleman proposes to deal with this matter from the criminal point of view, and, so far as he has made the criminal features paramount, and has dealt with this fraudulent use of trade marks as a part of the criminal law, I do not object to it; but when he goes beyond that, and infringes on the civil rights of the parties, and provides that persons other than the principals may be affected by the provisions of this Bill, I think he is clearly invading the province of the Local Legislature, and that is exhibited in the provisions of the 17th section, in which he says:

"On the sale or in the contract for the sale of any goods to which a trade mark, or mark or trade description has been applied, the vendor shall be deemed to warrant that the mark is a genuine trade mark."

Suppose the mark is genuine. I ask the hon. gentleman whether he has the right to put the party to the proof? That is not criminal. There has been no criminal offence committed. The use is legitimate, and he proposes to make a provision which in a civil contract, a contract of sale, would put the party to the necessity of proving a certain fact before that sale could be effected. Clearly that cannot be done. The hon. gentleman is creating a limitation upon the existing civil right when he says that a party who has clearly a civil right in regard to a civil contract shall have that right limited in a particular way, and that that right shall not be effected unless a certain fact is established. That is formally an invasion of the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures, and has nothing whatever to do with the criminal law. This Bill cannot be confined to the offender. The hon. gentleman imposes certain penalties on a party who has not violated the law, and he says, unless you do certain things and prove them, your law is inoperative. I think the hon. gentleman will see that this is something which this Legislature cannot do.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and myself entertain very different views as to the extent to which this Parliament can deal with civil rights. In my opinion, when we are in reality, substantially, and in good faith, dealing with matters over which we have jurisdiction, we have a right, in so far as it is, in our judgment, essential to legislate fully on these subjects, to take possession of any subject that is relegated to the Local Legislature, civil rights included. Every time we deal with the subject of criminal law, every time we establish an offence which is not an offence at common law, we deal with the subject of civil rights. Every time we legislate in respect to interest, bills of exchange, or promissory notes, we affect civil procedure and civil rights. We are given power to legislate with respect to these subjects, and the giving of that power implies the power to legislate so fully that it may be necessary for us to take up other subjects which are not given to us at all. Every time we legislate with respect to rivers, harbors or the public domain, with respect to the erection of public buildings, lighthouses, and so on, we take power to expropriate private property, and invade in that way, and necessarily, in the fulfilment of our functions, the domain of civil rights in its very citadel, the rights with respect to real estate in the Provinces. Now, are we doing so here or not? If the hon. member does not agree with me in this view of the constitution, of course I cannot expect to convince him; but if he agrees with me that that is the extent of our powers in legislating over matters which are given to our Parliament, I should hope to convince him that here we are doing nothing more than this: having made this a crime, as we have a right to do; having prevented the importation into the country, as we have a right to do; having prevented the sale in the country, as we have a right to do, we have also a right to nullify a sale, or to attach conditions to the contract of sale. We have a right, even, to say that the making of that contract shall be a crime; we have a right to make that a felony, if we please; we have a right to attach any punishment, capital punishment, if necessary, to the making of that contract.

Mr. EDGAR. But you do not do it.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, we do not do it. We do a little less, but we do what is involved in that principle. Having the right to punish the making of a contract, having the right to declare it invalid, we have surely the right, while we punish parties for having made it, although we do not invalidate it, to attach conditions to it which will give the innocent purchaser a remedy for that in respect to which we have punished him. Now, the hon. gentleman is mistaken, as a matter of argument, in his contention that, in the case of a

purchaser of goods properly paid for, we are putting the proof upon him of his innocence. No question can arise at all unless there has been proof that the trade mark was forged—that the crime was committed; but we are in no respect putting the burden of proof upon him, any more than you are putting it upon me if you accuse me, in any court of justice, of a crime that I did not commit. Every man against whom there is evidence of an offence must be put upon proof that the offence was not committed. But, as I said before, if we were imposing a criminal penalty which might be beyond our power, if we were doing anything by which the subject could be harassed or oppressed, I would think it well to keep far within the limits of our jurisdiction; and so I would say as to any kind of legislation which might have the effect of harassing or distressing the subject. But here we are dealing simply with the party to a fraudulent contract; the party who has committed a forgery, and where the matter must necessarily come before the court for adjudication before an innocent party can get the redress which we are endeavoring to give him. It does seem to me than no injury can result from the adoption of this, even if I am all wrong as to our powers.

Mr. EDGAR. If an ordinary letter relating to the sale of an article which may be trade marked, is brought to a lawyer, and his advice is sought as to the liability of the party on that ordinary letter, with no warning, with no reference whatever to the trade mark, does not the Minister of Justice see how exceedingly unreasonable it would be that he should have to search all over the criminal laws of the Dominion to see if, by accident, some clause might not be inserted creating a contract which does not appear on its face, and when, in respect of that very contract, no criminal liability is attached? It does look to me as if the Minister of Justice were trying, whenever the subject of criminal law is before the House, to reach out in all directions to see if, by any ingenuity, he can bring a civil matter, a civil contract, into such legislation. I cannot imagine that the Minister of Justice would ever think of proposing such a clause in the criminal law of his own motion; but he finds it in a law which is of the nature of a treaty, and which it is considered advisable for this Parliament to pass. But a question of this kind can never have arisen in any of the countries which are concerned, because the Legislatures who enacted it have supreme power on all those questions. Surely it would be far better, if there is nothing essential in the criminal part of this statute to require the contrary, that the Minister of Justice should make the whole statute more nearly within the jurisdiction of this Legislature, by leaving that clause out or modifying it in some way, so that it would be connected with the criminal portion of the Act. Now it is distinct.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. He overlooks one feature of this altogether, because he bases his argument, to a great extent, on the supposition that we are not making the contract an offence. But the hon. gentleman will remember, when I recall it to his attention, that the making of that contract, that is, the contract of sale of fraudulently marked merchandise, is just precisely what we are making it, the committing of a forgery, by this act. Now, having made that a forgery, we say the forger shall be liable, not only to the penalty which we prescribe in this Act, but that his contract shall be voided to the extent of the purchaser being able to recover back the amount of his purchase money.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman, I think, goes further than that. Under the section we are now considering, you are merely determining how far the contract shall be deemed to apply, while the party selling may be perfectly innocent. He may be knowingly selling an article with a trade mark on it, or he may be doing it innocently,

Mr. THOMPSON.

but in any case you are importing into the contract a stipulation which is not there at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. He has committed the offence.

Mr. DAVIES. Not if he does it innocently.

Mr. THOMPSON. He has committed the offence.

Mr. EDGAR. Under what section?

Mr. THOMPSON. Under the section which makes it an offence to sell goods with the false trade mark attached. But we have relieved him from the penalty. If he goes into court and the burden of proof being upon him, proves that he did it innocently, we relieve him of the penalty, but the offence has been committed. The moment he has made this contract of sale, although he has done it innocently, we say the contract shall be practically voided. That is about all we are doing. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) spoke of the difficulty of counsel advising. I do not think that is a practical objection to the legislation. Counsel must be assumed to know the law including the legislation with reference to trade marks, and if there were brought to counsel a letter which constituted the contract of sale and he were asked to put the proper construction on it he would enquire whether that contract related to goods which had trade marks, and if so he would tell his client the conditions attached thereto. The difficulty of searching applies in this no more than in all copy-right legislation, and such legislation is necessary as a matter of public policy.

Mr. LAURIER. I would be disposed to agree at the first blush to the principle which has been laid down by the Minister of Justice; that is to say, when we have power to legislate over matters here we have a consequent power to invade civil rights, in so far as may be necessary to give effect to our legislation. Take the instance given by the Minister himself. We have power to legislate over election matters, and if this Parliament declares that a certain contract shall be a corrupt practice and be treated as such, we, I imagine, have the consequent power to destroy the civil effect of that contract by declaring it to be a corrupt practice and, therefore, within our jurisdiction. But it seems to me that this principle does not apply here. I could understand the reasoning of the Minister if the effect of the clause were to destroy the effect of the civil contract which is made a criminal offence; for instance, to declare that the sale of trade marks relating to spurious articles should be null and void. Then you would destroy the civil effect of the contract. The offence respecting the trade mark would be made a criminal offence, and so the civil offence would be null and void. That is not what is done by this section. The section is not to give effect to our legislation, but it is to import a new element into the contract. Suppose, instead of having our divided legislative power, we had full and paramount power in this House, what would be the effect of this section? The effect would be clearly to enable the party who would be the sufferer to bring a civil action to recover from the vendor damages upon that contract. This is not giving effect to our legislation, but it is importing an altogether foreign element which is not at all a consequence of the civil offence.

Committee reported.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to ask the Minister of Justice whether the Government have considered the suggestion which I made the other day, or which I submitted for a third party, touching the time at which this Act will be proclaimed?

Mr. THOMPSON. I did consider the matter, and I am convinced the writer of the letter misunderstood the purport of the Bill, because there can be no reason for delaying bringing this Act into force in so far as inconveniencing

persons making importations is concerned. The importation of improperly trade-marked goods is fully forbidden by the present law, so that if this Act were not in force the present law would apply.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SPEEDY TRIALS ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 93) further to amend the Speedy Trials Act, chap. 175 of the Revised Statutes.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. THOMPSON. I desire further to make this Act applicable to British Columbia. This has been requested by the Judiciary there and by the Provincial Government. I propose to provide that in the Province of British Columbia the judges shall be the Chief Justice or a Puisné Judge of the Supreme Court or a Judge of the County Court.

On section 2,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That certainly is not the Bill before us.

Mr. THOMPSON. It merely makes it applicable to British Columbia, at a request received from there after I introduced the Bill.

On section 3,

Mr. THOMPSON. It is precisely the same as in the existing Act, the words added being "British Columbia."

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC PRINTING AND STATIONERY.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved second reading of Bill (No. 60) to amend chapter 27 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery. He said: It is a matter of mere detail and can be explained in committee. The first section gives to the clerk of the Printing Committee of both Houses the performing of the duties which in the Act formerly was given to the Clerk of the House or the Clerk of the Senate. It is proposed that the orders to be given to the Printing Department should be, first, by the deputy heads of each department; second, by the Clerk of each House; and third, for the common printing of both Houses, by the Joint Committee of Printing or by their clerk. The second section only changes the old Bill, in exempting from the necessity of an order of the department the stationery and books which are supplied to penitentiaries by chaplains, prayer and school books, and for books of the Library, which was an oversight in the former Bill. The third section settles the salary of the the Queen's Printer as a deputy head. The importance of the situation and the new duties which will devolve upon the Queen's Printer have decided the Government to make him a deputy Minister in the full sense of the word; meaning salary as well as position. When it is known that the Queen's Printer will control an expenditure, left to his own personal supervision, of over \$400,000 or \$500,000, we have considered that his duties would entitle him to the salary of a deputy Minister. The fourth section is as to the right to appoint in the printing office, officers, by the Superintendent of Printing, who shall not be necessarily members of the Civil Service. We want to make that printing department really a commercial department. When I say "commercial" I don't want to say the Government will engage in trading, but that the depart-

ment will be conducted on a commercial basis, that is to say, the officers there and employes will not be subjected to the provisions of the Civil Service—for instance, working from half-past nine to four o'clock. The Superintendent of Printing said: "I want my men to work like myself, beginning at eight, and finishing their work at six o'clock." The fifth section says that the pay-lists for the officers may be made fortnightly as well as monthly. The sixth section is only continuing the provisions of the first section, that is to say, defining the duties of the clerks of both Houses, of the deputy chiefs of the departments, and of the joint clerk of the Printing Committee to give the orders to the printing and stationery department. The seventh section is a consequence of the preceding one, and the last provides that the auditor may take stock annually instead of quarterly as in an ordinary commercial office. These are the only provisions in this Bill.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I move to add, after the words "the clerk of the Joint Committee of the two Houses on Printing," the words "or other officer specially designated by that committee."

Mr. EDGAR. This section makes a decided change in the discipline of this House. I understand that all the subordinate clerks, including the clerk of the Printing Committee, are under the control of the Clerk of this House and subject to his discipline. This secures uniformity of action and avoids interference by outsiders with the affairs of this House, because, perhaps, Ministers may sometimes be called outsiders with regard to the affairs of this House. I have no reason to suppose that the present efficient clerk of the Printing Committee would cease to be an efficient officer, but we do not know how soon he may be superseded or retired, and I think it may be a serious thing to interfere with the control of an important functionary like the clerk of the Printing Committee.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is no difference in that respect. The discipline of the House will be preserved. The clerk of the Printing Committee will be under the clerk of the House, as usual. But in giving orders for the printing work of the Session, he is not more under the control of the clerk of the House now than he will be under this Bill. The committee is a joint committee of both Houses, and the orders given by the joint committee are orders given both by the Senate and the House of Commons, and his duties provided for in this clause are only to give the orders required for printing and printing paper during the Session. There is no abrogation of the rule, and certainly no usurpation of power.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I notice that for some days you, Sir (Mr. Rykert) have had to discharge the duties of Deputy Speaker, and it does seem to me rather extraordinary that we should have a Deputy Speaker at a very considerable salary, and that for at least a fortnight he has not been here. I think, Sir, that while we have this Bill under consideration, it would be a very important duty on the part of the Administration to tell us why the business of the House is not conducted in accordance with the provisions of the law. The hon First Minister sometime ago provided that there should be a Deputy Speaker, and that those duties should not be undertaken by an ordinary member of the House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Is the hon. member in order?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is the very question of order, the irregularity of these proceedings, about which I am

making these observations. I am not at all objecting to your fitness, Mr. Chairman, under ordinary circumstances; but I am asking the Government how it is that the ordinary proceedings of the House have been interfered with, and this irregular mode of procedure adopted under existing circumstances?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that discussion is altogether out of order. We are discussing a certain Bill, and are considering the first clause of that Bill. What has that to do with the Deputy Speaker? I really cannot see. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman information respecting the absence of the Deputy Speaker. I presume he has a good reason for being absent, or he would be here, just as the Minister of Railways has a good reason for being absent. I have no doubt that the regularity of the proceedings, or the legality of the measure we may pass with the hon. member for Lincoln in the Chair, will not be disputed. The hon. gentleman may dispute it, because he is in a disputatious humor sometimes, but I do not think the courts will say that the measure we may pass through committee is in any way affected by the absence of the Deputy Speaker. As the hon. gentleman has brought up the matter, I will cause enquiry to be made, and ascertain whether his absence may be due to ill-health or to some other reason.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to say that I am serious in my proposition. The hon. gentleman knows right well that this House could not proceed with business in the absence of the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker. There is a certain regular and proper mode of procedure required. The Speaker is required to be in the Chair when the House is conducting business. The House undertook to amend the Rules, and provided that there should be a Deputy Speaker, who should take the Chair in the absence of the Speaker, and should take the Chair when the House went into committee. That change was made at the instance of the hon. First Minister. Now, the Deputy Speaker is absent, and an ordinary member of the House is called on to take the Chair and discharge his duties. This may have been a regular proceeding before we created that office; I do not question that at all; but we amended the law at the instance of the hon. First Minister, who told us that it was quite unfair to call on an ordinary member to be constantly here to discharge those duties. The hon. gentleman now undertakes to treat the matter as a huge joke. If it is, his Bill is a huge joke, and the charge upon the public Treasury is a huge joke.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must say I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is a little unreasonable in this matter. It is well known that it has become the practice and the habit of this House to allow the servants of the House, when important political exigencies demand their absence in the interests of the party, to leave the House, and go and attend to those interests. We know that within a very recent date three officers were punished by dismissal for leaving their duties and going to speak at political meetings. The hon. First Minister would imply that ill-health is the cause of the absence of the Deputy Speaker. I think I can give my hon. friend a better reason than that. I understand that the deputy is in Missisquoi at this moment, aiding in the contest there for the Local House. I do not know what course may be taken by the House, but if the House is consistent with itself, and the hon. gentleman does his duty in this case having discharged the Messrs Tremblay and Poirier for taking part in political elections while in the pay of the House, if it is proved that the Deputy Speaker at this moment is in Missisquoi with the view of carrying the flag in triumph to the Local House of Quebec, surely my right hon. friend will feel it his duty, or the Secretary of State will feel it his duty, following out the rule he has laid down and the precedent he established the

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

other night, to ask for the dismissal of Mr. Colby from his position of Deputy Speaker. At all events, if we can afford to have him absent from the House, his pay should not be inserted in the Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is fair to bring up this discussion while the hon. gentleman is absent. I may explain that on Thursday evening the Deputy Speaker told me he had very important personal business to attend to at home, and asked me, as a favor, if I would allow him to go home. I did not think at the time that his absence would cause this awkward constitutional point to be raised, and I thought that in giving him leave I was only imposing on myself the obligation of remaining in the Chair nearly all the time, and that my personal discomfort would alone be the result. I told the Deputy Speaker, therefore, that I had certainly no objection to his leaving. I understand he arrived here last night and is now in the city, but that he is tired and unwell or he would be with us to-day.

Mr. IVES. He has not been in Missisquoi at all.

Mr. LAURIER. I am only too glad to accept the statement of the Speaker that the Deputy Speaker was absent on private affairs. Otherwise I would agree with the hon. member for Northumberland that his conduct was outrageous in absenting himself to go electioneering, and there would be but one voice in this House on both sides to condemn his action. I may be pardoned for bringing to the notice of the Speaker and the House the fact that several officers of this House, not later than last Saturday, were on the hustings in the county of Missisquoi.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not aware of the fact, and no officer has been given a *congé* for that purpose.

Mr. LAURIER. I quite believe that no officer would dare go to you, Sir, and ask leave to go to Missisquoi in order to electioneer against the Liberal party; but still it appears that officers did go there, and did electioneer, without asking your permission. I have been told, by parties who were present, that translators of this House—not Mr. Poirier or either of the Tremblays—but general translators of this House, were on the hustings last Saturday in Missisquoi.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am very sorry my inoffensive little Bill has been the cause of so much trouble.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend ought to be glad that I brought this to his notice, because he is rather touchy on that point.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend wants to make an impression on the House, and takes the occasion of my Printing Bureau Bill to do so. I must say with regard to his last remark, as I was one of those who brought before the House the matter of officers dealing disrespectfully—personally—and discourteously with the members of this House, that his remarks do not alter the position which I then took and which the House endorsed; and if he or any of his friends will show that any one of the officers of this House has behaved on the hustings in a discourteous manner or interfered with the action of members of this House, such officer ought certainly to be punished. To come back to my Bill, I move that the amendment I suggested should be carried.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has not given any reason why the committee should be empowered to appoint any other officer than the clerk of the committee to do the work which was assigned to the clerk of the committee.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is at the request of the Printing Committee, a delegation of which asked me to give them this power.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 3,

Mr. EDGAR. What is the object of this ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have stated that the Queen's Printer is a deputy head, and now that the establishment of the printing office is an accomplished fact, he is entitled to the salary of a deputy head. Last year that was objected to because the bureau was not then organised.

Mr. LAURIER. Who is the Superintendent of Stationery ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Young, who is, unfortunately very sick, and who will likely have to be superannuated. By the next clause we ask power to name the Superintendent of Printing, the Superintendent of Stationery and the Chief Accountant at a lower class, if the Government think fit, should it be necessary at any time to make new appointments.

Mr. LAURIER. Who is the Superintendent of Printing ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. André Senécal is the Superintendent of Printing and Mr. Gliddon is the Accountant, the latter an old officer of the department.

Mr. EDGAR. In section 4, the person selected to be Superintendent of Printing must have five years' experience in Canada. Is the choice to be restricted to Canada ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose to take away the words "in Canada." We might have some very good printers from the United States; and we have taken away the word "management" in the sixth line because a man might not be a manager and still be a very good man for the position.

On section 4,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We want the Superintendent of Printing to appoint officers irrespective of Civil Service rules. This is for the good and practical management of the printing office.

Mr. EDGAR. I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman has left out the words "skilled hands."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection to restore those words.

On section 6,

Mr. EDGAR. I see that the Clerk of the House is still to furnish estimates.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Clerk of the House and the Clerk of the Senate will give the necessary orders for each House, as in the departments the orders are given for each department, and the clerk of the Printing Committee will give the order for the printing and printing paper required for both Houses.

On section 7,

Mr. EDGAR. The former provision was that the Auditor General should check the accounts quarterly; now it is annually—why is that change made ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The stock on hand will be so large as to devolve upon the Auditor and the other officers work which it is unnecessary to repeat three times in the year, and this clause has been inserted at the special demand of the skilled officer of the department, with the assent of the Auditor himself, and we know that the Auditor does not shrink from the responsibility of keeping the accounts close.

Bill reported.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No 106) further to amend the Indian Act.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I notice that the sixteenth and seventeenth lines are new. Under the statute as it stood, the half-breeds were allowed to withdraw from the treaty on their own motion, without any consent being required from the Indian Commissioner, or the Assistant Indian Commissioner. I see also that the two last lines of the section are new also, which embrace in the withdrawal the minor unmarried children. Has it been found necessary, in the interest of the half-breeds, to take away from them the power of determining for themselves when they shall withdraw, and putting this into the hands of the Indian Commissioner ?

Mr. EDGAR. It seems to me that the withdrawal is to be surrounded with a great many difficulties. He has to signify his desire in writing, and that has to be sworn to and witnessed before two men. In addition, he has got to get the consent of the Indian Commissioner. What is the object of all that ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Many of the half-breeds have been accounted as Indians, because they have lived with a band for some time. When scrip is given to the half-breeds, they all become white men in order to get it. Then they withdraw from the white men to get the advantage of the annuities, and then they want to get back into the band again. Having received their scrip as white men, and having expended it, they want to get back into the treaty again, to be considered Indians once more, and to receive their share of the annuities and supplies given to the Indians. We wish to prevent them moving from one stage to another, from being half-breeds now, then being Indians, and back again to be half-breeds, it, perhaps, being forgotten that they previously got scrip. To prevent this we provide that there shall be a consent given in writing by the Indian Commissioner. There is also, at the end of the clause, a provision that such withdrawal shall include the minor or unmarried children of such half-breeds—the children shall go with the parents.

Mr. EDGAR. All these new restrictions are to prevent them from getting out of the treaty. The old restrictions are in the first part of the clause, which prevent them getting anything except under special circumstances to be determined by the Superintendent General, or his agent. Now, the difficulty the Minister is trying to get over, apparently, is to prevent them getting out of the treaty.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With a knowledge of all the facts of the case.

Mr. WATSON. I would ask if many half-breeds or Indians are asking to get back into the treaty again ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not sufficiently aware to be able to state positively; but I have little doubt that a great deal of inconvenience has been caused by the half-breeds wasting their scrip and going back to the band, and then, by-and-bye, in a year or two, leaving the band again and becoming white men, and setting up a new claim for a second grant of scrip. In order to prevent any fraud of this kind, this provision is inserted. I think the hon. gentleman will see it is very necessary.

Mr. WATSON. I think it is very necessary, because it has been reported to me, in fact I know it is the case, that

a large number of Indians were advised to take scrip by speculators.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so.

Mr. WATSON. In fact I have been given to understand—I cannot prove it, of course—than an Indian agent benefited to the extent of \$10 a piece on every Indian that he could advise to get out of the treaty and to take scrip. He advised these Indians that if they applied for scrip they would get it at that time, but that if they waited for two or three years the chances were that the Government would wipe out this annuity altogether, and they would receive nothing at the end of that time; and unless they received scrip before July, 1887, they would not be entitled to scrip at all. It was done for that purpose, and also for the purpose of placing these Indians on the voters' lists. A great number of these Indians were placed on the voters' lists during the local elections in Manitoba. The Indians I refer to particularly now, are the Indians around Lake Manitoba, and the name of the agent who has been reported to me as advising these people to get out of the treaty, is Martineau.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Is he agent now?

Mr. WATSON. He is agent still, I believe.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will enquire about that.

Mr. WATSON. There is quite a number of those Indians that are not fit to go out of the treaty. They have spent all they received for their scrip, and they are now in a destitute state. I have no doubt that they are now, as the Minister stated, anxious to get back into the treaty and to get their little annuity when the paymaster comes round. These people should never have gone out of the treaty at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think every case of that sort is a proper subject for enquiry, and that where land so acquired is still held by the speculators, it should be resumed by the Crown. In every case where scrip has been obtained, and land obtained on that scrip by the speculators, it ought to be resumed by the Crown, and the Indians ought to be allowed to come back.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But the Indians should not be allowed to belong to the Indian band, and then, simply for the purpose of acquiring the right to vote, be permitted to leave the band by the permission of the Indian agent, and then allowed to resume their positions as Indians again. If they are entitled to vote as Indians, they ought to have a vote, in Manitoba, as well as elsewhere, and not evade the law. As I understand my hon. friend, this has been done in the local elections in Manitoba. But, in any case, it seems to me that if the person desires to withdraw and does withdraw, he should give reasons for it; and now, when power is taken from him to get out upon his own request, and leave is given him by the Indian Commissioner, it seems to me he should remain out. I see by the first part of the clause that only on very special circumstances can he re-enter, but then it is possible that the Government might consider some case of that kind as a special circumstance that would warrant him in being reinstated when it was not special. Not having full confidence in the Government, I consider this is giving them too much power.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, when a change takes place and when my hon friend becomes Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, I shall have every confidence in his attending to the matter honestly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I shall be sold, then.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that where an Indian agent has persuaded the Indians to leave the band, and has speculated out of the change, that agent should be dismissed, but I do not think the Indians ought to be punished by

Mr. WATSON.

exclusion. The Government have acted upon the principle that the Indians are minors, and of course they could not hold them responsible to the same extent that other parties are held. If he is holding land himself, that is good reason for treating him as an emancipated Indian, and leaving him in possession of the land; but where the land has gone into the hands of speculators on scrip given to the Indians, it seems to me the proper course is for the Crown to cancel the scrip, to resume possession of the land, and ignore the party who has acquired the land altogether. It is a fraud upon the Crown, and there ought not to be for one moment any hesitation in refusing to recognise any claim so obtained.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, of course, upon the fraud being proven the scrip should be cancelled, and the cancelled land, if possible, reclaimed. This clause, however, does not apply to Indians at all, emancipated or otherwise; it applies to half breeds. The hon. member who was Minister of the Interior and managed the Indian Department knows perfectly well that the line between a pure blooded Indian and a half breed is very indistinct. If an Indian has some white blood in him he remains an Indian, and remains in the band until it becomes an advantage to him to say that he is a white man and not an Indian. I take it that a very considerable percentage of Indians, even in the North-West, are not pure Indians; they are considered to be Indians, but they are really half-breeds, having white blood in them. These men, having expended their substance, having thrown away their land into the hands of speculators, now want to get back to their former position. I hope the hon. gentleman was misinformed when he said that an Indian agent or a land agent had connived with speculators in regard to dealings in Indian lands, and it is a matter that will be enquired into. I have no doubt that every Indian with the slightest pretence to have white blood in his veins claimed to be a white man, and on their establishing that they had white blood they came under the law and became entitled to scrip. Now their complexions are dark and they are full-blooded Indians again, and they want to go back to their former position, for the reasons mentioned by the hon. gentleman, and we must have a check on them in that regard, and this must be done only by the consent, not of a subordinate, but of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, or the Assistant Superintendent.

Mr. WATSON. It is very difficult to find full-blooded Indians in Manitoba. Among the Indians around Lake Manitoba and those on the St Peter Reserve, I question if there is one full-blooded Indian in either of the bands. I hold that an Indian agent or any person entrusted with the care of the wards of the Government, who has done wrong, should be punished; but so far as the cancellation of lands is concerned, they might have been purchased by scrip obtained from Indians originally and resold to innocent parties, and it would be unfair to cancel lands purchased by this scrip. I do not bring it in the form of a charge, although I make the statement on my responsibility as a member of this House, that it has been reported to me on very good authority that an Indian agent did advise Indians to take scrip and that he received some consideration for giving that advice. I hope the Government will enquire into the matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. I think, moreover, there will be sufficient evidence to back up my statement. The parties who should be punished are those who have thus advised the Indians and not innocent individuals who have purchased lands with scrip originally obtained from Indians. No doubt the Indians were led to believe they had as much right to vote as white men in the local elections in Manitoba, and they were so advised by the men who expected to

get their votes. They did vote, but the spectacle presented at the polling place was very disgraceful. Indians walked up to the polls, and on being asked their name did not know it, they did not know what name was put on the voters' list. They were afterwards told their names by the persons interested in the election of a certain candidate, and they were told how to vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What was your majority?

Mr. WATSON. They did not vote in the Dominion elections in Manitoba. This was in the local elections; and I may say that a candidate who received 19 majority of the intelligent electors was defeated by 58 majority by this particular Indian vote. Some of them, no doubt, were intelligent men, but a large number of them were men whose names should never have been placed on the voters' list. So much is the case that the Local Government of Manitoba have seen fit, under the new Election Act which they are preparing, to disfranchise all Indians, or at least to provide that an Indian must have been outside the reservation and independent of the Government for three years before he shall be entitled to vote. This is done so that Indians who have come out from the treaty a year or a year and a half or two years ago shall not be entitled to vote. The intention is to give them time to become sufficiently well acquainted with the questions of the day to be able to give an intelligent vote, before they are given the privilege.

On section 2,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This and the next three sections seem to be new provisions of the law, and they seem to be necessary. Has there been no provision in the Indian Act to cover this point before?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. EDGAR. These provisions are very much the same as those contained in the Ontario Land Act. The seventh sub-section of this Bill makes provision that deeds shall be registered in the office of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. In Ontario and in Provinces where there are registry offices the ordinary registry laws should be made to apply, and in Ontario, in case of sales by the sheriff for taxes, there is a provision in the law that the deeds shall be registered within six months, and thus priority is preserved. It is unfortunate to make separate provision with respect to time and place for registering title-deeds in Provinces where there are registry laws now in operation.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is discretionary with the Superintendent General whether he will recognise certain conveyances, and it is quite necessary to provide that no person shall have a right to call upon him to exercise that discretion. The registration must be done within two years.

On section 3,

Mr. LISTER. I would like to ask, is it the intention of the Government under this Act to provide for cases now being examined into by a commission respecting the right of Indians to participate in Indian lands and annuities? I understand that the Chippewa tribe, and I believe other tribes, are very much exercised on account of a certain investigation which is being proceeded with by the Inspector of Indian Agencies throughout the western part of Ontario. Any person who has had dealings with the Indians knows that they are of a very suspicious nature, and this investigation to which I refer has created the greatest possible uneasiness among the Indian bands of western Ontario. Under the Treaty of 1827 made between the Government and the Indians, whereby the Indians relinquished to the Government the land, and in return were secured certain reserves and an annuity to them and their descendants for all time to come, this treaty was signed

only by a few members of the band, the chief, and I think some eighteen of the others. Since 1827 those people have been in receipt of annuities from the Government and have been in occupation of the land upon those reserves. At that time there were Indians living with the Chippewa band, who were, strictly speaking, not members of the band, but who were recognised as members, and whose children and grandchildren living on the reserves have been participating in the annuities ever since that time. At that time the Pottawattamies were living with the Chippewas and became mixed with them. It appears now that some people say that they should not participate in the annuity. I may say to all intents and purposes they have more Chippewa blood than original Pottawattamies blood. It appears that a complaint has been made that they should be excluded from the same privileges as the Chippewa Indians, and this is the investigation which is going on among the Indians. Suspicious as they are, they believe the scheme is set on foot for depriving them of the lands on which they were born, and which they were told belonged to them, and for depriving them of their share of annuity moneys. I may inform the Government of a fact that perhaps they are not aware of, although I believe they are desirous of acting fairly in every way with the Indians. The great majority of the Indians on this reserve are unquestionably entitled to be called Chippewa Indians, and the band have passed resolutions acquiescing in the claims of those so-called foreign Indians and requesting that those proceedings should not be continued. But, in the face of this resolution, and in the face of this action on the part of the principal men of the tribe, those proceedings are being continued. I think it is very unfortunate indeed, in the face of the action by those Indians themselves, that this investigation should go on. It can result in no good, for the Indians are willing that those people who have intermarried with their tribe and who have been recognised and looked upon as Chippewas in every sense of the word, should be allowed to participate in the rights and privileges of the Chippewas. I desire to bring this matter before the attention of the First Minister, and I may say that I have petitions and affidavits here proving the statement that I make.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The subject that the hon. gentleman has just alluded to does not come within the provisions of the Bill, and I see he has availed himself of the opportunity, when we were discussing a measure relating to the Indians, to bring the matter up. This is a question I was formerly familiar with when I was Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. It is a very difficult question. The original Chippewas allowed the Pottawattamies to come among them. They allowed them certain privileges and they intermarried; but now a portion of the original Chippewas have pretended that they have no rights at all, and that they only afforded to the Pottawattamies Indian hospitality while among them. That is the story they have given. I know that the Chippewas, at least a portion of them, and I do not know how many, instead of being willing that the Pottawattamies should be recognised as the original Chippewas, have themselves complained some years ago when I was head of the department. I presume that to-day the Superintendent had those papers before him and he caused an enquiry to be made into it. If the Chippewas withdraw their demands for investigation into the position of the Pottawattamies, of course there is an end to the whole affair, but I fancy that is not the case. I fancy that they are still pressing. However, I will take an opportunity to enquire into it. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that, so far as I can judge at present, those Pottawattamies, after mixing with the original Chippewas for so many years and intermingling their blood, that it is quite impossible now to oust them out of their

houses which they and their fathers before them have occupied.

Mr. LISTER. The great-grandchildren of some of them are there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman is quite right in that regard.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will ask the hon. gentleman, while on the subject, although not relevant to the Bill, whether that enquiry extends to the disputes between the Munceys of Caradoc and Pottawattamies, and whether they are within the purview of this commission?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it does not.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice on section 3, to the fact that this clause is new from the word "taxation," in the fourth line, and provides for Indian lands which have been surrendered being liable to taxation. I should judge that was right. There is, however, an exception made against the Crown and any Indian locating on the land. I wish to ask why the exception is made as regards an Indian being located upon it? It is surrendered land; it is no longer a portion of the reserve at all, and any Indian living on surrendered land seems to me to be in the same position as other citizens, and that the land that is occupied by him would be liable to taxation the same as the adjacent land held by a white person; that it should contribute its share of taxation towards repairing roads, the maintenance of bridges, and the other municipal purposes for which adjacent property is taxed. Why is exemption given to an Indian if he ceases to be an Indian and lives on surrendered land?

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. member has correctly stated the meaning of the clause. There is a reason for the land not being taxed as against the Crown, and the intention of the draftsmen evidently was that in making the liberal extension which we have by this Bill to the right of taxation by municipal authorities, we should prevent the Indian who is our ward upon those lands being ousted as the result of taxation. I would not object to that, I think it is right and as the Minister says it is a liberal provision which is being made in favor of the municipalities, but is an Indian living on surrendered land really in the full sense of the term, a ward of the Government or not? I know he has not become an enfranchised Indian, but still he is not living on the reserve.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume he may be held to be living on the reserve. The Indians surrender the title to the Crown, so that a certain portion of the land can be disposed of for their benefit. Until it is sold it is *de facto* a portion of the reserve, and the Indians live on it; but having surrendered the legal title to the Crown, when any portion is disposed of, the Indians have to leave it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is a good deal of force in that. They might be living there after the land has been surrendered, and any white person purchasing would purchase it knowing that that difficulty was in the way.

On section 4,

Mr. EDGAR. I see that, apart from some verbal changes, the chief change in this section seems to be that non-treaty Indians are proposed to be taken out of the class who are protected by the law from having intoxicants sold to them. The words "non-treaty Indians" are left out of that portion of the section. According to the Interpretation Act, a non-treaty Indian is not covered by the word "Indian," so that this must be a distinct change of policy, and I do not think it can be meant; it must be a mistake.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The word "non-treaty" should be in; it is an omission.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another point on which I would like to have some information through the First Minister or the Minister of Justice. I observe that in the Province of Manitoba and the Province of British Columbia, on the evidence of the informer alone, if he is a credible person, two justices of the peace can sentence any person accused of giving liquor to Indians to no less than six months imprisonment with hard labor and a fine of \$300. It appears to me that is putting in the hands of two justices of the peace an extremely large discretion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it has operated unhappily. In the North-West, the hon. gentleman knows that population is very sparse.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But it is not the North-West alone that is concerned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In Manitoba the population is almost as sparse, and in British Columbia, where there is a great deal of liquor drinking among the Indians flocking from the mountains, if there is to be any protection at all, a single witness must be sufficient. If it is necessary to have two witnesses, there will be very few convictions. And then, we have the power of pardoning in case there is any suspicion of injustice. Although the statute is more rigid than we would like to have it in the more settled parts of the country, in the interests of quiet and order the people on the confines of civilisation must submit to it. The fine is heavy, but the profits made by the men engaged in smuggling are enormous, and unless the punishment is exceedingly severe, the introduction of intoxicants cannot be prevented. The profits are so great that, notwithstanding this severe statute, there is an enormous amount of smuggling, and great quantities of spirits have been seized and destroyed, and the smugglers have been properly punished. We have had no complaints of any injustice having been done by the measure, and if there had been any, I think I would have heard of them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is quite true up to the present time, but the Province of Manitoba in particular is becoming much more densely inhabited than the North-West Territories, and it is to be hoped that that Province will speedily become very much more densely populated than it is at present. The hon. gentleman will notice that the objection I take is not to police magistrates, or judges, or stipendiary magistrates having this power. It is simply to two justices of the peace, and he must know as well as I that justices of the peace are in many cases appointed without any great regard to their judicial skill or attainments. I have known justices of the peace who, having such a statute, would feel themselves obliged to commit anybody, even the hon. gentleman himself, on the evidence of any person who came before them. It is quite true that the power may not have been abused up to the present time, but I am speaking of the chance of danger in the future. I do not know the extent to which justices of the peace are appointed in Manitoba, but I have known counties where every fourth man was a justice of the peace.

Mr. BARRON. I suggest that there ought to be the power of appeal from the two justices of the peace. I do not think it would be right to give the power of conviction to them without appeal, especially when they can convict on the testimony of one witness.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Act provides for an appeal. It is perfectly true that some of the magistrates cannot be very fit for their duties. My experience of the decisions of unpaid magistrates in the country is that they are more liable to let people off than to enforce the law with

great severity. The complaint generally is that they do not inflict the law with sufficient promptness or severity.

Mr. DAVIN. I may add, for the information of the committee, that in the case of persons charged with selling liquor to Indians there are always circumstances attending the sale that make up really a very strong case. Those persons are generally engaged in bartering with the Indians, from whom they get goods, such as furs and other goods, at such low rates that the business is very profitable. The Indians, once they get a few glasses of whiskey, will sell their furs for a hundredth part of what they are really worth, and hence it is necessary that a severe penalty should be inflicted, and that justice should be sharp and quick in order to prevent the Indians being tampered with.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In the old clause these words are found: "Or causes or procures the same to be done, or attempts the same, or connives thereat—" that is, furnishing Indians with intoxicants. I would like to know whether leaving these words out, the law will reach persons who would buy liquor for the Indians with the money of the Indians. For instance, an Indian enters a town; he cannot go to a merchant and buy liquor himself, but he may get some disreputable white man, and give him the money to go and purchase the liquor for him. That person purchases the liquor from the merchant and then brings it to the Indian. The old section would cover this case, but I question whether the new section will.

Mr. THOMPSON. The words "supplies or gives" cover the case.

Mr. WATSON. I was going to suggest that it would be in the interest of the general public to have such a clause as the one which the Minister has given. It would be necessary in Manitoba, because we are not provided with all first-class justices of the peace in that country. We have some justices of the peace there who are not fit for the position at all. A year or two ago, about every other man was a justice of the peace. Every other man expected to be in the employ of the Dominion or the Local Government, and if there was no other position for him, he was made a justice of the peace. I called the attention of the First Minister, when he was at the head of Indian Affairs, to the importance of having some mounted police on the northern portion of Lake Manitoba, because a great number of Indians secure liquor from the traders who go there and who give whiskey in exchange for fish, &c. This is doing a great deal of harm, and one or two mounted policemen should be stationed at some point where they could watch those traders and follow them up. The trouble with us is that there are not enough informers. Even their share of the fine does not induce them to inform, and in many cases the liquor is furnished by a third person. Men are known to make a living by simply waiting for the Indians, then taking their money and buying whiskey for them. Liquor is doing an immense amount of injury to the Indians throughout Manitoba. The settlement of the country is bringing the Indians in contact with the whites, and the Indians are becoming very much degraded through the influence of liquor, and the Government cannot be too strict in dealing with people who furnish the Indians with intoxicants. I thoroughly approve of the penalty, and would willingly see it increased.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the law will be much plainer if we would insert the words of the old section to which I drew the hon. gentleman's attention. The question might arise as to whether a disreputable white person, who purchased liquor with the Indian's money, could be said to have supplied or given the liquor. It might be argued that as it was the Indian's money with which the liquor was paid for, the liquor was at no time the property of the white man who bought it, and that the white man

simply procured the liquor for the Indian. I think the words of the old clause would leave no room for doubt "Causes or procures the same to be done, or attempts the same or connives thereat."

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no doubt the clause does cover the case the hon. gentleman refers to, but I have no objection to add those words in order to make assurance doubly sure.

Mr. BARRON. The Act provides that no appeal shall lie from the fourteen sections next proceeding except to a judge. That appears to assume that there is an appeal under the Summary Convictions Act, but I understand that that appeal is only from one justice of the peace and not from two, and I do not think this section meets the case, because, under this Bill, the hon. gentleman is introducing an appeal from two justices.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have always acted upon that.

On section 5,

Mr. EDGAR. What is the intention of this?

Mr. THOMPSON. There is general legislation by which, where the disposition of a fine is not specially designated in the Act, it is to go to the Indian fund. It has been considered desirable that, in the Province of British Columbia, we should give the fines to the provincial authorities, the Provincial Government undertaking the administration of justice under this Act.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the Minister of Justice prepared to make any statement in regard to the Supreme Court Bill, which he said was urgent, and he intended to proceed with at once?

Mr. THOMPSON. I would have moved the Bill a further stage to-day, but I understood it would be objected to unless it was printed, and it does not appear on the Order Paper as having been printed, and, therefore, I have not moved it. Unless the Bill were passed to-day, we could not give the notice to those who are engaged in sufficient time, and I am afraid that, as it did not meet with unanimous approval, we shall have to abandon it.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY—CABLE BETWEEN PELEE ISLAND AND THE MAINLAND.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BRIEN. I desire to occupy a few moments, because some additional information has come to my hands of late in regard to a matter which, I believe, the Government have now under consideration, that is, in regard to laying a cable between Pelee Island and the mainland. I believe members on both sides of the House are willing to facilitate this work, and the Government have already a vast amount of information as to the necessity of this submarine cable. Every day there is some further evidence coming forward as to the necessity of this cable being laid. It is not so much a matter of local importance as it is a national question. It is of great interest to all those who are engaged in navigation, and a vast amount of shipping passes through the narrow channel between Pelee Island and the mainland, which is interspersed with reefs and shoals, making it very

dangerous to navigation. Petition after petition has been placed in the hands of the Government, representing the case pretty fully, but so far we have not any definite information as to the conclusion the Government have come to. The people in that section will be very much disappointed, and all those who are engaged in navigation will be seriously disappointed if that cable is not laid immediately. Life and property are in danger. Several wrecks occurred there during last year. I cannot do better than read a letter which I received lately from a captain who is sailing upon the water in that section during most of his time:

"KINGSVILLE, March 5th, 1838.

"DEAR SIR,—Yours of the 29th February at hand, and contents fully noted. During the time I have been on the waters, I have become more acquainted with the waters at the head of Lake Erie, especially around Pelee Island. All the boats that pass through the Detroit River go between Pelee Island and Pelee Point, which is the natural channel. But you will remember that there are reefs extending north-east, from one to two miles from the north-east point on Pelee Island, which render it very dangerous to navigation. These reefs are called the Middle Grounds. Any boats getting on these reefs are plainly visible from the Island, and greatly exposed to all north-easterly and easterly gales, and a place that all mariners dread on account of there being no communications near by. In 1837 I relieved two steamers from the reefs, happening to see them from the Island. Again in 1837, three other crafts went to pieces near Pelee, over on Point Pelee, a distance of 7 miles from Pelee Island, and is visible from Pelee. The other two went to pieces on the south-west point on Pelee Island. In 1836 the big schooner *Maggy McCray* went ashore on the west side of Pelee Island and would undoubtedly have been dashed to pieces if I had not just happened to be passing with my boat, and released her just before another big gale came up. The captain was making arrangements to row from Pelee to main shore to telegraph for assistance, and would have had to do so had I not happened to be around. The life of Captain Duich might have been saved if there had been any communication to the Island. At that time my boat was lying at Kingsville, and could undoubtedly have saved him if I had known it, and a great many other wrecks I could mention if it be necessary. Now, Sir, the loss of life and property is more or less due to the want of communication between Pelee Island and main shore. I would beg of you not to leave anything undone that would press on the minds of the authorities that there is great necessity of a cable being laid between mainland and Pelee Island. Besides what I have mentioned, it adds greatly to the convenience of the Island. Hoping to hear of a success of a cable being laid, I remain,

"Yours respectfully,

"CAPT. N. J. WIGLE,

"Kingsville, Ont.

"J. BRIEN, M.P.,

"House of Commons, Canada."

Any further information than this is scarcely necessary for the Government, I think. The estimated cost of this work would be only some \$7,000 or \$8,000; and that amount of property would be saved in one season. Now, considering the dangerous character of that coast, and the importance of that section of the country, the large interests at stake, and considering that the Government are taking every possible means, and very laudably so, to facilitate navigation, I hope that they will not forget that section of the country. It is a matter that is not only of local importance. I hope that the Government will give this matter their most serious consideration. I believe the Minister of Public Works is already convinced of its feasibility. If he can only convince his colleagues—and we are well aware that if he gets their consent, when we remember his activity and the energy which he brings to bear in every work he undertakes—the work will soon be accomplished. Therefore, without detaining the House any longer, I ask the Government to give this matter their most serious consideration. It is not a party question, it is not a local question, but one in which all are interested. If the Government will undertake this work, I do not think there will be a dissenting voice, either in the House or the country, and I am sure they will have the thanks and goodwill of all.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman, in bringing this matter before the House, gives me an opportunity of saying a few words on the subject. The hon. gentleman was not in the House in 1834 and the following

Mr. BRIEN.

years, when this matter was brought before the House and before the Government by the gentlemen who then represented South Essex and North Essex, I think Mr. Patterson and Mr. Wigle. But at that time we had not the necessary data to give an affirmative answer to the request and petitions that were presented to us on that subject. Since that time Mr. Patterson has prosecuted the scheme with the persistence he is known to possess. The hon. gentleman knows that when the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) begins a matter of that kind, he sticks to it as long as there is a chance of carrying it to a successful completion. Well, the hon. gentleman has continued in the same course, and has presented petitions in 1836-37-38, as the hon. member now representing South Essex (Mr. Brien) is doing. The surveys have been made, and have proved that the petitions that were presented were such as would warrant the Government in going on with this work, if the revenues of the country would allow us. But as the hon. gentleman must see, I am not in a position just now to say what would be the policy of the Government on this matter. If, in conformity with the petitions which have been presented from time to time, and the pressure which has been brought to bear, the Government decide in asking Parliament to come to the relief of the settlers there, and especially to come to the relief of trade and the vessels, a sum will appear for that purpose in the Supplementary Estimates. Of course, if the revenues of the country will not allow us to do so this year, we will have to ask Parliament to wait for another year; but, as I said just now, I am not in a position at the present moment to inform the hon. gentleman what course will be followed by the Government.

DEFALCATIONS IN THE KINGSTON POST OFFICE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In conformity with the notice which I gave last night, I desire to call the attention of the House to what appears to be a very serious miscarriage of justice in the case of certain defalcations which lately occurred in the post office at Kingston. If the facts have been correctly stated to me, they are of a rather important character. For some months back, in fact, I believe, for some years back, there have been complaints of a number of robberies committed in the post office at Kingston, and very recently, if my memory serves, since this House met, an important official in the post office, the deputy postmaster of Kingston, Wm. Shannon, was caught *in flagrante delicto* by one of the officials of the post office, in the act, as I am informed, of feloniously opening letters and extracting their contents. This was publicly known, and notwithstanding that, apparently, 24 hours was allowed to elapse without any action being taken by the post office authorities, and the culprit made his way to the United States. After remaining some time there, he returned, and it was known that he had returned, as I am informed. He was in Kingston, and I believe he carried away with him a considerable amount of money, largely composed, at least so it is alleged, of the balances he had collected in this way. I desire to call the attention of the House, in the first place, to the fact that a number of persons allege they have been robbed, presumably by William Shannon, and the Government, according to the statement made by the Postmaster General yesterday, do not intend to recompense those parties. That, however, is a minor detail. What appears to me to be very serious indeed is that, if the facts were correctly stated to me, if this officer was detected by another officer—as I am informed by no less a person than the deputy inspector of post offices in that district—in the act of feloniously opening letters, and if he was allowed 24 hours law and then escaped to the United States, it appears to me there has been a very gross miscarriage of justice, and I cannot understand how the officers

of the post office could have permitted a culprit under those circumstances to escape without being arrested. A very considerable number of persons have expressed their astonishment to me in this matter, and there is no doubt whatever that it does look exceedingly as if, by reason of the influential connections which this officer may have had, he had escaped punishment which would undoubtedly have been meted out under such circumstances to any subordinate officer connected with the department. I shall be glad if there is any explanation to be made relieving those officers from what appears to me to be a gross neglect of duty; but, most undoubtedly, when we come to consider the nature of the offence, and the fact that this is only one, apparently, of a whole series of similar offences, it does seem that there has been very gross negligence in this man being allowed to escape, and after having escaped, to be allowed to return and pass through Kingston and remove a considerable amount of property along with him, to the great prejudice of parties robbed by him; also, I think, to the great scandal of the Government if an officer in their service, after committing such offences as these, is allowed to escape without being brought to justice. I shall be very glad to hear any explanation which the hon. the Postmaster General may have to offer on the subject.

Mr. McLELAN. I admit there has been some want of vigilance and promptness on the part of my officers at Kingston in this matter, and the excuse they give for it is this: That Wm. Shannon had been for a generation an officer in that department; he had never been suspected of doing anything wrong; he was a man well advanced in life, he being some 64 years old. When he was caught handling letters improperly by one of the clerks, the clerk gave information to the inspector. The inspector sent for Mr. Shannon, and he admitted he had three letters in his possession and showed them. They were unregistered letters, ordinary letters passing through the mail; one of them contained five cents in coin and twenty cents in postage stamps. The other two were without enclosures. The inspector, as he stated himself, was so overwhelmed with surprise that he did not act promptly, and delayed until he could make further enquiries, and when he communicated the next day with the department here, he also stated the fact that he had found Shannon had left the country. The hon. gentleman, I think, has been misinformed as to Mr. Shannon's return. I am informed by the inspector, who has recently reported, that, so far as he can ascertain, Shannon has not been within the Dominion since 17th March.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My information came from persons of credibility who stated that they had seen him.

Mr. McLELAN. It was intimated to the department here that he had returned, and immediately I caused a telegram to be sent to have him arrested. An information was laid by the county attorney against him, but the officers were not able to find him, and they reported that he had not been in the city. I stated yesterday, in answer to the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that the Government had not paid anything. The question was: Had the Government paid anything?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Or agreed to pay.

Mr. McLELAN. I may state now in answer to the hon. gentleman that Mr. Shannon's friends have lodged with the officers of the department a certain amount to meet any losses that may have been sustained by private individuals, as soon as we can ascertain what those losses are. None of the letters were registered. Some complaints have been made that letters which should have passed through the Kingston post office, in their natural course, had not reached their destinations, and the statement is made by the senders

that they contained enclosures of money. My officers are making enquiries into these cases, and when it is clearly ascertained, and when it has been clearly traced, that those letters passed in a mail that went through the hands of Shannon, in all probability the losses will be met from the amount placed in the hands of my officers by Shannon's friends. I need not state the amount, because perhaps that might induce persons to make claims, but every care is being taken to ascertain what letters have been lost of those that really passed through the office and through the hands of Shannon. It has already been ascertained that some letters said to have passed through Shannon's hands were sent at dates when he was not in the office; so all these matters will have to be investigated and the truth ascertained, as far as possible, that justice may be done to the parties who have suffered loss. I may say that I regret as much as any one can that my officers did not act with that promptness which they should have shown immediately on detecting the wrongs of which Shannon had been guilty. But the explanation they gave is this: that Shannon, an old man, an old servant of twenty-five or thirty years' service in the department, had not been suspected through all that lifetime of doing anything wrong, and the officers were so overwhelmed with surprise at what had been done and at the insignificance of the amount traced in his hands at the time, twenty-five cents, that they refrained from acting with that promptness which they should have shown, and they express regret for it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I certainly think the explanation offered by the Postmaster General is a weak one. As I understand it, the post office clerks are supposed to be directly responsible to the Government. They are civil servants in the employ of the Government, and it is, therefore, the duty of the Government to see that they perform their duties faithfully. I am also surprised to hear that the inspector, having ascertained without any doubt that this man Shannon had been guilty of meddling with letters in the post office, whether the amounts were large or small, did not proceed at once to execute the law and take steps that the man might be punished. The plea that he was an old servant and about 60 years of age, put forward by the Postmaster General to this House as an excuse for the negligence of his officers, is a frivolous excuse indeed. Many people deposit their money in the Post Office Savings Bank, or send their money through the mail, considering that the Government are responsible for the safe delivery to the parties to whom they are sent, and if the public feel there is an uncertainty as to the safety of the letters, the fact will very materially interfere with the efficiency of our post office service. Not only that, but if it becomes known, as it appears, that the Postmaster General indicated to-night that there are delays to compensate those who lose money under such circumstances, this will cause distrust in the efficiency of the service. But, perhaps the mover of this motion is a little too hard. It may possibly be found that this man Shannon was not an ordinary friend of the Government, and it may be found that, perhaps, in years gone by, this man Shannon or some of his friends or relations had been very intimately connected with the then representative of the city of Kingston. It may have been that, perhaps, this man Shannon may have had some information that if he had been arrested, and an attempt made to punish him for his wrong-doing, he might possibly have been in a position to have divulged something that would not be very creditable to the Government of the day. It is possible that this leniency may have been caused by that, instead of on account of the small amount contained in the letters that he had abstracted from the Post Office Department. I maintain that this ought to have been examined into, and whether the man stole five

cents or five hundred dollars he was equally guilty of wrongdoing as a civil servant, and he was equally responsible to the Government of the day. Perhaps, if we refer back a few years, we may find that a Mr. Shannon had performed an important service in that locality, and we may be able, perhaps, to come to some conclusion why it was that the Postmaster General was so kind towards this man Shannon, and that he, through his inspector, neglected to perform the duties that were incumbent upon him. Let me call your attention to an election trial that took place in Kingston some time ago, in 1874. I have no doubt the First Minister will remember the election trial that took place at that time, and I have no doubt he will remember that he had a very ardent friend, and whether it was this Mr. Shannon or some of his relations, it certainly was a Shannon, and, perhaps, it was on that account the Postmaster General felt it would not be hardly right for him to proceed very actively against this man, but to wait until a telegram should be sent down to him asking him what he should do under the circumstances. This particular old friend had got into a difficulty, and he ought to proceed and punish him as they would any other criminal under the circumstances, but, perhaps, it was on account of past services rendered and the strong attachment between himself and the First Minister, that it was considered whether it would not be a little better to give him an opportunity that he might get out of the country and not divulge some secrets that might be in his possession. We find that a trial took place at Kingston when the First Minister was being tried for bribery and corruption. To his credit, be it said, no personal charges on that occasion were proven against him. He was situated on that occasion pretty well, but not as well as he was on the last trial, for although in 1874 he retained his qualification, his seat was voided. It was sworn at that election trial as follows:—

"James Shannon sworn. I live in Kingston and took an active interest in anything that concerned Sir John A. Macdonald."

I believe that is the present Premier,—

"Was not a member of the committee, at least did not remember that I was, had some doubts whether a committee was formed. Spent about \$400 in election. This was not my own; received this and also \$500 from Sir John A. Macdonald, and \$1,000 more, part from Mr. Patton."

I suppose the First Minister will remember Patton,—

"I got \$1,000 from other parties, which was not all spent. I gave the balance \$900 back to the Hon. Mr. Campbell with a memorandum showing the disposition of the money that had been spent."

I think Mr. Campbell was not at the trial on that occasion and I suppose the First Minister will state why he was not there.

An hon. MEMBER. He was in the States.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). My friend says he was in the States. You don't suppose a Conservative would run to the States in order to avoid giving evidence at an election trial. It would be too horrid to imagine anything of the kind.

"Q. Why did you give it to Mr. Campbell?"

"A. He was acting for Sir John A. I received the money from Sir J. A. personally in Kingston, it was for election expenses. I think it was by cheque."

"Q. What was Sir John giving the money for? What did he say?"

"A. He gave no directions. I knew what the money was for, it was for necessary expenses. Sir John asked me to take charge of it. I had charge of money for Sir John previously."

"Q. What did you do with it?"

"A. I did not spend over \$400 or \$500, speaking in round numbers."

This may turn out to be the same Shannon who took the letters in the post office. He continues:

"I gave to different friends of Sir John \$30 or \$40; to Armstrong McCormick, about \$30; Isaac McNabb, \$20; Jos. O'Brien, \$10; telegraph company, \$25; to bill-sticker, \$25; Flanagan, for cab-hire, \$18, and \$10 to Conroy."

Then comes another portion of the evidence, showing that Shannon was working earnestly in the Kingston election. Parkhill sent Hunter to Shannon with the following letter:

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

"The bearer, James Hunter, is an elector; has a horse and sleigh; had better look after him. J. C.'s men are looking after him this morning. Must do something now, else it will be too late. Put him in the way at once.
J. A. PARKHILL."

Now, as it would appear, we have found there are several Shannons in this locality, and that they had been friends of the First Minister, and if the First Minister possesses one good quality it is the quality of remembering old friends. He being the leader of the Government, perhaps the Postmaster General was not so much to blame for the course he took, because after receiving information from his inspector in that locality he would have to make enquiries as to this man Shannon—whether it was the Shannon who worked so energetically at the time the election took place there—before he could move in the matter. At all events 24 hours elapsed and, therefore, Mr. Shannon escaped to the other side. The Postmaster General says that he was not aware that he was back in the country, but as far as that is concerned he should never have had an opportunity of getting away to the United States. I repeat again that I think the lax manner in which the civil servants perform their duty in the post office should be carefully looked to. People depositing their money there, many of them poor people, should be protected by the Government. The Government should feel that for every dollar lost in the post office they should be held accountable. I hope my hon. friend from South Oxford will not feel too hardly against the Government on this occasion, because very likely he will find, if he examines carefully into the matter, that this man Shannon had been a useful and important individual in an election trial, and deserved some consideration at the hands of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot conceive for a moment that this is a concerted scene between the hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. gentleman who has just sat down; but the coincidence is rather remarkable. When the hon. gentleman, in his anxiety for the public interest, and to see that crime is punished, and that the official performs his duty, brings this matter up, it is rather a singular coincidence that the hon. member for East Elgin should have hunted up the records of my trial in 1874, in which I was unseated. It looks very like as if the question was put and the remark made, not for the purpose of public justice, but to give the hon. member for East Elgin an opportunity of exercising his malignity by trying to drag my name into this matter respecting Mr. Shannon. It looks marvellously like it, and it will take a good deal to white-wash the hon. member for South Oxford from the suspicion that this is a concerted arrangement. The only thing that makes me doubt it is that the hon. gentleman is barking up the wrong tree; he has waked up the wrong passenger; he has got the wrong Shannon. The Shannon he speaks of is Mr. James Shannon, who is a friend of mine and a most respectable man; and the hon. gentleman, having been elected for one of the ridings of Elgin, must be supposed to be a respectable man, but he would be higher in the estimation of the hon. members of this House, than he is now, if he held the character of Mr. James Shannon. Mr. James Shannon was the trusted book-keeper and accountant of my firm for many years; he took care of my money, took care of my accounts, and managed my affairs; and although this person who opened these letters is a relative of Mr. James Shannon, I may tell the hon. gentleman, if he would like to know it, that the two brothers have not spoken or had any communication except on business for many years; and I suppose the fact that that was known must have been the reason why the clerk, instead of going to Mr. James Shannon, the postmaster, went to the post office inspector. The hon. gentleman, in his desire, I may say his malignant desire, to make an attack, says what? He says the Postmaster General has been guilty of great laches, and, in order to

favor a supposed friend of mine, neglected to have him arrested. The hon. gentleman heard what the Postmaster General said. He said that the first intimation he had of the matter was in the letter he received from the post office inspector, who resides at Kingston, informing him that the deputy postmaster there had been discovered opening letters, that the clerk who discovered him had informed him, but that the inspector did not cause him to be arrested as he ought to have done; and when he got instructions to arrest, which he did the moment the Postmaster General heard of it, the bird had flown—the man had gone. The hon. gentleman heard this statement, and yet he has the face to get up in this House and make this statement. It only shows how far political malignity can go, that he could try to make a little capital by reviving the recollections of the trial against me in 1874, and making the defalcations of this officer in 1888 a peg to hang a malignaut attack on.

CLAIM OF MRS. GOWANLOCK.

Mr. RYKERT. I would like to change the subject for a few minutes in order to bring to the notice of the Government and of the House what I consider to be a very important matter, that is, the claim of Mrs. Gowanlock. In the early part of this Session the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) asked the Government whether or not they intended to pay Mrs. Gowanlock, the widow of J. A. Gowanlock, who was killed by Indians at Frog Lake in the North-West rebellion, a pension in the same manner and to the same extent as they had paid Mrs. Delaney. The House will recollect that during the late rebellion Mrs. Delaney and Mrs. Gowanlock were seized by the Indians immediately after their husbands were murdered by the Indians at Frog Lake; and hon. members will recollect what an excitement there was throughout the country about the fate of those two ladies. I venture to state that if this House had been asked at that time to vote a sum of money for the purpose of having these ladies restored to their homes, any amount, no matter how large, would have been cheerfully voted. The hon. the Minister of the Interior, in reply to the question of my hon. friend from North Victoria, stated that Mrs. Gowanlock's husband was not an employé of the Dominion Government, while Mrs. Delaney's husband was. The ground taken by the Minister of the Interior, and the Government, has been that Mrs. Gowanlock's husband, not being an employé of the Government, she was not entitled to compensation or to a pension. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that during the late Parliament a pension of \$400 a year was granted to Mrs. Delaney. Now, I think I can show by documents which have been brought down to the House that Mr. Gowanlock was considered an employé of the Government. The facts are these: The Indian Department were desirous to have a mill erected at a place called Onion Lake in the North-West Territories, and called for tenders for the erection of the same. Mr. Gowanlock and Mr. Laurie, his partner, put in a tender for the work, which was accepted, and entered into an agreement with the Government to run that mill for ten years. The agreement bears date the 17th of September, 1884, and is between the Hon. Edgar Dewdney, Indian Commissioner for Manitoba and the North-West Territories, of the first part, and John Alexander Gowanlock and Richard Carney Laurie, of the second part, and, among other things, provides:

"That the party of the first part, being desirous of having a saw and grist mill established at a point adjacent to Onion Lake Reserve near Fort Pitt in the North-West Territories, upon the conditions and terms following, that is to say: First,—The parties of the second part agree to erect a good substantial building according to the plans and specifications hereto attached, marked No. 1, and that the capacity of the saw and grist and machinery used in construction with the same will be according to the specifications hereto attached, marked No. 2.

"The mill to be erected and in operation by the fifteenth January, 1885.

"The parties of the second part agree that they will keep the said mill in good operation for at least ten years; that they will constantly have a competent miller in attendance at said mill, that the Indians shall have the preference over other customers in the gristing of their grain and that they shall be charged less toll by one-fourth for two years, and one-sixth for the eight succeeding years than white customers.

"In consideration of the above, the party of the first part binds himself to pay to the parties of the second part the sum of \$1,500, the said sum to be paid as follows: \$1,500 when the machinery is on the ground and the balance, namely, \$1,000, on completion of the work."

It is well known that although \$1,500 were advanced by the Government for building that mill, the mill was destroyed before it was completed, and as the late hon. the Minister of the Interior stated, upon an investigation made into the pecuniary loss sustained by the firm, a certain amount was awarded to the firm for the material and the building which was destroyed, from which was deducted the \$1,500 granted by the Government. It is said that Mr. Gowanlock was not an employé of the Government. I have before me two letters from the Department of Indian Affairs, in which the department very plainly referred to Mr. Gowanlock as an employé of the Government; but I say whether he was so or not, the Government are bound to take notice of the facts and to place Mrs. Gowanlock in the same position as Mrs. Delaney. This will establish no precedent whatever, as the circumstances never can occur again.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not know about that.

Mr. RYKERT. Humanity alone demands for this woman, placed in this sad position, consideration at the hands of the Government. Mrs. Gowanlock lives in my constituency. I see her frequently, and I know that she may not live many years in consequence of the trials and sufferings she endured; and the circumstances of her case are such that they will justify the Government in showing more liberality towards her by giving her fair and reasonable compensation; and I am sure that the House will endorse the Government in any action it may take to this end. I have a letter of the 21st April, 1887, from Mr. P. B. Douglas, Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, addressed to Mr. Henry Johnson, the father of Mrs. Gowanlock. In this letter, Mr. Douglas says:

"I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th inst., and to inform you that a copy of that portion which relates to the pension desired for Mrs. Gowanlock has been referred to the Department of Indian Affairs, of which her husband during his lifetime was an employé."

I find also a letter addressed by Mr. Douglas to Mr. L. Vankoughnet, dated 21st April, 1887, in which I find the following:—

"I have the honor, by direction, to refer to you, herewith enclosed, an extract from a letter from Mr. Henry Johnson, Tintern, Ont., asking that a pension be granted to Theresa Gowanlock, widow of the late John Gowanlock, who was in his lifetime an employé of your department, such pension to be maintained to her during her widowhood."

These letters clearly indicate that Mr. Gowanlock was in the service of the Government. At any rate, we have the fact before us that he was bound, under heavy penalty, to carry on his mill for a period of ten years, and to grind grain for the Indians at a cheaper rate than for the whites. In that respect, he was as much an employé of the Government as any other person. It seems to me this is a case deserving the favorable consideration of the Government, and I hope that the Government, on considering the facts, will show generosity towards the petitioner. Mrs. Gowanlock saw her husband killed before her eyes, she was submitted to indignities and insults by the Indians for two months, and if any case was ever worthy of consideration, it is hers.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have much pleasure in sharing in the recommendation of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). The case of Mrs. Gowanlock is one of extreme hardship. Mrs. Delaney was with Mrs. Gowanlock and suffered the same great calamity. Both of them lost their

husbands at the same time. Mrs. Delaney was born in the county I represent, and I have known her from my childhood. She has told me of the terrible incidents of that terrible time, and I do think, under the circumstances, as the hon. member for Lincoln has pointed out, that Mrs. Gowanlock is entitled to the same privileges and indemnity, to the same kindness and consideration, at the hands of this House and the Government as Mrs. Delaney. I had great pleasure in bringing the case of Mrs. Delaney under the notice of the hon. First Minister. He received me with the utmost kindness and consideration, and granted her a very proper indemnity which will make her comfortable for life. I think that, under the circumstances, the representations of the hon. member for Lincoln should receive consideration, and I am sure they will receive consideration at the hands of the Government. I am quite sure that every hon. member from the Province of Quebec will be quite willing to accord to the woman of Ontario the same rights, privileges and indemnity which they accorded to the woman of Quebec.

Mr. BARRON. I am exceedingly glad that this matter has been brought before the House by the hon. member for Lincoln, and I sincerely hope that his efforts in the direction of getting justice done to Mrs. Gowanlock will meet with a more favorable result than mine in the past. It will be in the recollection of this House that I brought up the case of Mrs. Gowanlock last Session, and also a short time ago this Session. I confess I have not been able yet to appreciate what I consider to be the invidious distinction drawn between the case of Mrs. Delaney and that of Mrs. Gowanlock. As the hon. member for Lincoln has stated, the distinction is sought to be drawn from the alleged fact that the husband of Mrs. Delaney was in the employ of the Government at the time of his death, and that such was not the case with the husband of Mrs. Gowanlock. That statement was made last Session by the hon. the Finance Minister and also this Session by the late hon. the Minister of the Interior. Without going into the question at present as to whether or not Mr. Gowanlock was really in the employ of the Government, I do not think that can be a reason for always refusing what one would suppose was only justice to the widow and children of the deceased person. That cannot be a reason in this case. If in Mrs. Delaney's case it was a reason for granting the pension, then, in every case in which an employé of the Government dies, his widow and children could advance the argument that because their husband or their father as the case might be, was, during his lifetime and at the time of his death in the employ of the Government they should receive a pension. But that was not the sole reason. There was some other reason for granting Mrs. Delaney a pension. What was that other reason? It was the sad, harrowing circumstances under which her husband met his death, and those circumstances apply just as much in the case of Mrs. Gowanlock as they did in the case of Mrs. Delaney; and therefore what was done for Mrs. Delaney should, on the very self-same argument and for the self-same reasons, be done for Mrs. Gowanlock. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) has stated shortly the sad circumstances under which Mr. Gowanlock met his death. Will the House allow me for a moment to read Mrs. Gowanlock's own statement from her own lips of the circumstances under which her husband met his sad death:

"Neither I nor my husband understood the Indian language, and so were not addressed by them, but we understood we were prisoners and had to go with the rest. When we left Mrs. Delaney's house no one knew what was going to happen, and I do not think it was really supposed any of us were in danger. We all left Mrs. Delaney's house together. My husband at the time was outside, and as we left the house he met me and took me with him and we walked on together. We had only got a few paces from the house when the Indians began firing. Mr. Dill, Mr. Quinn, and Mr. Gilchrist were shot first, though I did not see them shot, but as soon as I saw Mr. Willscroft, an old grey-headed

Mr. WRIGHT.

man, fall in front of us, I then knew all were being killed. I became greatly alarmed. I saw an Indian aiming at my husband by my side. In a moment he fell, reaching out his arms towards me as he fell. I caught him, and we fell together. I laid upon him, resting my face upon his, and his breath was scarcely gone when I was forced away by an Indian. It was not the Indian who fired that dragged me from my husband. I was almost crazy with grief, but I remember seeing the two priests shot and also Mr. Delaney. They were in front of me. One of the priests when shot was leaning over Mr. Delaney."

I have also here Mrs. Delaney's statement, taken from her shortly after she was rescued from the Indians, and her statement is almost the same as that of Mrs. Gowanlock. It will be seen that the exceptional circumstances—because they were and are very exceptional circumstances—that induced the Government to grant a pension to Mrs. Delaney apply equally to the case of Mrs. Gowanlock. Their husbands were at that time doing their best, as they thought, to defend the lives of the people who were then more or less under their care, and I, therefore, heartily join with my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) in hoping that the Government will do justice to Mrs. Gowanlock, apart altogether from the question of whether her husband was or was not an employé of the Government at the time of his death. But I think I can also support my hon. friend in his argument that Mr. Gowanlock was at that time, if not technically, at least sufficiently for the purposes of the argument, in the employ of the Government. My hon. friend from Lincoln has read the agreement which was made with him, and I think the preamble of that agreement shows that Mr. Gowanlock was to go to Onion Lake to construct a mill which was to be of invaluable use to the settlers in that locality; and he also read a letter showing that officers of the department treated Mr. Gowanlock as being at that time in the employ of the Government. Therefore I think that not only from the standpoint of justice, but also from the fact, as I maintain, that the husband was in the employ of the Government, Mrs. Gowanlock should be treated in the same way as was Mrs. Delaney. But I find, on looking into the granting of pensions in England, that they do not confine these pensions by any means to the widows and children of husbands and parents who have been in the employ of the Government. I find that on the 31st July, 1885, Mrs. Sherwin was granted a pension of £100 on the ground of the literary merits of her sister, the late Mrs. Jameson. I find that Miss Leech was also granted a pension on account of the merits of her brother, the late Mr. John Leech, an artist; and several other sisters of Mr. Leech were also granted pensions on the same ground. Then, Mr. Huxley was granted a pension because of his eminent services to science. This shows that the rule is not inflexible that the person at the time of his death must necessarily be in the employ of the Government, and I think, as has been stated by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright), that members on both sides of the House will join heartily in supporting the Government in granting to Mrs. Gowanlock the same pension that was granted to Mrs. Delaney. Perhaps the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) stated what, I am afraid, is correct, that if a pension is granted to Mrs. Gowanlock, she will not be permitted, owing to the serious trouble and anxiety which she suffered in the North-West, to enjoy it very long. I hope this House will grant it to her, and will in that way perform a simple act of justice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the hon. gentleman who has last spoken has strengthened his case by quoting the pensions granted in England to Mr. Huxley and to the sister of John Leech the artist, because, though he may not be aware of it, there is an annual sum of £1,200 voted by Parliament under a statutory provision for the purpose of granting pensions to persons who have gained such rewards for literary and artistic services. That is voted annually, and is divided, on the advice of one of the Ministers, among artists and literary people who have

become rather reduced in circumstances. I quite agree with the hon. gentlemen who have spoken that Mrs. Gowanlock's case is a very sad one. She saw her husband murdered before her eyes, and she suffered a great deal in mind and body as well as did Mrs. Delaney. It would be always an agreeable task for the Government of the day, who have hearts in their bosoms, to deal with such cases of hardship, and I may say of horror, if they thought it was their duty to do so, if they thought it was within their power to do so; but it is very easy for a government to be very liberal with the money of other people, with the money of the public, and we had to consider in these two cases what we had a right to do, and what we had power to do. Of course, without coming to Parliament, we could not in any way whatever be justified in granting a pension to Mrs. Gowanlock. Her husband was in no way an employé of the Government. The case was simply this: The Indians on that reserve had raised a good deal of grain, but they had no means whatever of using it because there was no mill there. The Indian Department tried to find some person enterprising enough to put up a grist mill, and it was stated, as the House will well understand, that it was a country which would naturally be settled by whites, and that a bonus would be given if anyone would go at once and establish a mill, which, it was expected, would not be profitable when it simply had to grind the scanty crops of the Indians, and, therefore, a bonus would be given until it became a profitable milling establishment in consequence of settlement. Tenders were called for, and Mr. Gowanlock succeeded in getting the contract. It was simply a case of contract, by which he was told, if you put a mill of a certain size there and grind for a reasonable rate the grain of the Indians, and if you will continue, when the white settlers come in, to give the preference to the Indians and not to shove them away with their little crops, and will give security that you will maintain that mill for a certain number of years, we will give you a bonus of \$1,500 for that time. His death by the hand of an Indian, although it took place under the most dreadful circumstances, and at the same time when the clergymen were killed, and Delaney, the civil servant, was killed, and other men were killed, still the Government had to look at the circumstances. The case stood in the same position as if an Indian had killed a white man in any other part of the North-West. And we had to consider that giving a pension to Mrs. Gowanlock might be held to establish a precedent that in any cases where murders were caused by Indians—and they generally act with very considerable barbarity if their blood is up—that in any honorable case of this kind, where a white man was slain by an Indian, his relatives had a claim on the public treasury for a pension. We had to consider that, it was our bounden duty to consider it. As I have already said, it would be a very agreeable duty for us to ask Parliament to confer a pension upon Mrs. Gowanlock. If that is the general consent, the Government will be ready to come down.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is, Sir John.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If that is the general consent of the House; but we know perfectly well, in the first place, that the two cases do not stand on the same footing at all. All Governments take care to provide for the families of their civil and military officers who have fallen in their service. Delaney was an officer there on the outskirts, in the very act of dealing out food to these Indians when he was barbarously murdered. He was a civil servant, he had moved there with his family at the orders of the Government. As I have said, in such cases all Governments provide for the families of their servants slain on duty, but that is not the case with Mrs. Gowanlock. Parliament is not very partial to granting pensions, but if I can gather that it is the general consent of this House that

this should be made an exception, and if they are not afraid of setting a precedent, Government will take this case into favorable consideration.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has exhibited a regard for the public purse to which he has not accustomed us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Allow me to say one word more. I think that full compensation was given to the estate of Mr. Gowanlock for his property which was destroyed at the time of his death.

Mr. LAURIER. However, I think in this instance Parliament will not grudge the money that will be given to the widow; not only for the reasons which were mentioned by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) and in which I would be disposed largely to concur, but also for this other reason, that Mr. Gowanlock was one of the first victims of the rebellion. Now, we have had a commission sitting to investigate the claims of losses sustained in consequence of the rebellion, and I can see no reason why, if we should compensate a man who has been a victim of the rebellion in losing property, we should not also indemnify his family for the loss of his life.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is opening a very wide door.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps it is, but, after all, the rebellion was caused by the action of the Government, and I cannot see why the country should not compensate the evil that has been done. In this matter I believe the Government will see their way to allow a grant to the widow, and that both sides of the House would be glad to ratify the action of the Government in this matter. Now, there is another matter to which I want to refer, and to which I was about to refer when the hon. member for Lincoln rose, and that is the case which was brought forward by the hon. member for Oxford a moment ago. The Prime Minister, in answering the speech of the hon. member for Elgin, said that no doubt it was a mere coincidence that my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had brought the subject up, and that the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) had spoken in the manner he did. Well, coincidences will sometimes occur. It was, perhaps, a mere coincidence that there was a thief in Kingeton by the name of Shannon, and at the same time another man in Kingston by the name of Shannon, who happened to be a bosom friend of the Prime Minister. It was, perhaps, a mere coincidence that prevented the arrest of the one who was guilty, and that another man bore the same name was the friend of the First Minister. I would have been disposed to consider it a mere coincidence, but after having witnessed the exhibition of temper which the First Minister gave us a moment ago, I began to suspect that, after all, the hon. member for East Elgin had touched the true spot. No one who listened to the Postmaster General but must have come to the conclusion that the reasons which he gave to explain why this man was not arrested when he was caught in the act, were extremely flimsy, to say the least. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is evident from the language of the Postmaster General himself, that there were grave irregularities in the post office; and I believe, from the little that has been said—for I never heard the statement before to-day—I believe from the little that has been said by the Postmaster General, that the deputy inspector who was there, and who caught the thief in the act, was there for the purpose of detecting the guilty party who had been committing frauds for some time previous. The hon. gentleman has denied it; but, it is evident from his language, at all events, that frauds were going on. He said, and I took note of his words, that parties were making claims to-day

for money lost at the post office, upon the friends of Shannon. It was said that money had been extracted when Shannon was not in the post office, and that consequently he was not the guilty party. Therefore it is evident that at the time this man was caught in the act, there were great irregularities going on, since claims are made to-day which cannot reach the guilty party, but which must reach other parties as well. Therefore, I say it is probable, at all events, that the deputy inspector was there to investigate that case, and to find the guilty party, but finding, probably, the man whom he did not expect to find guilty, finding a man by the name of Shannon—

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman is not correct. The deputy inspector lives in Kingston, and has his office in the post office. The clerk went up and told the inspector.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, he went up and told the inspector. He could not have told the inspector that Shannon was the guilty party, since, according to the statement made by the Postmaster General, the deputy inspector caught Shannon in the act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. McLELAN. The clerk saw him handling the letters improperly and he told the deputy inspector, and the inspector sent for Shannon to come up to his room.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well, let it be so—is there any difference? The moment the man had been caught in the act, why was he not arrested?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And so he ought to have been.

Mr. LAURIER. But instead of arresting him, the gentleman thinks he must consult the authorities at Ottawa. Why? If it had been any other man than the man who bore the name of Shannon, probably he would have been arrested in the act. I can see no reason why he was not arrested in the act, and why in such a glaring matter of crime as that, the deputy inspector should not have arrested the man at once, instead of sending to Ottawa. No explanation has been given why this man was not arrested at once, and why it was thought proper to consult the authorities at Ottawa before ordering the arrest.

Mr. McLELAN. No, he did not consult the authorities at Ottawa. When he conveyed the information that the crime had been committed, he at the same time conveyed the information that the criminal had left the country.

Mr. LAURIER. It makes the case simply worse. Instead of consulting the department the officer thought he would let him go, and after giving him 24 hours leave, he writes to Ottawa and states that the man has left the country. Why was not the man arrested? That is a circumstance which requires explanation. My hon. friend behind me thinks the explanation is this: that this man was related to a gentleman who was a friend of the Prime Minister in former years, and who was a friend at a trial which was of great moment to the First Minister at that time; and probably he said, as he naturally may have said: I being an officer of the Government, it would be too bad to bring disgrace on the name of a man who is related to the friend of the Prime Minister, and I will give him a chance. I see no other reason for the conduct of the official, and this is the reason which my hon. friend behind me gave. Whatever was the conclusion at which my hon. friend arrived, whether it was right or wrong, the First Minister had no right to impute motives to him in the disrespectful manner in which he did impute them. This is a free Parliament, and every member has a right to express his views, so long as it is done in parliamentary language, and the First

Mr. LAURIER.

Minister should be the last man to reflect on a member who, in the discharge of his duty, may use language rather warm. My hon. friend did nothing but discharge his duty to the best of his ability, and certainly no man in this Parliament should be taken to task because he discharged his duty in that manner.

Mr. McLELAN. I desire to say, in explanation to the hon. gentleman, that there has been no complaint against the Kingston office in particular. Notice had been given that letters were missing which had passed through a circuit of 100 or 150 miles and through a number of post offices, and as they were not registered they were not under the direct supervision of any one particular officer. There was no special suspicion directed against the Kingston office until the clerk saw the assistant postmaster improperly handling two or three letters. He then went up stairs to the inspector's room and informed him of the fact, and he sent for Shannon, who confessed to having three letters, in one of which there was 25 cents, the other two containing no enclosures whatever. I may state further that the greatest attention is given to the security of money transmitted by post, and to induce people to aid the post office officials in tracing letters. The fee for registration has been placed at a merely nominal sum; we only charge 2 cents for registration, while ten cents is charged in the United States. Out of three and a half millions of letters registered during the past year, 1887, there have only been lost from all causes—destruction of mails and robbery—58 to the million, which is an infinitesimal percentage of letters registered and placed in a position that the post office officials can trace them. The letters that have been lost in this case or on this circuit, passing through some twelve or twenty post offices, were unregistered, and the letters that Shannon tampered with were also unregistered. Since he was detected in that act enquiry has been directed to special transactions in the Kingston office under the suspicion that Shannon had tampered with other letters passing over that circuit, and information is being gathered and facts obtained which I think will lead to the restitution to parties who have lost money from letters passing through the Kingston office.

Mr. LISTER. While this post office matter is before the House, I have a small case which I wish to bring before the attention of the Postmaster General, and I think this is an exceedingly suitable opportunity to do so. It appears, so far as my experience of the management of the post offices of the country is concerned, that if the incumbents of the post offices happen to be supporters of the hon. gentlemen opposite, they are treated with extreme leniency, but if they happen to have been appointed by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House when they occupied the Treasury benches, the slightest pretext is seized by the Government to dismiss those gentlemen from the offices, and often this is done without any intimation being given to those officers as to the nature of the charges made against them. It seems to me from the slight experience I have had in these matters, that the post office inspectors are officers appointed by the Government for the particular duty of dismissing officials who are offensive to the Government of the day. In my own county there is a village called Arkona, and in 1870 when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was leader of the Government, a reputable and responsible citizen, a man respected by the whole community, was appointed postmaster. He is responsible in every way, financially and otherwise; but this Government recently, without any charge being made against him, without any investigation of any charges being made, summarily dismissed him from the office which he held for the past ten years. The letter which I hold in my hand is the only information that gentleman received that his services as postmaster of the village of

Arkona were dispensed with by this Government, and it is in these words:

"I am to acquaint you that on receipt of the books the post office of Arkona will be transferred from your charge to that of Robert Dunn. Please govern yourself accordingly."

Why was he dismissed? I know that in my county postmasters have been in arrear and in default in connection with the money order department, that those charges have been known to the Government and the inspector, and yet those men have been retained in the office and hold their office to-day. No such charge has ever been made against Mr. Everest; it could not be made against him, for he is eminently responsible for everything in connection with the office; and yet he has been dismissed in this summary way because he happens to be a Liberal in politics. The Postmaster General has had no ground whatever for dismissing him from office, except that it was necessary to find a place for a supporter of the gentleman who opposed the late member for East Lambton. What excuse do the Government give? They say that Mr. Everest is not a resident of Arkona, but that he is a resident of the village of Forrest. That is only partly true. He owns business establishments in both places. He carries on a drug store in Forrest. His family are as capable as he is of attending to the business of the office, and the office has been attended to. There have been no complaints made against him, and yet the Postmaster General, without any investigation, dismissed him in this summary manner. The inspectors of the Government are apparently in office for the purpose of making places by removing men who are holding positions. I have nothing to say against the man whom the Government have selected. He supported the Government with all his might, and of course it was necessary that some place should be found for him; and in order to do it the Government have removed an honorable, reputable and responsible official to make a place for this Mr. Dunn who now holds the post office. If that is to be the game let us know it. Our men will go out, but God help yours when we come in—that is all there is about it—and we will get there before long. If this system is to be the policy we want to know it, for these gentlemen should not be dispossessed and turned out of office until some substantial complaints have been made and proved against them. The conduct of the Government, so far as this man is concerned, is unjust, and it is unworthy of hon. gentlemen occupying the position that hon. gentlemen do governing the country to-day.

Mr. McLELAN. If the hon. gentleman had been disposed to do what was right in this matter, he would have followed the example of his leader from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and have given notice of the particular charge he intended to make to-night.

Mr. LISTER. What would have been the good of the notice. We would never have got to it.

Mr. McLELAN. Oh, yes, you would.

Mr. LISTER. Not this Session.

Mr. McLELAN. If you had given an intimation that you would bring up the matter, I would have been prepared with the facts bearing on the case. I have only to deny the charges that he has made—that this Government has appointed post office inspectors for the purpose of making reports against postmasters of Liberal politics. It is not true that I have ever enquired what the politics are of any inspector on the staff. I have been told by members of Parliament, and I have been told by residents in different parts of Ontario, that a number of the inspectors are in politics Liberal, and opposed to the present Government. I have never supposed that those men would have had their

reports affected by their politics. Not at all. I have felt confidence in every inspector that he will discharge his duty fairly and honorably by the department, and by the officers under his control. So far as my experience goes they have all done that, whether they have been Liberal or Conservative in politics. Now, as regards this particular case. My recollection of it is this—and I speak only from memory, because with the multitude of post offices we have and the number of incidents connected with almost every office in the country, it is impossible to remember all the details. My recollection of it is this: that some two years ago the inspector reported that the man who had charge of the post office at Arkona was resident out of the town of Arkona for six days out of the seven, and it was only on the Sabbath that he was a resident of the town of Arkona; also that the business of the office was kept in a slovenly manner and that it was the practice of the postmaster on Sunday when he was home, to sign, in blank, the returns necessary to carry on the business of the office and leave them in blank in charge of somebody. A few months ago the question again arose that the postmaster was still an absentee from the town and that the same practice was being continued. I asked the inspector to make a report, and he reported substantially the same; that this gentleman was doing business in the town of Forrest, some miles away, where he spent six days out of the seven, returning to Arkona on Saturday evening, remaining over the Sabbath, and leaving the post office in the hands of some assistant, and with blanks signed in charge of the assistant. This having been the second report, I thought it was an improper practice and I changed the postmaster.

Mr. LISTER. Without notifying him.

Mr. McLELAN. Two years ago when the matter was reported on, it was brought to his notice that he was an absentee. In any case if I know of any similar instance whether the postmaster be Grit or Conservative, I should feel it my duty to change the postmaster who was responsible for the office, and see that he was a resident of the town so as to oversee the business of the post office.

Mr. LISTER. Is it, or is it not, within the hon. gentleman's own knowledge that he has retained postmasters who have been behind in their money order accounts?

Mr. McLELAN. I find that there are a great many postmasters who are in arrears in their accounts, and I am making extra exertions to have those collected. I want to ascertain whether this is in consequence of neglect, or whether the arrears in the accounts are not brought to their cognizance by officers in the department—whether it is really a fraud or detention of moneys. I am making exertions to have all those accounts brought square before the 30th of June, and to make an entire change in the system.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has not stated whether he notified this postmaster of any complaint before dismissing him.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As I understand the Postmaster General he has laid down the principle in appointing postmasters that a resident of the town should be appointed to the position.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That was what he said.

An hon. MEMBER. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. A vacancy occurred in the village of Plattsville caused by the death of the former postmaster, and a petition was got up by the residents of that village, signed by almost every person in that village and neighborhood, asking that the post office be kept in the family of the deceased gentleman who had occupied that position for a great many years; but the Postmaster General did not

comply with that. Even the Conservative paper, on the borders of the riding, in Woodstock, complained that the Postmaster General had not appointed a member of the family of the deceased postmaster, but went outside of the village of Plattsville and hunted up a boy—a son of the Government candidate who opposed me in the last elections—and forced him upon the residents of that village against the expressed desire, by petition, of the whole of the residents. This does not coincide with the statement of the Postmaster General that he wishes to appoint a resident to a position of that kind.

Mr. LISTER. The Postmaster General did not inform this House that this postmaster in Arkona had a deputy. It was not necessary that he should live in the village of Arkona so long as the duties of the office were properly discharged. He had a deputy to discharge the duties properly, and there was never a complaint except that the papers were kept slovenly. He was not of the right complexion and that was the real trouble.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am rather surprised to hear the Postmaster General say that no one was ever dismissed on account of his political opinions. I can mention a case that I know personally. Mr. James C. McDonald, of Duart, was dismissed because he was a Reformer and voted for the Reform candidate. The hon. gentleman's predecessor offered the position to a Mr. McCallum who refused to take it, and it was given to a man who was in the habit of carrying the mail, a Mr. Curtis, who was utterly incompetent, and who was obliged to employ some one else to take charge of this office on his behalf. In making this statement I state what I know personally, and I have no doubt there are many other cases in which precisely the same thing has been done. I am rather surprised at the statement the hon. gentleman has made in regard to the impartiality of the inspectors. I would like to know if there is not a Mr. Griffin, the inspector at Kingston, who was the former inspector at London—and had not the Government some reason for removing Mr. Griffin from London to Kingston? Will the hon. gentleman bring down the papers regarding the change of Mr. Griffin from London to Kingston? Does he not know there were serious irregularities in the post office?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does he not know that a person was persuaded to resign his position in the London post office to save the guilty parties.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think I have papers in my possession which will inform the hon. gentleman. I do not wish to delay the House, but I think it would be worth while to bring the matter to the attention of the House, for it does seem to me that very serious irregularities have grown up in connection with many post offices in this country.

Mr. COOK. I wish to direct the attention of the Government to the fact that there is a vacancy in the customs house in the town of Penetanguishene, in the county of Simcoe. The customs officer some time ago resigned his position, and I believe there are a great many applicants for the vacancy. The appointment should be made at once, because I can tell the Government that the petition against the member for East Simcoe is withdrawn, and there is no necessity for keeping the place open.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to separate the cases of Mrs. Gowanlock and Mr. Shannon. The hon. First Minister kindly stated that if both sides of the House would express an opinion on the subject of Mrs. Gowanlock's claim, he would look into it. I have seen this unhappy woman, on whose brow still rests the shadow of the great peril that befel her, and who is not long for this world; and I hope

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

the hon. First Minister will treat her with the same kindness that he did Mrs. DeLaney. I think both sides of this House will gladly join in expressing the opinion that the Government should do so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. From what has been said on both sides of the House, I take it that there is a general assent, and therefore I may state that the Government will submit a proposition.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the case of Mrs. Gowanlock is out of the way, I would venture to make a remark to the Postmaster General about a vacancy in the post office at Newcastle. It will be in his recollection that last year I called his attention to the great neglect that occurred in that post office in the delivery of that leading organ of public opinion, the *Montreal Herald*, of which I sent a good many copies to my constituents in order to prevent misrepresentation, to keep them right, and to let them know what was going on in this House. I think I stated to the hon. gentleman last year that a great many copies of the paper, particularly just preceding the election, were thrown aside, some into the furnace. I have not heard that the hon. gentleman made any enquiries which he told me he would make. The occupant of the post office at the time was a son of the postmaster himself, who had been an invalid for a number of years. He was a very respectable man, and I am sure, had he been in his place, he would never have countenanced the disposal of the papers in the manner in which they were disposed of by the son, who was acting for him. The postmaster has been dead for some months, and I have not heard that a successor has been appointed. I did see that the Conservative Association, presided over by the gentleman whom I honored by beating him, had a meeting, or rather several meetings, of what is called the Liberal-Conservative party in that town, and had several ballots, as to which of the numerous applicants should get the appointment; but I am not aware that any recommendation was made by that body to the Postmaster General on the subject. I would like the hon. gentleman to answer me, first, as to whether he made any enquiry into the complaints I made of the disposal of the newspapers, which I thought it in my interest to send to some hundreds of my constituents, and next, whether any recommendation has been made by the Liberal Conservative club of that town, and if so, who has been appointed?

Mr. McLELAN. I called the attention of my officers to the remarks made previously by the hon. gentleman and directed them to remedy anything that was wrong. I may state that an appointment has been made to the post office.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I ask who the party is?

Mr. McLELAN. I can scarcely give the name now; I can hardly recollect it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps you will let me know tomorrow.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I approve of the conduct of the Government with respect to Mrs. Gowanlock. I think it is desirable that she should receive some compensation for the great hardships she has sustained. But I must say I think it an unfortunate thing, and calculated to create just and well-grounded suspicion on the part of the people of Canada, that the Postmaster General has no better explanation to offer than that which he has given to the House, of the most scandalous and infamous failure of justice that took place, whereby a felon, a man caught in the act of felony, was allowed, for whatever reason it may be, to escape to another country, whereby the ends of justice have been utterly defeated. If any man deserved to be sent to prison, it was a man who, in the position of deputy postmaster at Kingston, was found tampering with letters. I think the hon. Minister has been misinformed on one point.

I would state to him that I have been informed that it was known to the postmaster for many months that irregularities were committed, and that officials were kept under suspicion of being the guilty parties.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am glad the Government have come to the conclusion to give some compensation to Mrs. Gowanlock. The discussion on the subject of the postal service generally I do not think will be amiss. If there is one subject on which this House should give a decided and united expression of opinion, it is that when the people's mail matter is entrusted to the officials of the Government, it should be forwarded to its destination without being tampered with; and it will be a very unfortunate thing if it should go forth to the postmasters that any laches on their part will be condoned by the Government. I very much regret the tone of the hon. First Minister's remarks to-night, because they will be taken as a palliation of the conduct of postmasters who tamper with the people's letters. The Opposition in this House have always held that the Post Office Department should be administered for the people, and when the Government have asked for money for that purpose, it has readily been granted; and because I feel that that department should be administered, not in the interest of party, but in the interest of the people of this country, I very much regret the tone of the Premier's observations, because it may lead those in charge of the postal service to take for granted that if they are faithful to the Government they may tamper with the people's mails and open their letters, and will still be retained in the service. It is most unfortunate and most calamitous to the officials of the country that any such sentiment should go abroad that those guilty of wrong-doing in the postal service are to be maintained in office so long as they are faithful to the party. That principle should be stamped out on both sides, and the Government should be particular that no utterance of theirs would give the slightest sanction to public servants in the post office believing that they might with impunity, so long as they were true to party allegiance, tamper with or delay the mails or filch money from the letters. A gentleman has just showed me a telegram stating that a letter which he mailed from Ottawa to Mount Forrest on the 4th April, did not reach Mount Forrest until to-night. If we are to be treated to the excuses and palliative utterances, which the hon. the First Minister gave us to-night, we will have these delays repeated. Last year there were lost of registered letters 204 in the Dominion of Canada, and of letters not registered containing money, 273. This should not be. Why should those letters have been lost? They were not stolen by burglars, but they were lost or stolen by post office officials. In my riding, a letter was sent by the bank a distance of 11 miles, and although this letter contained \$690, it never reached its destination. There has been no prosecution, there have been no dismissals, but every official has been kept in office. I must presume those officials were appointed by the Government, and the Government gave them to understand that so long as they were faithful to the Government it did not matter what became of the letters. In view of these facts, the remarks of the hon. the First Minister to the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) were not at all justified; and the hon. member for Elgin struck at the root of the evil when he said the conduct of the postal service should not be ruled by party feeling. The postal service should be administered for the people, and the safe transmission of letters should be the paramount consideration of the Government. No sanction should be given to any wrong-doing on the part of the officials. I entirely disapprove of a gentleman holding the position the First Minister does, sanctioning a crime such as was committed at Kingston, where letters were opened and the money taken out, and then ridiculing an hon. gentleman who made a state-

ment in accordance with the facts, and which struck at the root of the evil. I have no personal feeling towards the right hon. gentleman, but I say it is not consistent with the high position he holds that he should condone a crime and try to divert attention from it by ridicule. If more severity were exercised in the treatment of officials guilty of wrong-doings, we would not find so many letters going astray and so many delays in their transmission.

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

(In the Committee.)

Dorchester Penitentiary \$46,304 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know how far the building has progressed and what quantity of land the penitentiary has under cultivation and what work is done by the convicts?

Mr. THOMPSON. The buildings are completed, and we expect to occupy the new wing on the first of May. There is a large tract of land under cultivation. The convicts have been fully employed so far. We have very satisfactory workshops and also manufacturing machinery which give employment to the convicts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I wanted to know was whether any satisfactory arrangement had been made for employing them in the way of anything like a permanent manufacture.

Mr. THOMPSON. We have not made any permanent arrangement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that they are employed in work in the prison and about the farm, and in the manufacture of buckets.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I wonder if this will be affected by Mr. Abbott's Bill in regard to bucket-shops.

Manitoba Penitentiary \$49,914 48

Mr. THOMPSON. Under the Penitentiary Act of last Session, there was a maximum allowance for a surgeon of \$1,200. Dr. Sutherland had been the surgeon of the Manitoba penitentiary for some time, and had been receiving \$600, but he had not been required to give his whole time to the prison. He was living in Winnipeg, and the fact that he had to go so far to attend to the penitentiary was found to be a great inconvenience. It is a prison in which there is an unusual number of prisoners requiring medical and surgical aid, and it was found, especially in winter, that it was impossible for a surgeon living in Winnipeg to properly attend to the wants of the prisoners, so it was thought better to require him to live at Stoney Mountain and to give his whole time to the penitentiary, and so he was allowed the maximum of \$1,200. The other increases, as regards salaries, are in accordance with the statute of last year—they are simply statutory increases—except that an additional guard has been provided for, and indeed was provided for in the Supplementary Estimates of last year. In the maintenance, there has been a decrease of \$307, because so much convict clothing is not expected to be required. In the working expenses, there is an increase of \$369, the principal item being in connection with the maintenance of buildings, for small repairs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that the hon. gentleman observed that the convicts in this penitentiary require a great deal of medicine, and I agree with him, for I see that \$533 was expended for these 100 convicts for drugs and medicine, while only \$271 was expended for 175 convicts in the Dorchester penitentiary. It certainly appears to me that that is a monstrous disproportion.

Mr. THOMPSON. I made some remarks on this question before, and the only explanation I can give is the same

as I gave then, that a very much larger quantity of medicines and drugs is required in Manitoba than elsewhere. We have there a number of Indians and half-breeds, and these are persons who, after a short period of confinement, almost invariably develop disease, and require care and stimulants and medical aid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many Indians are there?

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot state the exact number.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are there twenty?

Mr. THOMPSON. No; I think about fifteen.

Mr. WILSON. Does the hon. gentleman mean by "stimulants"—supplied to Indians—liquors, or what?

Mr. THOMPSON. We have some there who are far advanced in consumption, and occasionally liquors have to be provided for them.

Mr. WILSON. I understand that the Minister took power in a Bill which was passed to-day to provide that, if anyone gave spirits of any description to an Indian—whether it was a doctor or anyone else—he would be liable to a fine and to imprisonment. Am I to understand that the Minister is making provision now to give spirits to the Indians and to make the doctors violate the law and make themselves liable to be fined and imprisoned? Either the Government must amend the law passed this afternoon, or they must do away with the spirits. It seems to be very absurd that they should provide that this surgeon Sutherland should be fined every day for supplying liquors to Indians, while they furnish the whiskey for the purpose. I do not understand it. I think the warden must be very weak and delicate and must require a great deal of stimulants, because I see in the warden's department there is no less than \$129.45 paid for drugs and medicine. I should like the Minister to explain how this happens. Perhaps he will state whether there are any Indian patients in the warden's department who require stimulants and nourishment on account of lung disease.

Mr. THOMPSON. There are no such patients in the warden's department. I hope the hon. gentleman will acquit me of any desire to lead astray any member of his profession. I could not hope to do that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know exactly what sort of rations may be required in the Manitoba penitentiary, but it does appear to me that the quantities set down here for a year's consumption is rather extravagant for 100 convicts and some 20 or 25 guards. I find there are 211 lbs. of bacon, which is not extravagant, 57,353 lbs. of beef, 927 lbs. of mutton, 3 barrels of pork, and 182 lbs. of veal. It seems to me that those rations are calculated on a very extraordinary scale. Speaking roughly, I should say it would amount to a ration of about 2 lbs. of meat *per diem* for each man, which seems very much in excess of the ordinary prison allowance, and I think is very much in excess of the rations allowed to Her Majesty's soldiers. I think a pound of meat *per diem* is all that is allowed to a soldier, and if I am wrong the Minister of Militia can correct me. However, it is clear that these allowances are out of all proportion to what might be supposed to keep a man in health and strength during the year. I have no objection whatever to these men being properly fed. It would be very improper to deprive them of a reasonable amount of nutriment, but, if the hon. gentleman will make the calculation for himself, I think he will agree with me that this amount is unreasonable.

Mr. THOMPSON. Under the old system, the guards were supplied with rations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are only 25 of them.

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON. We supply them no longer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, but the hon. gentleman should know that 100 convicts and 25 guards could hardly be expected to consume the quantities I have alluded to. It is enormously in excess of the rations granted in the military service, and those are supposed to be quite sufficient to keep men at the very top of their condition.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to enquire whether it is the intention to continue this extra allowance of \$100 to Mr. Bedson, the warden.

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot give the hon. gentleman any explanation as to the rations, but I will promise to do so the next time we go into Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it should be looked into, because it is vastly in excess of what it ought to be. If the hon. gentleman will look back to the rations in other cases, he will see that it is enormously in excess of what seems to be supplied there. Now, by way of comparison, if he will look at Dorchester Penitentiary, he will see there that the quantity of beef is 16,000 lbs. as against 57,000 lbs. There is a little more pork, apparently—24 barrels of pork, and only three here, but as far as I can see, running my eye over it, the rations received in Dorchester Penitentiary, would, per head, hardly be one-third part of those that are alleged to have been consumed in Manitoba.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think, when on this item before, the drugs used in Manitoba Penitentiary in the warden's department, came up incidentally and the Minister promised us that he would be able to give us later more detailed explanations as to the nature of this item. I have been waiting patiently for his explanation, and deferred my remarks until we came to the item. I hope he will now fulfil his promise.

Mr. THOMPSON. If I made the hon. gentleman that promise, it has escaped my memory altogether. I supposed the explanations I gave the other evening were satisfactory, but if he will allow me, I will promise to make the explanations the next time we go into Supply.

Mr. TROW. I notice an unusual number of guards employed at that penitentiary. It is well known that the warden of that penitentiary is a very large herder of buffalos, that roam at large over the prairies, and I am persuaded that some of these guards are employed in keeping them within reasonable limits. He has some 35 or 40 buffalos. I know that they are guarded, and I would like to know whether he employs the guards of the penitentiary for that purpose?

Mr. THOMPSON. There are no guards employed at any work of that kind, and none of the prison employes. I may give as one reason why so many guards are required, the fact that there is no wall fence about the prison grounds.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think we have not had such full explanations as we ought to have in reference to this penitentiary. A number of years ago I remember distinctly that the reasons given why the expenses were so unusually large were on account of the cost of living, and the cost of maintenance in that locality. But to-day, although they have good facilities, and the expense of living ought not to be any greater than in any other Province, we find that the expenditure, *per capita*, in Manitoba is increasing from year to year. The expenses of running that institution are becoming greater. We find, according to their own estimates, that in 1886-87, the cost per head was \$1.53; in 1885-86 it was \$1.43, and in 1884-85 it was \$1.31. Now, that shows a gradual running up, contrary to what they promised. They told us that, after a time, as the cost of living decreased, the expenses of the institution

would decrease. Now, what is the reason of the constant increase? I must confess I do not think we have had any sufficient explanation. Is it the warden who is at fault? Does he make requisitions upon the Government that they cannot resist? If the Government find that the warden is more extravagant than he ought to be, let them take steps accordingly. He may be an efficient man, but it is their duty at once to refuse to grant the requisitions he makes upon them. I cannot for the life of me see why the expense should be so enormous. I know there is a large number of Indians usually sent to this institution, and the expenditure increased on account of their being there. I believe you will find that the cause of the increased expenditure, I may say the reckless extravagance, in the institution is traceable to the warden himself, and the sooner the Government make full investigation and curtail the expenses, the more satisfactory will it be to the House. While I am perfectly willing that all facilities should be given to the unfortunate inmates, I am afraid, judging from the appearance of the amount, and judging from the explanation given to us by the Minister, that the unfortunate inmates are not the extravagant ones, that these various extra delicacies are not intended for the inmates, but they are intended for the officers, and I think it is high time for the Minister to make an examination and try to conduct the institution in the future in somewhat such a manner as it ought to be conducted. When we take all the various items, we find that the expenditure is much larger than it is in any other institution of the kind, either in this or any other country, and I cannot for the life of me see why the Government should allow it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is understood, of course, that on these items as to which the hon. gentleman promises further explanation, full discussion will be allowed on concurrence. Now, in support of the statement of my hon. friend behind me, I may just point out a sample instance of how things are managed in the Manitoba Penitentiary. I see a charge of \$52 for a single item of ink. Well, now, in the name of all that is wonderful, how is it that the ordinary correspondence of the officers of a penitentiary like that in Manitoba could require \$52 worth of ink in one year. I find that at Kingston \$30 was sufficient, although that institution has 600 convicts. I think when the hon. gentleman comes to overhaul the accounts of the Manitoba Penitentiary he will find that there has been great laxity somewhere.

Mr. WATSON. There is no doubt that there is ground for complaint, with regard to the management of this penitentiary, as compared with other penitentiaries; and if we look at the items it must be apparent to every member that there is gross extravagance in connection with that institution. The heavy expenditures in connection with the Manitoba Penitentiary are apparent when we consider those made for other penitentiaries. While the expenditure for rations is \$69.33 per head in Manitoba, it is only \$46.20 in British Columbia, and yet rations can be purchased as cheap, if not cheaper, in Manitoba than British Columbia. Take the items as between Manitoba and British Columbia. Wardens and officers' quarters, Manitoba, average cost, \$11.86; British Columbia, 17 cents; travelling expenses of inspector, Manitoba, \$6.36; British Columbia, 4 cents; livery and feed Manitoba, \$4.41; British Columbia, nothing. The quantity of fuel consumed in Manitoba penitentiary is something enormous: coal 486 tons, costing \$3,251; wood, 2,117 cords, costing \$7,582. These are very extravagant items. Then there is also the warden's salary of \$2,000, which is all right, but there is also the warden's storekeeper and accountant. I do not know who he is, for his name is not mentioned, possibly it may be Mr. Bedson himself.

Mr. THOMPSON. The name is McGowan.

Mr. WATSON. I supposed that, perhaps, Mr. Bedson might keep his own accounts, judging from the way in which they are kept. In the tailoring department there is a tailor and an instructor of tailoring. Is it necessary to have an instructor of tailoring when a tailor is employed?

Mr. THOMPSON. The only tailor now employed is engaged in instructing the convicts in tailoring.

Mr. WATSON. Then, as to the cost of living. We explain to people coming to Manitoba that it is a cheap country to live in. But the cost of maintenance at the Manitoba Penitentiary increased from \$1.31 per day per convict in 1884-85 to \$1.43 in 1885-86 and \$1.53 in 1886-87. I submit that these figures should be reversed, because the cost of living is cheaper now than it was in 1885. I especially desire that some explanation should be given with respect to the travelling expenses.

Mr. THOMPSON. The expenses of the inspector are those paid to the inspector of penitentiaries who goes from Ottawa to make the inspection, and they have no relation to the expenses of the prison itself. The reason why they are so much larger for Manitoba as compared with British Columbia, is that the New Westminster Penitentiary is so far away that it is very rarely visited from Ottawa, I think only once within three or four years. The hon. gentleman knows better than I do the exposed situation of Manitoba Penitentiary and the difficulty experienced in heating it. The building is, I think, very ill-designed for the prairies. Under the old system, allowances were made to wardens and other officials. These have all been discontinued since last July.

Mr. TROW. I should imagine that the cost of living in Manitoba would be much cheaper than that of any other Penitentiary in the Dominion, for the simple reason that they have an almost unlimited extent of land. The institution raises its own root crops, onions, beets, potatoes and so forth, and it must have, at least, ten acres under cultivation, the same being land of inexhaustible fertility which is cultivated by prison labor. The expense, consequently, should not be so large as in other penitentiaries where there are not such advantages.

Mr. THOMPSON. We pay two cents per pound more for beef for the Manitoba Penitentiary than at Dorchester.

Mr. WATSON. What do you pay?

Mr. THOMPSON. 8 cents per pound.

Mr. WELSH. I find that 85 prisoners in Manitoba Penitentiary cost about the same amount as 143 in Dorchester Penitentiary.

Mr. THOMPSON. Because the prices are so much higher.

Mr. COOK. There are two barrels of apples for Manitoba at \$11, which is a pretty high price. Had the duty anything to do with the price? There is one item that I do not think is sufficiently high, and it is that for bibles and books. I am afraid the Government are neglecting the convicts in that respect. They should pay a little more attention to church matters there and give the convicts a little less beef, and their morals will be improved thereby.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the \$100 for extra cost of living for the warden in Manitoba Penitentiary? Mr. Bedson receives \$2,000 a year, and last year he received \$400 for extra living.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no allowance for extra living granted to any prison official. The salary is fixed by law; the minimum salary of the warden is \$2,000 and he goes by increases to \$2,400. The extra allowance to which the hon. gentleman refers was made in this connection: When the large influx of prisoners occurred in consequence

of the Rebellion the warden was required to vacate his quarters and remove his family to Winnipeg. One member of his family was very seriously ill, and the illness resulted in death, and an allowance was made in consequence of his extra expenses. In order to save expense the warden was ordered to go on one or two occasions to the Regina and Prince Albert jails to inspect.

Mr. WATSON. Has he any consideration for that outside his salary?

Mr. THOMPSON. Not except travelling expenses.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like the Minister to explain the item of sugar. I find there are 5,551 pounds, costing nearly 7 cents a pound. I also find there are 100 pounds of "Paris lump." Would he explain why this "Paris lump" was used.

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot explain that just now. I find the contract is 10 cents a pound for sugar and the estimate for the coming year is 2,500 pounds.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). That would be only about half the amount that is down here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not 10 cents a pound an extraordinary high price to be paid for sugar to be supplied to a prison?

Mr. THOMPSON. I can only explain what the hon. gentleman asks about this sugar by saying that under the former system on which those accounts are based, rations were allowed to the warden and deputy warden. I suppose the supply was for them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must have misunderstood the hon. gentleman if he says that sugar of a sufficiently good quality for penitentiaries cannot be obtained in Winnipeg less than 10 cents a pound.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is the statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Customs can tell us something about this article. It can hardly be 10 cents a pound.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is the cost of transportation. We pay 12 cents in British Columbia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That should only cause a fractional difference between the price in Winnipeg and the price in Toronto and Montreal. The cost of transportation even on the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot be so material as to involve such a considerable difference in price.

Mr. WATSON. We can buy granulated sugar in Winnipeg for $8\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would be very happy to give a contract at that price.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). You bought the Paris lump sugar at 10 cents per pound.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is the brown sugar we are estimating for now.

Mr. McMULLEN. In connection with the Manitoba Penitentiary I think there is evidence that its expenses requires the careful attention of the Minister. I have no desire in the world to find unnecessary fault, but I have made a calculation which shows that there is something wrong with the Manitoba Penitentiary. In Kingston there are 572 inmates at a cost of \$187.10 each for all expenses during the year; in Dorchester there are 143 at a cost of \$298.90 for all expenses, and in Manitoba there are 85 at a cost, *per capita*, for officers and all expenses, of \$558.80, or very nearly \$600 an inmate. In British Columbia there are 95, and they cost only \$368.14 each. Now we find that for the feeding alone of those inmates: in Dorchester they

Mr. THOMPSON.

cost \$66.80 each; in Manitoba \$111.25 each, and in British Columbia, where I think certainly food should be quite as dear as Manitoba, they only cost \$108.30 each. In the Central Prison in Toronto they only cost 55 cents per head, per day, while in Manitoba they cost \$1.53, and in Dorchester 81 cents, in which the inmates are equal in number to the Guelph Central Prison. When you come to Manitoba the charges there are enormous, and I think the Minister should have a full investigation of all items of expenditure in connection with that penitentiary, and see that they are reduced to something within reasonable limits.

Mr. COOK. I suppose they keep horses there. I see one charge for a buggy at \$200. Is it for the purchase of a buggy?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. COOK. I see items for livery and horse feed, \$243, and horse hire \$24. If they have horses what is the necessity for hiring horses?

Mr. THOMPSON. The livery was for the surgeon.

Mr. COOK. There is a very large item of \$321.60 for telegrams.

Mr. THOMPSON. Telegraphing is expensive there.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think you will find there are separate items in reference to the surgeon's livery. It appears in the officers department that there is another charge for livery and feed. It must have been for some of the other officers.

Mr. THOMPSON. Probably for both; I will enquire about that.

British Columbia Penitentiary,.....\$43,827 85

Mr. THOMPSON. There is an increase of \$1,530 in the salaries. The increase is to give the warden the minimum salary provided by the statute, which is \$2,000. There is an increase also in the salary of deputy warden on account of the special duties that he has to perform. In addition to his duties as deputy warden and chief keeper, which, of course, may well be discharged by the deputy there, he has qualifications as a farmer. He has been successful in bringing a large area under cultivation, and he attends to the duties of the farm, thus saving the expense we have to incur elsewhere for the employment of a farmer. He does it very successfully indeed, and we thought, under those circumstances, he should get an increase of \$100. The warden has asked to have a carpenter instructor and a baker appointed, and that has been recommended by the inspector. I need not tell the committee that it is very useful to have a carpenter instructor, where so many convicts are employed, either at practicing or learning the trade; and it has been recommended as decidedly in the interest of economy that a baker should be employed instead of having the bread furnished by contract, as at present. The other increases are only statutory increases. In the maintenance there is a decrease of \$3,323.40, on account of a smaller estimated prison population than last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is that?

Mr. THOMPSON. The fact is that we have had for two or three years past an abnormally large number of convicts, principally in consequence of the kind of population that was left stranded in the country after the completion of the railway works; but the influx of prisoners to the penitentiary has since been much less. There is a small decrease in the working expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see that there is much ground of complaint there; but if the hon. gentle-

man will look at the Auditor General's report of 1886-87, he will see that the complaints which have been made regarding the Manitoba Penitentiary are amply justified. If you take the item of meat, you will find that in Manitoba, including the guards, there will be about the same number of persons as in the British Columbia Penitentiary, and yet they consume four times the quantity of meat that was consumed in British Columbia. It does look as if that required a considerable overhauling.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no doubt that that ought to have careful enquiry. I may say that a very diligent accountant has been appointed in the Manitoba Penitentiary; he was formerly employed in the Dorchester Penitentiary, and I have every confidence in any accounts that pass under his hands. He was appointed about two years ago.

Regina Jail..... \$13,000

Mr. THOMPSON. We have at present merely organised the staff in anticipation of the wants of the prison. I estimate that we shall require two more guards when, as we expect about the 1st July, we shall take the prisoners who are confined in the police barracks throughout the North-West and transfer them, as far as we can accommodate them, to the Regina jail. We have not had any prisoners there heretofore.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What kind of an arrangement is likely to be made with respect to all the jails throughout the North-West? The Dominion will have to support the penitentiaries, but does the hon. gentleman contemplate the establishment of several ordinary jails throughout the new North-West Territory, because it will be a tolerably expensive business.

Mr. THOMPSON. We must do so, because we have to look after the administration of justice there, which devolves on the Provincial Governments elsewhere, and I have asked the hon. Minister of Public Works to provide, on an economical scale, for several jails and lock-ups in the North-West. The fact is, we make an allowance to the Mounted Police for keeping prisoners in the guard-rooms and cells in their barracks, which are in most cases unsuitable places for keeping convicts. At present the only jails erected are at Regina and Prince Albert, and this is the only one yet occupied.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Do I understand that you are making provision to keep lunatics at this jail permanently?

Mr. THOMPSON. No, the lunatics are confined in the asylum at Selkirk, and an allowance is made to the Provincial Government for their support. The Selkirk Asylum is full, and at present, I am sorry to say, there are lunatics confined in the police barracks of necessity; but I made arrangements with my late colleague, the Minister of the Interior, a month or two ago, for the removal of all those to the Manitoba Penitentiary, where they can be better cared for.

Salaries, House of Commons..... \$66,650

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is a considerable increase.

Mr. SPEAKER. The increase \$2,100 under this head is made up as follows:—Thirty clerks are entitled to the annual statutory increase of \$50, making \$1,500. For years past it has been found necessary to have one of the messengers attached to the stationery office to attend to the supplying of stationery to the members, and holding copy in proof-reading, which is done in that department. The person so employed became necessary to the office, and therefore, instead of having his time divided between the messengers' room, and the stationery office, it was deemed

advisable to attach him to the stationery office as a junior clerk. The change has been found to work well, as attending at the counter and proof-reading can be proceeded with at the same time. His salary is \$600, being only \$10 more than he had before.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This item embraces sessional clerks. How many are there?

Mr. SPEAKER. I could not state the exact number, but I am quite sure we will not exceed the usual vote for that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a great curiosity on the part of many young members like myself to know what the duties of those sessional clerks are.

Mr. SPEAKER. Their duties are varied. Of course, they cannot always be employed, but sometimes they have all the work they can do. The custom has been followed by many members employing them on their own account when they are not working for the House. They employ them as private secretaries, and I think that on the whole they are useful to the House and very often to the members. When asked to copy something, they are always ready.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If hon. members employ them, it is at their own expense.

Mr. SPEAKER. They can employ them on public business, for instance copying electoral lists. They are also employed in some of the departments when required.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then a member of the House can have any official work of that kind done by one of these clerks?

Mr. SPEAKER. Certainly; the moment the application is made to the Clerk of the House, these clerks are supplied to do any work that can be called public business.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Do I understand the Speaker to say that he does not know the number?

Mr. SPEAKER. The number is not greater than in other Sessions.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). In 1886 you had about 37.

Mr. SPEAKER. To-day I should say we have not more than 25 to 28.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As Mr. Speaker has kindly imparted to us this information, it might be interesting to know how he distributes these clerks when wanted by various gentlemen in the House. If available, they should be available in due proportion. We should have them appointed in the same fashion as we appoint commissioners. A certain section should be attached to the service of hon. gentlemen on your right, and a certain section on your left. I am a pretty old member, having been in office a good many years, and I have never obtained any advantage or assistance from the gentlemen of the sessional clerk department. If Mr. Speaker will see that the division be made proportionately, I suppose my hon. friends will not say much about it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I had pretty nearly forgotten there is one side called the right side and one the left side. I do not attend to these details, but I understand from the Clerk of the House that any member who applies to him for the assistance of a sessional clerk for doing his work, when that work may be called public business, a clerk is always supplied to him. I am quite sure that if the hon. gentleman would see his friend, Mr. Bourinot, he would have any number of clerks he wanted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is information to every hon. gentleman on this side. There are 30 or 40 of those clerks now. At one time there were 110.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In 1878.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be a great convenience to have these clerks; but if we are to have gentlemen in waiting, we should have the privilege of appointing those who are to serve us. Sometimes those public documents are of a confidential nature, and there would be an advantage in having clerks in whom one might have perfect confidence when giving them such documents to copy. It has so happened, so far in the distribution of these clerks, that, although we do a very fair proportion of public business on this side, not one of these blessings has ever fallen to us.

Mr. SPEAKER. You do not care much for them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker has never given us an opportunity of letting him know how much we would appreciate advantages of this sort.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Just try it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am inclined to think that if we were to make the trial, we would find they are always engaged to the full extent of their powers by hon. gentlemen opposite. A few years ago, I know we had a number of these gentlemen, and they sat in the galleries, and were correspondents of newspapers supporting hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. There were a few not exactly of that class. I think Mr. King Dodds was one who was appointed an extra sessional clerk one Friday, and on the following Monday he left, but his appointment was antedated forty days, he drew \$160, and he was allowed to return home in order to engage in an election canvass. That is the way in which he performed his duties. Then, another gentleman made a representation to a member for the city of Ottawa, but his services were not required immediately, for the reason, I believe, that they could not find a room to put him in, so that he might be out of the way; but the member representing this city received a letter from him at the end of the Session thanking him for the appointment and stating that he had received his money all right, though he had not been required to come to the House at all. I hope, Mr. Speaker, has not any of that class at this time. I hope the present clerks are all actively and earnestly engaged in discharging those duties which the hon. gentlemen on the other side find so extremely convenient and so necessary in the public interest; but it does so happen that not one of those sessional clerks has ever been placed at the service of any hon. gentleman on this side of the House. I must say that I never supposed it was any part of their duty to write the addresses on parliamentary literature which hon. gentlemen were sending to their constituents. On this side of the House, when hon. gentlemen have had anything of that kind to do, I believe they have been obliged to pay for it out of their own pockets; but, on that side of the House, thanks to the generosity of the Ministry and to the large sums in the public Treasury, hon. gentlemen are not put to any inconvenience of that sort, and those gentlemen find that it is highly convenient to have these clerks engaged as their private secretaries—for that is what it amounts to—and paid out of the public Treasury. The Minister of Finance has for some time been engaged, I think, in trying to cut down the public expenses. The hon. gentleman will see that here is an opportunity. Every little counts in this matter, and, as the hon. gentleman is, as we on this side are, a friend of unrestricted reciprocity with the neighboring republic and anxious to extend our trade relations with that country, and is desirous to economise in order to bring this about, it is highly proper that he should see that this element of public waste comes to an end. It seems to me, if we are to accept the statement of Mr. Speaker, if he is not mistaken—and I apprehend he is not mistaken, as to what these men are engaged in doing—we have been paying out of the public Treasury the salaries of parties who are

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

simply the private secretaries of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it can be properly inferred from what I have stated that these clerks are only employed in assisting the members on this side of the House. I said we were obliged to keep a larger staff than we otherwise would, because at times business is so pressing and there is so much work for them to do that we have to keep a large number of them so that the work on hand can be done at once. When they have leisure, I do not see why these sessional clerks should not be employed profitably in the public interest by members who might want them. The Clerk of the House has always allowed that. I do not think he has done it only for members on this side of the House, but I think he has done it equally for members sitting on the other side. Still, it is only when these men are at leisure, when they are not employed in the work of the House, that they are disposed of in that way, and I think the argument of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is not fair in this sense, that it does not prove that it is not a necessity to have these sessional clerks on hand when they are required. Hon. members might say the same thing in regard to a great many of the employes of this House. Most of them are only employed for three or four months, for the time of the Session. Is that a reason why their services should be dispensed with, because the whole work might be done in the twelve months of the year by a smaller staff? The work has to be done during the Session, and, if these officers have leisure after the Session, that is no reason for dismissing them. The same reasoning applies to the sessional clerks, and, when they have nothing else to do, we have to utilise them in some way, and we have to keep them on hand because they may be required at any moment in order that the work of the House may be done with expedition and with celerity, so that the work of the House may not be impeded. I do not think it would be fair that we should infer from what I have said that these sessional clerks are paid uselessly or that their time is wasted.

Mr. HESSON. I must entirely repudiate the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are utilising the services of the sessional clerks. I have been a member of this House for ten years, and I have never asked any sessional clerk for five minutes of his time. I think there are many on this side of the House who can say the same as I do. Can hon. gentlemen on the other side say as much? I know that there is one gentleman who has had 7,000 pamphlets or speeches sent out in a very short period, and I do not think that he addressed all the envelopes himself. If sessional clerks were at his disposal, if he asked the Clerk of the House to allow him to obtain their services, no doubt if they had leisure he would have obtained their services.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. HESSON. I utterly repudiate—

An hon. MEMBER. Name the man who sent out 7,000 speeches.

Mr. HESSON. Will the hon. gentleman have patience? I repudiate the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that it is customary for members on this side of the House—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not my statement; it is the Speaker's statement.

Mr. HESSON. The Speaker did not make that statement, that these clerks were only at the disposal of members on this side of the House. He stated the contrary. He said that, if hon. gentlemen asked for their services, the Clerk would give them to hon. gentlemen opposite. I have

nothing more to say on this subject, but I do not want to have the accusation hurled at me that we use the services of these gentlemen. Probably we have more work to do than hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I know that I have a great deal of work to do, and I am willing to do it, and I do not ask for any favor from the Government or from any of its employés. I believe it is necessary, as a great deal of work has to be done sometimes in this House, to have men employed to do that work; and, when they have too much leisure, it is well that they should be employed in other ways. I do not think it is fair to assume that they are only available for the services of gentlemen on this side of the House, when hon. gentlemen opposite are well aware of the fact that if they want the services of these men they can have them. For myself, I have never had one of them employed for five minutes, and I presume there are other gentlemen on this side of the House who can say the same thing.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member who has just sat down says that the Speaker did not say that these gentlemen were employed only for the service of members on that side of the House. I did not understand the Speaker to say that, but the Speaker did say that these gentlemen were at the services of members on both sides of the House. As a matter of fact we know that in the past members on this side of the House not only have not employed, but were not even aware that they could employ these clerks, and, as a matter of fact, members on this side have not employed them. In the past, hon. members opposite have had the full advantage of the services of these gentlemen; but in the future, I suppose that hon. gentlemen on this side will avail themselves of the services of these employés. But there is another point to which I wish to allude. How are these men paid?

Mr. SPEAKER. By the day.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask whether, when they are absent from the city of Ottawa, their pay goes on, or whether their time is docked whenever they are absent from the city? I have known some of these gentlemen who are most of the Session away from Ottawa, but I have understood that they collected their full pay for every day of the Session. I do not know whether all the employés of the House are in the same position and are paid in the same way; but I have, myself, within the past three days, seen an employé of this House down at Bedford in the county of Missisquoi who was present on a platform at the nomination of candidates in a local election, and that gentleman was not present in Ottawa doing his duty as an employé of this House from Friday of one week until Monday evening of the next week. An hon. gentleman near me asks me whether he was working for the Tory candidate. I did not speak to him, but I know he was there, and I would like to know from the Speaker whether this gentleman is allowed to draw his pay at so much per day, even though he may be absent from his duty and away in the country, apparently doing work in an election campaign.

Mr. MADILL. I would suggest that hon. gentlemen opposite appoint our Ministers.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not aware that permission has been given to any sessional clerk to do this; such a thing is not allowed. He is not entitled to his pay if he has been absent during a working day, and if he is absent without leave, he ought to be reported.

Mr. FISHER. What are working days?

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the days on which the House sits. On Saturday after one o'clock I suppose every clerk is at liberty to go away, like all other civil servants.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask Mr. Speaker what he calls working days?

Mr. SPEAKER. Every day of the week, except Saturday afternoon.

Mr. FISHER. I understand, then, that these men's services extend during the ordinary hours that civil servants work, or during the session of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER. Sessional clerks must be on hand during the sittings of the House. When we adjourn at two or three o'clock, sometimes, they have to remain here until four or five in order to get everything ready for the members next morning. It depends entirely upon the kind of work they have to do.

Mr. FISHER. Then I understand that if these gentlemen are away for a part of the time during which the House is sitting, and during which they are supposed to be here, they ought to be docked their pay for that time.

Mr. SPEAKER. Well, if they were absent half a day, I presume that strictly speaking, a half day's pay could be deducted from them.

Mr. LAURIER. There is more than that in the question of my hon. friend. If an employé of this House goes and takes part in an election, even while the House is not sitting, surely the Speaker will not permit that, and he would see that such an employé was called to a better sense of his duty. This has been a common practice in the past, but in the future I hope it will not be tolerated. No one, I am sure, can countenance any officer of this House going to take part in an election such as the officer which the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) has just mentioned.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the hon. member says, I do not think we ought to countenance clerks or other employés of this House taking an active part in elections. Of course they have their right to vote, but I should say at once that they have no right to take such a part in elections as to make themselves offensive in any way, either to the public or to members of the House. That rule should be followed strictly. I presume the election to which the hon. member has referred is a provincial election.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not considered what should be done in that case, but I should say that if a clerk was on the hustings where a member of this House was present, and if he did not conduct himself like a gentleman towards a member of the House, of which he is a servant, he should be dismissed at once. But I do not think that we can go so far as to say that officers of this House cannot mingle in provincial elections, or in municipal elections. They have their rights, and they can exercise them as well as any other citizen, but they should not engage actively in elections. But as I said before, I had not the occasion of considering the point. No complaint has been made to me yet in reference to officers of this House taking part in provincial elections.

Mr. LAURIER. I would not like to make a complaint that would involve the dismissal of an officer of this House, but I call the attention of the Speaker to a fact that has come under my notice, not with a view of procuring the dismissal of the offender, but with the view of preventing a practice which seems to me most objectionable. Mr. Speaker says that he is not disposed to say at present whether an officer of this House should be allowed to take part in a local election. I have no hesitation in saying that he should not be allowed to do such a thing. It is my opinion, and I think it is the opinion of the majority of this House, that no officer should be allowed to leave his business at Ottawa while he is a servant of the House, and go and take part in any election whatever.

If there is a municipal election here in Ottawa, or a provincial election, or a federal election, let him go and register his vote; but that he should leave the city here, leave his work, and go and engage in any electoral campaign whatever, ought not to be allowed. But this has taken place recently, I will not even mention the name; I do not want the officer to be dismissed, but I mention the fact in order to prevent a vicious practice which has been growing up.

Mr. FISHER. I would go a little further and say that if an employé of this House has a vote in any constituency where an election is going on, it would be perfectly competent for him to ask permission to leave his work here and go and cast his vote. I would not object to that at all, provided he were a voter in the constituency, and provided he obtained his leave of absence, and ceased drawing his pay while he was away. I do object most emphatically to employés going away, apparently without the knowledge of their chiefs, and taking part in elections in which they have no interest beyond their party interest, because I may state for the information of Mr. Speaker that this gentleman has no vote in Missisquoi and does not live there. I am not going to give his name, because I do not wish him to be dismissed on this charge or to be reprimanded, but I desire that such conduct should be put an end to in the future. I am told, although I cannot state it from personal knowledge, that this gentleman made remarks against the integrity of the hon. gentleman who sits in front of me, remarks most objectionable to that gentleman and his followers who heard those remarks. At the same time I do not wish to make any charge or to have him dismissed in consequence of his action. I do not think this is desirable, because the Government have not chosen to issue an order that employés should not do that work, but I hold that an order should be issued by Mr. Speaker directing that employés shall not meddle in political matters during the time they are employed by this House and paid by it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The rule of the House with regard to extra sessional clerks is that no one is entitled to receive pay except for the period of time he is here. The only thing that justifies Mr. Speaker in appointing an extra sessional clerk is the urgency of public business. If as a sessional clerk he is employed in order to perform certain work he is supposed to be here; he has no right to leave here for any purpose whatever, and I think it would be extremely improper for such a clerk to obtain leave for the purpose of voting in any particular constituency. We know what the result would be. There would be such a paucity of public business he would not be required here, if he were on the right side of politics; but if he happened to be on the other side public urgency would prevent his being absent. Then the practical way is that if he wishes to exercise his franchise he ought not to engage in the public service, but if he is engaged here as an extra sessional clerk then he should remain here to discharge his duties. When my hon. friend says he will not give the name of the party lest that might lead to his dismissal, I do not think there is the slightest danger. I dare say hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches may have sent this party into Missisquoi to engage in the canvass.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman cannot suppose such a thing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The innocents are not abroad, the innocents are at home.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I see them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Only the other parties are sent abroad. Mr. O'Donohue, a clerk in one of the departments, is away canvassing. Several hon. gentlemen have met him in Russell.

Mr. LAUBIER.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope they have made his acquaintance.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has made his acquaintance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know him very well.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Sometimes he has enjoyed the confidence of the hon. gentleman, and at other times there seems to be a serious misunderstanding between Mr. O'Donohue and his distinguished friend who leads the House. The hon. gentleman knows that the high estimation in which he holds Mr. O'Donohue, is not always reciprocated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, but he has found out differently.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is wonderful what influence money from the public Treasury has on even a man with such a cynical disposition as Mr. O'Donohue. If he had broad and generous views he would not suspect anything but the most lofty and pure sentiments on the part of the First Minister. But Mr. O'Donohue has entertained different views in regard to the right hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps even the hon. gentleman has thought the same way of me, but he has changed his mind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not always express my thoughts; but if I were to make a frank confession to the right hon. gentleman I would say that I have not the utmost confidence in him even at this moment. I am inclined to think, notwithstanding all the good intentions and good resolutions the right hon. gentleman has made, after all his efforts to start in a new path, it has become so much a matter of habit with him that notwithstanding these good intentions the hon. gentleman when he would do good evil is present. But it is not the hon. gentleman who does it but the sin that dwelleth in him. No doubt the hon. gentleman has a large number of these people engaged outside. The truth is that the public interest suffers by it either by the appointment of a larger number than is necessary in order that there may be individuals detailed from the service, or it suffers by a large number of those officers being away from their post of duty. I think Mr. Speaker has enunciated sound principles with regard to this matter, and I hope he will act on them, and that he will see that the extra sessional clerks absent from duty and engaged in political canvassing will not be paid out of the public Treasury. It is all very well to come down handsomely in election contests.

Some hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear." Hon. gentlemen opposite always do come down handsomely in election contests; but, unfortunately, they come down by putting their hands into the public Treasury instead of putting their hands into their own pockets. That is the difficulty. Hon. gentlemen know there are some gentlemen on the Treasury benches who have got into difficulty from not distinguishing between what belongs to the public and what does not. I say that because they may have gone wrong occasionally, that is no reason why every clerk should be trained to go wrong in precisely the same way. Hon. gentlemen who say "hear, hear," know pretty well that they have themselves been, perhaps, rather generously aided in election contests in this way, and it may have been all very well in the past, but we hope—we are a progressive people, and the hon. gentleman claims to represent a progressive party—they will initiate a better state of things which will be entered upon at an early period. If they do that we shall have less ground for complaint, and we shall not have these clerks employed by Mr. Speaker and the

House, and paid out of the public Treasury, sent out to canvass for and aid Tory candidates in the county of Russell or elsewhere instead of being here at the post of duty.

Mr. LABELLE. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) has made an assertion that one of the extra clerks has been on the hustings and has made disparaging remarks respecting the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). I hope he will give the clerk's name, because he richly deserves to be put out of his employment if he has done so. The hon. gentleman knows the attitude I have taken in the Tremblay case, and, if the hon. gentleman makes the charge, that clerk does not deserve to be an employé of the House. I hope the hon. gentleman will make a complaint if not in the House at least to Mr. Speaker, and I shall be one of the first to sustain Mr. Speaker in dismissing him from his employment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Whilst the hon. gentlemen opposite are making such serious charges against the Administration for allowing the servants of this House to be employed in connection with the election campaigns it would be, perhaps, well for the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to spare a little of that advice and to offer it to Mr. Mowat, the purist Premier of the Province of Ontario. I may say to the hon. gentleman that in the campaign I had the honor to wage against their candidate in the election in Haldimand, I have met the officials of the Ontario Government in various portions of the riding engaged in working for the Reform candidate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But you had Her Majesty's assistance.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no doubt the argument of Her Majesty would have little effect on the mind of the hon. gentleman. I do not ask him to rely upon my word solely in making those charges against the servants of the Ontario Government. I hold the print of a letter written by Mr. Thomas Paxton, M.P.P., in 1872.

An hon. MEMBER. He is dead now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, it is no crime for him to be dead. There are various others who might be dead to the greater benefit of the country. This letter is to Mr. A. P. Cockburn, and reads in this way:

"Mr. D. M. Card is authorised to do some work for the Ontario Government in your part, wishing to make your acquaintance and get your advice. * * * Mr. Card is a first-class man in an election contest. Of course I am aware he must be cautious what he was doing under the circumstances."

The public accounts of the next year show that Mr. Card was paid \$3,504.28 out of the public funds of the Province of Ontario. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said something with regard to the expenditure of public money, and though it may not be very relevant to the subject under discussion, yet as that discussion has taken rather a wide range I desire to call his attention for a moment to a matter circulated in the county of Kent at the present time, presumably in the interest of Mr. Campbell, the Reform candidate in that constituency. I saw it published in the papers to-night and that is my authority for making the statement, but hon. gentlemen opposite know as to the facts, and if that circular is not now being circulated they will deny it. It is an extract from a paper and it says:

"GOOD NEWS FOR RALEIGH.

"THE ONTARIO GOVERNMENT RELIEVES THE TOWNSHIP OF
\$17,000 INDEBTEDNESS.

"On Thursday, the reeve, first deputy and Messrs. Morrison and Dolsen, a deputation appointed by the council of Raleigh, waited upon the Hon. C. F. Fraser, Commissioner of Public Works, at Toronto, to urge the remission of a portion of the indebtedness due the Government of Ontario on the Government drains, in order to enable the township to provide a sufficient outlet by deepening Jennet's creek, without increasing the burdens on the ratepayers. After a full discussion of the

case, Mr. Fraser, on behalf of the Government, offered to throw off the last five payments, and reduce the interest on the debenture indebtedness of the township to four per cent. which reductions of principal and interest relieve the township of an indebtedness of at least \$17,000. This grant reduces the cost of the drains from \$84,000 to \$18,000, leaving only some \$9,000 to pay instead of \$26,575—the amount heretofore due the Government. This generous act on the part of the Reform Government of Ontario will be appreciated by the ratepayers of Raleigh, who will thereby be enabled to improve the entire drainage system and provide a sufficient outlet for all the waters of the township without adding to their taxes. The electors of Raleigh know that the promises of a Reform Government are sincere and will be carried out to the very letter, and that a promise of the above nature is worth a thousand of the election promises of Henry Smyth and his friends. Mr. Smyth's insincere and absurd proposal to dredge Jennet's creek has often been used to assist him in entrapping innocent voters always doomed to disappointment. The promises of Mr. Campbell and his friends are not so numerous but they are always fulfilled."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is extremely desirable no doubt, that great economy should be exercised in all matters of the public service, and I notice in connection with the county which the hon. gentleman represents for the time being and perhaps not for very long a most remarkable instance of economy which he can compare with the liberality to which he has alluded as about to be exercised by the Ontario Government. I notice, Sir, that in that county there is a little town called Cayuga, with a population at last census of 790 people. I notice they had a net post office revenue after paying all expenses of \$450, and I observe that a liberal and wise-minded government have lately put in the Estimates a sum of about \$3,000 odd, to provide a post office for the town, which has a population of 790 souls and a net receipt for post office purposes of between \$400 and \$500. So, Sir, they will be able to pay the interest on the amount of expenditure for this post office, and have probably about \$80 clear out of the annual income received from the post office in Cayuga. As the hon. gentleman is desirous of promoting economy, here is an instance which must commend itself to this House. There are about 300 towns—I am not sure if there are not more—containing a population of 800 souls in the Province of Ontario, and if the hon. gentlemen are desirous of promoting economy—they have only a deficit this year of \$350,000 in the management of the post office this year—where there are such deserving citizens as the hon. member for Haldimand, there is a most admirable illustration of how you can save public money and promote economy. I have no doubt the Minister of Finance will expound to us, to-morrow evening I hope, the scrupulous care with which the finances of this Government are managed, and this I submit as one of the nice little illustrations of the mode in which—we will not say votes are influenced in the county of Haldimand—but one of the modes in which a deficit of nearly a million a year is made good in the Post Office Department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may say, Sir, in connection with that grant, that it is the first the county of Haldimand, one of the most important and one of the heaviest tax paying counties in Canada, ever got from the public Treasury. I have to say further, that when I was engaged in my last contest my opponents were the strongest advocates for the erection of that public building. They claimed it was a necessity and a justice to the county, and the only argument they produced against me was that the Government would never build it. If it was not a correct expenditure why did the hon. gentleman allow it to pass last year?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because I had not the majority to stop it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, but because he was afraid such opposition would influence the minds of the people against his candidate; and now when the hon. gentleman knows that Haldimand has gone from their grasp and that they never can redeem it, he is willing to vote against it. So far as his insinuation that I shall only be here for a short time is concerned, I

may say that my hold on my people is not so flimsy, not so small nor not so slight as the hold of the hon. gentleman has been on the various constituencies which I shall not tax my mind to remember to-night, and which he has endeavored to represent in this House. I have come here to represent the electors of Haldimand, and I believe I have come here to stay longer than the hon. gentleman did in any of his constituencies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So long as the hon. gentleman is supplied with returning officers of the kind that elected him, and a sufficient number of ex-convicts, so long he may find his way here and no longer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So far as the deputy returning officer is concerned, against whom he is desirous to use the tongue of slander, so far as his present conduct is concerned, he is just as honorable a member of the community in Haldimand, as the hon. gentleman himself is in Kingston.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt whatever that he is a very fit associate for the hon. gentleman—not the slightest doubt at all, and also for the men who appointed a returning officer who would appoint such convicts.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to say a few words on this before it is carried. Hon. gentlemen need not think that any of their insinuations or utterances will stop me from saying what I am going to say. If they attempt anything of that kind they will get enough of it before the Session is over. I notice in the Auditor General's report that there are 16 officials who got an extra allowance of \$50 each last year. I do not understand why 16 messengers were allowed a gratuity of \$50 extra. I notice that one man, a sessional clerk, got \$50 for clothing. I would like to know under what circumstances he got that.

Mr. SPEAKER. Some of the messengers got that gratuity on this ground: They are all paid alike; but some of them, those in immediate attendance in the Chamber, have to be provided with uniform, and being not better paid than the others, the hon. gentleman will understand that it would be unfair to them, and they would be really less paid than the others if they did not receive that gratuity at the end of the Session.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know if uniforms have been supplied to those at the outer doors, or only to one.

Mr. SPEAKER. There are five or six who are required to have special uniform, not more.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may say that there has been a complaint made that the French messengers got this allowance last year, and the others did not. I would like to know if there is any truth in the statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not aware that there is any truth in the statement, and I am astounded to hear that there is a complaint made that I would give anything to the French messengers that I would not give to the English messengers. In fact, I do not know their nationalities, and I would add that not more than one-fourth of the employés of this House belong to the French nationality.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would say that the complaint was made in my hearing by a messenger; and I am glad that the Speaker has been able to deny that there is any truth in it. I did not think myself that possibly there was, but when a complaint is made, it is just as well to know whether there is any partiality of that kind or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say it is not my fault if most of those who have received gratuities are of French nationality, as the positions which they occupy have been given

Mr. MONTAGUE.

to them by my predecessors. One of them, old Mr. Laflamme, has been employed in the Speaker's rooms, I think, for forty years, and I think it would be pretty hard for me to dismiss him now because he is a Frenchman.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would just make another remark about a remark which was dropped by the hon. member for North Perth. He said there was one member of this side who sent out 7,000 pamphlets, and who employed the clerks to send them out, and I heard North Wellington mentioned. I would say that no sessional clerk has ever performed an hour's work for me without my paying for it, and they always professed to do what they did for me after hours. I noticed on several occasions that they were doing nothing, and fancying that they would be willing to earn a dollar, I, on one or two occasions, engaged them to address matters for me; but every single item they did for me I paid for out of my own pocket.

Mr. HESSON. I did not use the hon. gentleman's name in connection with that, but if the cap fits him, I presume he felt it more applicable to him than to anybody else.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You were asked the name.

Mr. HESSON. I am aware that I was asked the question, but I was not bound to give the name.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may just say that I have not sent out 2,000, let alone 7,000, and if the hon. gentleman had any reference to me, he is quite mistaken.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman got 7,000 envelopes.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not true.

Salaries of Officers of the Library \$16,630

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask whether that includes the salary of the Librarian at the Supreme Court.

Mr. HESSON. No, the librarian at the Supreme Court is a messenger of the Department of Justice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He is an intelligent man, and I think his pay is a very small amount for one occupying that position.

Purchase of works on America for Library \$1,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What special works on America is this money devoted to?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A general collection of works on America.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to have this devoted to certain special lines so that it will not be all frittered away. It would be more valuable if directed to procure a certain class of works than if spent in an indiscriminate fashion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand from the Librarian that this is to complete all our works, historical, geographical, and otherwise relating to the continent of America. Of course, we have a great many books on that subject, but there is a number wanting.

Preparing and reprinting the Catalogue of the Library of American history \$2,500

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That has been recommended for two years by the Library Committee, and their report was adopted last year.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is this to be a yearly expenditure?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it is only for this year.

Printing, paper and book-binding \$80,000

Mr. MITCHELL. What does this include, and are tenders called for it?

Mr. BOWELL. The printing is done after public tender is had. The printing paper is furnished after tenders have been advertised for and specifications sent to the different manufacturers. My impression is that the lowest tenders were those of two manufacturers in Montreal for the two classes of paper. Mr. Rolland was one; I forget the name of the other.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 27th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORTS ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That the time for the reception of reports from Committees on Private Bills be extended until Wednesday, the 9th May next.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the York Farmers' Colonisation Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. McCulla.)

Bill (No. 114) amending the different Acts relative to the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto (from the Senate).—(Mr. Small.)

THE HARBOR OF MONTREAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House, on Monday next, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide:

(a) That the Government of the Dominion of Canada may release and discharge the Corporation of the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal from all liability to repay to the said Government the whole or any part of the advances made to the said Corporation to enable them to widen and deepen the channel in Lake St. Peter and the River St. Lawrence, from Montreal to Quebec, or any interest thereon, beyond the amount of interest already paid by them to the Government (it being understood that no portion of the amount heretofore paid for interest is to be refunded);

(b) That the Government may pay to the said Corporation of the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal a sum not exceeding the sum of \$37,405, which they represent as being the excess of their expenditure (apart from the expenditure on capital account), over their net revenue during the calendar year 1887;

(c) That the Government may, in addition to the said payment last mentioned, expend, through the medium of the said Corporation or otherwise, in the work of completing the said channel, the amount now remaining unexpended of the sums authorised by any Act heretofore passed to be advanced to the said Harbor Commissioners of Montreal for the purpose of completing the said channel;

(d) That no tonnage dues shall be hereafter levied on, or collected from, any sailing vessel or steamer at the port of Montreal;

(e) That the dredging plant and appliances heretofore used by the said Harbor Commissioners, in connection with the said channel works, shall hereafter belong to the Government of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

THE HARBOR OF QUEBEC.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House, on Monday next, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide:

(a) That the Graving Dock built at Lévis, opposite Quebec, shall become a public work of the Dominion of Canada, under the control of the Minister of Public Works of Canada, and administered by him, and the Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners shall cease to have any control over it, and all powers, privileges and authorities in them vested shall cease and the same shall thenceforward be vested in the Government of the Dominion of Canada.

(b) That the Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners shall be released and discharged from any obligation to repay to the Government of Canada the whole or any part of the advances made to them by the said Government for the purpose of constructing the said Graving Dock, and from any obligation to pay to the said Government any sums of money to provide for the payment of interest thereon, or for the formation of a sinking fund in connection therewith.

(c) That out of the bonds of the Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners now held by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General to cover advances made to the said Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners by the Government of Canada to meet payments on account of improvements in the Harbor of Quebec and in connection with the wet or tidal dock at the mouth of the River St. Charles, there shall be returned to the said Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners such amount of bonds as shall be equal in par value to the amount which has been paid out of capital by the said Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners to the said Government for interest and sinking fund on the bonds so deposited as aforesaid with the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, and the said Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners shall thenceforth be released from any obligation in connection with the bonds so to be returned as aforesaid and the advances represented thereby.

(d) That from and after the first day of January, 1888, the rate of interest to be paid on all the bonds so deposited as aforesaid, and on all bonds thereafter deposited to cover further advances for the same purpose, shall be 4 per cent. per annum without sinking fund, and that all of the said bonds remaining in the hands of the Receiver General, after deducting the amount to be returned as above provided, shall be replaced with bonds of the said Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners for the same par value, in such form as he may approve, bearing interest at 4 per cent. per annum without sinking fund: Provided always, that all amounts actually paid to the Government by the said Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners for sinking fund on their said bonds shall be the property of the Government of Canada and form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER, in moving that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move that you do now leave the Chair for the purpose of going into Committee of Ways and Means, I must again ask the indulgence of the House from the fact that, owing to the circumstances connected with the administration of the affairs of the country, I have been under the necessity of being absent from Ottawa for a considerable period since the last Session. Although my department has been watched over during my absence, first in London and afterwards in Washington, by my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Customs, with his usual ability, yet this House will expect from me, as Finance Minister, the usual statement as to the financial condition of the country. With this brief preface, I will pass at once to the consideration of our condition in that respect. I will first give explanations as to the variations in the financial statements made in May last respecting the year expired 30th June, 1887, and then review the condition of affairs of the current fiscal year, and finally indicate to the House the position that the Government expect will transpire during the next financial year. Taking first the financial affairs for the year ended 30th June last, we estimated that the revenue received from all sources would amount to \$35,300,000. In May last, when making the annual statement, I endeavored to deal with our expectations in as careful a manner as I could, and not to overestimate to any extent the probable revenue likely to be received. It is with pleasure

that I remind the House that the total revenues for the year were \$35,754,993, or an increase over the estimate of \$451,993. The yield from Customs which we estimated would amount to \$22,000,000 actually amounted to \$22,378,800. This increase was no doubt mainly caused by the revenue of the following year being anticipated, owing to the changes made in the tariff. Before passing from this branch of the subject, I think it will be interesting to point out to the hon. members some of the features which might be termed the curiosities of Customs revenue. In the year ended 30th June, 1886, the amount of duty collected on coal and coke was \$1,023,332. The revenue on these articles for the year 1887 amounted to \$1,178,964, or an increase of over \$100,000 over the preceding year, although 150,000 tons of anthracite coal were admitted free of duty in this latter year, a striking indication of the progress which Canada made during that year in manufactures. In the matter of luxuries such as fancy goods, there was an increase from \$332,246 in 1886 to \$608,776 in 1887. In silks and manufactures of silks there was an increase from \$702,465 in 1886, to \$860,395 in 1887; and whilst on these luxuries the revenue has increased it will no doubt be gratifying to the members of the House to find that in the year 1887, 1,207,284 gallons only of spirits and wine were imported against an importation of 1,400,690 gallons of the same commodity in the year before, and that the revenue therefrom in 1886 amounted to \$1,911,601, whereas in 1887 the yield was only \$1,700,076, showing conclusively that the temperate habits of the people are gaining ground. Let me add that this conclusion is borne out by the report of my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue. In 1887 the quantity of spirits taken for consumption was 2,864,935 gallons as against an average of 3,376,410 gallons for the two years preceding. I take the average of the two previous years, inasmuch as the quantity taken for consumption in the year 1885 was abnormally large owing to an anticipated increase of duty, and the figures for 1886 are smaller in consequence. The average of the two years is fair and just for comparison. The revenue from sugar of all kinds shows an increase in 1887 of over \$800,000, the amount of duty collected thereon in 1886 being \$2,303,397, and in 1887, \$3,167,528; on wool the duties increased from \$2,499,246 in 1886 to \$3,176,741 in 1887. Coming to matters of Excise we estimated that the yield from this source would be about \$6,000,000. As a matter of fact the yield was \$6,308,201. This increase is accounted for by the fact that an exceptionally large quantity of spirits was entered prior to 1st July, 1887, when the provision of the Inland Revenue Act came into operation respecting the enforced warehousing of spirits for two years prior to sale.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that \$6,300,000 include simply the spirit and beer and tobacco duties under the head of Excise?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It includes all the excise duties, and the increase is due to the change that was made in the Excise Act, which requires spirits to be aged for two years before going into consumption, and which induced a very large amount to be taken out of Excise previous to the end of the year. In miscellaneous items there was a slight decrease, but the Post Office showed an increased revenue of over \$100,000, and in Public Works, including railways, there is an increase of about \$200,000. We estimated that the expenditure for the year would be \$35,600,000, leaving an estimated deficit of \$300,000. The actual expenditure for the year was very close to the estimate, being only an excess of \$57,860, and the estimated deficit of \$300,000 has been turned into a surplus of \$97,313. In view of the statements made last year the Government cannot, I think, be accused of laying an over-sanguine statement before the House when we compare the estimate with the final realisations.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

I now come to the probable result of the year 1887-88. Having explained to the House the result of the operations of the last fiscal year, I have now to ask their attention to the probable expectation of the present year. It will be recollected that in the last budget speech I stated that the total revenues expected to be realised for the fiscal year 1887-88, \$36,400,000, made up as follows:—Customs, \$22,500,000; Excise, \$6,400,000; Miscellaneous, \$7,500,000. Taking first the Customs revenue, I may state to the House that during the year we have experienced a series of ups and downs. It might have been thought likely about last Christmas that the revenue from Customs would not realise what was anticipated, and this might have been justified from the fact that, as has been before mentioned, the revenue from that source exceeded expectations in 1886-87 by about \$300,000, no doubt to a great extent owing, as before stated, to duties having been paid in advance of the alterations made in the tariff last Session. But after Christmas the revenue from Customs began to recover itself, and on the 10th March the amount received exceeded the amount received in the corresponding period of the previous fiscal year by \$100,000. Since 10th March the revenue from this source has again dropped, and I regret to inform the House that up to the latest returns, those to the 20th April, the yield from Customs, as compared with last year, has fallen off \$227,000. As the total revenue from this source in 1886-87 was \$22,378,000, I do not think it would be right to calculate on a greater revenue than \$22,000,000, although we may hope that the early spring may tend to the revival of business and that a possible increase of revenue may again be our portion during the latter part of the fiscal year. But I have mentioned before I do not think it would be advisable to calculate on a greater yield from Customs than \$22,000,000. The Commissioner of Inland Revenue has informed me within the last few days that the amount that will be received from Excise revenue will be slightly in excess of the \$6,450,000, and we may estimate from this source a revenue of \$6,450,000. The estimate of Miscellaneous Revenues has been revised by the officers of the Finance Department, and it is thought that from the various sources forming that revenue the amount likely to be received will be \$7,550,000. The total estimated revenue for the current fiscal year will therefore, we believe, be in the neighborhood of \$36,000,000. Coming to the expenditure side of the account it will be seen that Parliament during the last Session granted supply which with the statutory expenditure amounted to \$35,969,981.98. As hon. members are aware we have brought down estimates in addition thereto of \$1,112,000. These two sums would amount to \$37,082,000, and taking the usual savings into account in the estimates, and these last year amounted to \$100,000, I think it is very probable the expenditure will be in round numbers \$37,000,000; and I have already mentioned that the estimated receipts will be about \$36,000,000. It is but fair, however, that the House should take into account that in the year 1886-87, as I have informed the House in the financial statement I made last year I anticipated a deficit of \$300,000. In reality this has been turned into a surplus of over \$97,000; and it is but right to estimate that this sum of \$400,000 was paid in in anticipation of 1887-88. With respect to the probable result of this year I consider that this fact should be taken into account, and having due regard to economy in the expenditure, I trust that the accounts for the present and coming year, taken as a whole, will balance. I come now to what will probably be the results for the year 1888-89. I am inclined to think, from the general tendency of trade, that the merchants of Canada will be careful in the matter of importations, and that it is not likely that there will be any material increase in the amount of importations over those in the last and in the present fiscal year. To be within bounds I put down the Customs reve-

nue likely to be received as \$22,500,000, being \$500,000 in excess of the estimates for the current year. I am informed by the officers of the Inland Revenue Department that, under the present condition of their revenue as compared with the last two years, they calculate that the Excise yield for 1888-89 may safely be placed at \$6,650,000. As regards Miscellaneous I have informed the House that the revenue estimated to be received from this source during the present fiscal year will be \$7,550,000. If we add to this sum the normal increase of revenue likely to be derived from the Post Office Department I think we can safely estimate that the revenue from miscellaneous sources, during 1888-89, will reach \$7,750,000. I, therefore, put down the total revenue from all sources at \$36,900,000. Hon. members have had before them the Estimates for the Public Service for 1888-89; and as, owing to the new departure, many votes have already been taken into account and explanations given in regard thereto, it will hardly be necessary to offer any very extended observations as to the variations in the estimated expenditure as compared with the Estimates asked for in Supply last Session. The amount of the Estimates now laid before Parliament is \$35,421,440.22, but, as hon. members are fully aware, no sums have been placed in the Estimates for mail subsidies and steamship subventions. That question was laid aside in order that we might give more careful consideration to it than we could give before the main Estimates were brought down. There will, therefore, have to be added to the amount already brought down sums sufficient to cover these services, and further amounts will undoubtedly be asked from Parliament in the Supplementary Estimates to complete the services of the year; but I believe that taking all these into account at the close of the year 1888-89, hon. members will find the statement I have made verified, that having regard to the results of the operations for the years 1887-88 and 1888-89 the balance for the two years will maintain an equilibrium. It is but right to mention some items in the expenditure likely to be incurred next year which show variations and which call for remarks. The interest on Public Debt shows an increase of \$116,000. This increase, as will be seen by reference to the Estimates, is chiefly made up by the amount \$63,000 required for the Savings Banks in consequence of the increased balances held by the depositors on the 31st December, 1887, and by the probable amount required to meet further indebtedness, \$250,000, less interest on loans maturing, in round numbers, \$200,000. We have also asked for an increase of \$68,000 in the investments for Sinking Funds, that amount being required to meet additional dividends requiring to be invested. The votes for Civil Government have already passed the House, and explanations have been already given of the increase of \$32,000 therein, and also of the increase of \$14,000 in the Administration of Justice. In Pensions and Superannuations there is an increase of \$21,000, largely made up of pensions to officers who have been retired owing to abolition of their offices, and to a great extent this increase is offset by savings in other branches of the service. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence will explain the increase in his services, mainly in the cavalry and infantry schools. In railways and canals (income) there is an increase of \$78,000, of which \$45,000 is for overhauling the foundation of the St. Ours lock, and the balance is made up chiefly for expenditure on the Welland canal and the Trent River navigation. The Lighthouse service requires an additional expenditure of \$10,000; \$6,000 of this amount being for maintenance and repairs to lights and \$4,000 in the salaries and allowances of the lighthouse keepers. In Miscellaneous there is an increase of \$55,000 made up by the increased cost required for the government of the North-West Territories, the expenditures at the Banff Park, and the plant required for the Government printing office and bindery,

explanations of which will be supplied in due course. The other large increase is \$290,000 in the service for Railways and Canals. This amount is made up by the \$300,000 required in the increased cost of repairs and working expenses of the Intercolonial railway. On the other hand the Immigration vote has been reduced by \$100,000, being the estimated saving in the general immigration expenses owing to the abolition of assisted passages and other causes. The £20,000 sterling (\$97,000), the contribution of Canada to the Imperial Institute having been paid, is of course dropped. The Public Works in the vote asked for shows a decrease of \$735,000, but I am afraid this vote will be supplemented to a certain extent. Generally, however, the Estimates have been framed with the full desire to add as little as possible to the expenditures of the country, and the Government have endeavored to ask for nothing more than sufficient to keep the Public Service in a state of efficiency consistent with economy. Having thus explained to the House to the best of my ability the probable outcome for the coming financial year, I will now, with the permission of the House, direct its attention for a few minutes to the Debt Account. By the monthly statements published in the *Canada Gazette*, which show fully the financial position of the country, it will be noticed that, at the present moment, we are in debt in England for temporary accommodation to the extent of £1,000,000. Since May last the country has experienced a certain amount of financial stringency, and one of the results has been that three banks have ceased to transact business. The past summer was one of unusual heat and drought in the Province of Ontario, and the harvest was not up to the average. The same cause has operated against the extensive lumber industry, and on account of the lowness of the water, timber which had been cut and which lay in the streams, could not be made marketable. This has caused a certain drain on the resources of the banks in order that the legitimate requirements of those engaged in the industry should be provided for. But against this we have occasion to be gratified by the splendid harvest in Manitoba and in the North-West. Still it must be borne in mind that we were going ahead rather too quickly. In our cities, and especially in Toronto, there has been a certain amount of speculation in real estate. However, by the exercise of economy and prudence, Canada will soon recover from the present stringency; her trade is, I am satisfied, sound at the core, and will soon return to its normal condition. At the commencement of the fiscal year the Government, chiefly in deference to the banking community, lowered the limit of deposits in the Savings Banks, and fixed the amount to be received from any depositor to be \$300 in any one year, and \$1,000 in all. Originally, the Savings Bank deposits were unlimited; a reduction was then made to \$10,000, and afterwards this was again brought down to \$3,000; now the limit is, as I have said, \$1,000. The effect, however, on the Government Savings Bank deposits, has been that some of the larger deposits held by the Government have been withdrawn, and have gone to swell the general business of the country by transfers to the banks where enhanced rates of interest were offered. The deposits in the Post Office Savings Banks show an increase, and if we set one side against the other, the Savings Bank balances, since the 1st July last, are nearly stationary, that is to say, the deposits equaling the withdrawals. Still, the country is to be congratulated that the deposits have increased in a marked manner from the poorer classes, showing that labor is fully employed and adequately paid. To illustrate this I may state that the number of depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank on the 31st March last, were over 100,000, an increase of over 10,000 since the 30th June last, and the number of depositors in the other savings banks under the control of the Finance Depart-

ment, increased from 56,000 to 57,000 in the same period. The stationary character of the Savings Bank balances is not to be put down to any withdrawal of capital from the country; these moneys have undoubtedly, for the reasons before stated, gone to the banks, and have been placed in other investments. The Government are of opinion that, by lowering the limit of deposit in the Savings Banks, the funds thus set loose, eased the strain on the banks throughout the country, and had the effect of mitigating the stringency. As a result, however, of the stationary character of these balances, the capital expenditure of the country, to a large extent, has had to be met out of the ordinary revenue, and the Government have been obliged to have recourse to the English market, and have borrowed to the extent already named. The million pounds sterling, which I have already stated, was borrowed in England, represented the amount that we expected to receive from our own depositors. It, therefore, becomes necessary, to complete the capital expenditure, as shown in the Estimates submitted to Parliament, and to pay the several subsidies to the various railways, as detailed in the Public Accounts, that further borrowing powers should be authorised, and a Loan Bill will be introduced hereafter, when it can be definitely ascertained how much the Government will have to place on the market. But I am glad to inform the House and the country that the Government have determined, for the present, with unimportant exceptions, to stop any further outlay on Capital Account beyond that to which the country is now committed. Having so far dwelt on the financial aspect of Canada, I would venture to detain the House by showing, to the best of my ability, how far the tariff changes of 1887 have affected the Canadian iron industry. It is well known to the House that at the outset much hostile criticism was provoked in England. No doubt this was because our position at that time was not clearly understood. But owing to the explanations made, and owing to a fuller consideration of the Canadian fiscal policy adopted since 1879, hostile criticism has been greatly modified, and generally speaking, that portion of the British press which deals with financial interests, now view in a friendly spirit our efforts to develop, on Canadian soil, the stores of mineral wealth within our borders. Of course, although much has been done, yet sufficient time has so far not elapsed to demonstrate fully the effects of the new tariff, the Act having virtually come into operation at the beginning of the present fiscal year, as the special provision for the admission of goods at the old rate of duty up to the 30th of June, was fully taken advantage of, and in many respects the requirements were to some extent, anticipated. It may be further mentioned that the amount of capital required for the production of iron from the ore, is so large, that great developments cannot be expected in a short space of time. As hon. members know, time is the essence of a bargain, and capital is cautious and very slow to move in new fields of enterprise. Confidence in the permanency of our fiscal policy is a further requisite before capital can be invested in the development of the large works required to build up the iron industries. And here I may state, to show how fully our neighbors are alive to the necessity of a permanent policy, that in the Mills Bill, now before Congress—that is, the Bill introduced into the House of Representatives by the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, and which embodies the policy of the Administration, and of the great democratic party in that country—the iron and steel duties are touched with a sparing hand. And the same thing is to be observed with regard to the measure introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. Randall, whereby no material reduction in the duties on iron and steel is proposed. The course pursued in the proposed revision of the tariff shows a fixed determination, on the part of our neighbors to the south, to continue an efficient

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

measure of protection to that great industry. In the production of iron and steel the United States lead every country in the world, having obtained this position after 26 years of uninterrupted protection. The changes under either of the proposed Bills leave the iron and steel duties largely in excess of the present Canadian rates. Mr. Mills, under his Bill, estimates the reduction of duties on iron and steel at \$1,000,000, exclusive of \$5,706,433 duties received last year on tin plate, proposed to be transferred to the free list. Of this reduction of \$1,000,000, nearly \$300,000 is on steel rails, leaving \$700,000 for other articles. Separating tin plate and steel rails from the other iron imports, we find the imports of "iron and steel and their manufactures" into the United States for the year ended 30th June last as follows:—Value, \$32,736,976; duty, \$14,165,183; showing an average rate of duty of 43½ per cent. Deducting \$700,000 from this duty, as proposed, the average rate is 41 per cent. From this it would appear that apart from tin plate and steel rails the reduction in duties on iron and steel and their manufactures is only from 43½ per cent., as formerly, to 41 per cent. as now proposed. Taking the whole importations of iron and steel and their manufactures into the United States and entered for home consumption for the year ended 30th June last, the average rate of Customs duty was 41 per cent. *ad valorem*, and allowing \$1,000,000 for the reduction of duty proposed under the Mills Bill, the average rate of Customs duty on the same importation would be 39 per cent. *ad valorem*. On the other hand, the average rate of Customs duty on iron and steel and their manufactures imported into Canada for home consumption for the year ended 30th June last was 17½ per cent., and for the nine months ending 31st March, 1888, under the amended tariff, the average rate of duty on these articles has been 2¼ per cent. *ad valorem*. Comparing the United States Customs tariff on all goods imported for home consumption with the Canadian tariff on similar imports, the Trade Returns show this result for the year ended 30th June, 1887:

Average rate on United States imports.....	31½ per cent.	<i>ad valorem</i> .
Average rate on Canadian imports.....	2¼	" "

Comparing dutiable articles under the United States Customs tariff with the same articles under the Canadian tariff, the Trade Returns for 1886-87 show the average duty on United States imports for home consumption to be 47 per cent. *ad valorem* against an average of 28½ per cent. *ad valorem* on Canadian imports for the same period. Under the Mills Bills the average Customs rates on dutiable articles, based on United States imports for home consumption for 1886-87, is estimated to be 43½ per cent. *ad valorem*; whilst under the amended Canadian tariff for the nine months ended 31st March, 1888, the average Customs rates on dutiable articles entered for home consumption has been 31½ per cent. *ad valorem*. I might also remark, before going into details, respecting the iron duties, that in addition to requiring time and in addition to the necessity of having a permanent policy we have to overcome the opposition of those interested in the handling and manufacture of the foreign product. But, Sir, the people of Canada have faith in the advantages which local industries confer on the country, and our people of every shade of politics have shown unmistakably the importance they attach to the operation of active home industry by the readiness with which free sites, exemption from taxes and cash bonuses are offered to start new enterprises to provide industrial employment in the several localities. With these introductory remarks, I may say, as I shall show in the details which I shall lay before the House, that the action taken last year is endorsed by the representatives of the principal plate and bar rolling mills, who express their satisfaction with the present tariff as a whole, and with its working. It is my intention to give an ac-

been consolidated with the Nova Scotia Forge Company, and arrangements made for the addition of a new smelting furnace, which will double the output of the Steel Works and will mean a disbursement of nearly \$250,000 a year for wages, fuel and railway freight. At St. John, N.B., reports from the Cold Brook Rolling Mills are to this effect. I quote from a letter received from the President of the Company:

"By the operations of the tariff, the imports of iron now are less, consequently our output now is proportionately greater, and the benefit to the manufacturer rests on a large turnover on small margins. We are able to sell our goods to the merchants at lower figures than they could be imported for previous to 1886."

There were, it appears, 50 per cent. more men employed in the Rolling Mills in 1887 than in any of the years 1884, 1885 or 1886. At Montreal, Pillow, Hersey & Co. have converted themselves into a joint stock company with a capital of \$800,000, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Co., contemplate the erection, during the present, season of a shop for passenger car work, and when this is completed all of their rolling stock of every description will be made in the country. The company built 24 locomotives in 1886 and 24 in 1887; and they have not purchased any locomotives outside of Canada since October, 1884, excepting two special ones for the mountain grade. All of their freight cars for several years back have been built in Canada, and practically all of their passenger cars are now built in Canada, excepting some of the sleeping and dining cars. The Montreal Rolling Mills Company have added to the capacity of their bar and plate mills by running night and day. 1887 was the first year during which the bar mill was run at night, and last year they worked 10,000 tons of iron of all sorts and used about 10,000 tons of fuel. They have recently put in an extensive wrought iron pipe plant embodying the latest improvements, which can turn out 6,000,000 feet of piping per annum, using up 4,000 tons of material to do so. The new pipe mill is running day and night. A German firm from Dusseldorf have decided, as I am informed, to erect extensive works for the manufacture of wrought-iron pipe and boiler tubes, which will be a new manufacture in this country. At Kingston, important changes have taken place in the locomotive works. Messrs. Dubbs & Co., of Glasgow, one of the largest manufacturers of locomotives in Great Britain, have invested in the Kingston locomotive works. They now manage and control them, and have in view their operation on a larger scale. At Hamilton, as one effect of the recent tariff changes, an establishment has been erected capable of giving employment to 400 hands in the manufacture of wood screws, carriage bolts and the like. In cast-iron pipe manufacture at Hamilton the immediate result of the tariff has been that the Canada Pipe Foundry has been steadily employed during the past season, and will soon necessitate its increase to double the present capacity. The Hamilton Bridge Company report:

"We use iron of local manufacture very largely, and find it of at least equal quality to that imported, and the price, as far as our experience goes, is reasonable and not so high as the full tariff increase would warrant. We also have the great advantage of ordering and obtaining this material when wanted, and without having to lay in our stocks."

Burrow, Stewart & Milne, of Hamilton, say:

"We are using half of all the iron that we run of Canadian make, and find the quality first-rate, A. 1."

The Ontario Rolling Mill Company report with regard to the new tariff:

"We are now beginning to feel the beneficial effects and expect we shall be called on by spring to make far more iron than ever before. We shall be able to turn out by spring nearly double the tonnage we ever made here. We are also arranging to start up the mill we have in London either there or elsewhere, so that by May we can, if necessary, make in that mill about 35 tons per day."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

The Hamilton Iron Forging Company say:

"In our own business we have felt the good effects of the wise and judicious policy of the Government, notably during the last four months, having largely increased our output by running our force full time both night and day, and within the past few days have started another furnace in our establishment with all the necessary equipment capable of turning out one car load more of finished bar iron per day; this will give active employment to 12 skilled men besides day laborers; we have also increased the capital stock of our company for the purpose of further developing the business, and in the near future we propose placing in position another mill plant with a capacity of 6,000 tons per year."

"In conclusion we have much pleasure in stating we never heard a consumer of iron complain of the tariff changes; moreover, we desire to place on record the general feeling and satisfaction expressed by them in having their wants supplied promptly at home without having, as in the past, to purchase abroad and carry large stocks and pay cash for them. They can now secure iron within a reasonable time that at once goes into legitimate consumption, thereby giving a healthy and vigorous tone to business."

"The continuation of an iron policy wise in its inception and having for its object the development of the mineral resources of this country covering the whole Dominion of Canada, meets with our hearty approval, and must eventually lay a foundation broad and enduring that will be materially helpful to every class of men living between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans."

As closely connected with the development of manufactories and as an evidence of the steady progress of the country, it may be mentioned that, in addition to the expansion of the iron industry, the changes in the tariff had a beneficial effect in the output of coal from the mines. In the Nova Scotia and Cape Breton coal mines the following is a close estimate of the output—I give the totals of Cumberland county, Pictou county and Cape Breton:—

	1886.	1887.
Cumberland County Mines, tons.....	416,000	469,242
Pictou County Mines, ".....	369,000	338,050
Cape Breton Mines, ".....	588,000	717,000
Totals.....	1,373,000	1,524,292

In 1879, the coal raised at Spring Hill was 92,000 tons; in 1887, the output had increased to 442,000 tons. At this mine 1,400 men and boys are employed, the largest force at any mine in Canada. Having thus, I trust, shown to the satisfaction of the House the effects of the tariff changes on the iron industry, I propose to show what has been done towards the development, and extension of the West India trade. The West India trade for the past year has been on the whole profitable. The present prices of fish in the West Indies during the past year would have been considered good. The price has advanced so much that our fishermen have greatly benefited thereby; and I have no doubt that part of the benefit, though not so much as went to the fishermen, accrued to the merchant shipper. It must be borne in mind that an important factor in the West India trade is the return cargo of sugar. It is gratifying to see that the recent change in the sugar duties, putting the same duty upon all sugars for refining purposes according to their polariscopic test, has had the effect of encouraging the importation of sugar from the West Indies, especially into Nova Scotia. The importation of West India sugar into Canada (including British Guiana sugar) amounted for the following years, viz:—

	Lbs.
Year ended 30th June, 1886.....	59,854,645
" " 1887.....	51,021,331
Or a decrease of 14½ per cent.; and into Nova Scotia alone:	
Year ending 30th June, 1886.....	19,830,723
" " 1887.....	24,398,201

Or an increase of 23 per cent. The importation of sugar from the West Indies (including British Guiana) into Halifax, amounted for nine months ending 31st March, 1888, to 33,837,455 lbs. The importation from the West Indies for the quarter ending 30th June, is usually about half as much as that of the other three-quarters combined. It will thus be seen that the importation of West India sugars into Halifax alone for the current year will amount to more

than double the importation into Nova Scotia for either of the two preceding years, and probably to as much as the importation into the whole of Canada for either of the years named. With regard to the conference which recently assembled in London on the sugar bounties, I may here state that the proposed abolition of bounties on beet root sugar by European Governments, if carried into effect, would be of much benefit to the Canadian West India trade. I have thus far dwelt almost exclusively on the special trade with the West Indies in connection with sugar, but, as a few nights since a debate arose on the general West India trade, I do not think it out of place to trouble the House for a few moments while I glance at the general trade of Canada with the West Indies. I find that in 1878 the total value of the imports entered for consumption from all the West Indies was \$1,181,728; and in 1886 it had increased to \$3,249,642. As will be seen from what I have previously said in reference to the importation of sugar for the nine months ended 31st March last, I consider that in the general trade there will be a still further development in the present year. As regards the whole trade, both imports and exports, I find that in 1878 the total value of these amounted to \$4,689,473, in 1886 to \$5,553,892; and when we take into account the development in the importation of sugar on the one hand and the exportation of fish and the other products of the country on the other, it is more than likely that the total volume of the trade will increase in the near future. I may mention here that the Government, with the view of expanding the trade of Canada, have sent an agent of very considerable commercial ability, from St. John, N. B., to investigate the chances of extending our trade with Brazil and the Argentine Republic; and we hope also, at no distant day, to give an increased stimulus to the West India trade by the establishment of a line of steamers between a Canadian port or Canadian ports and those countries. At this point I take the opportunity to make a passing reference to our cotton industry. There are now about 60,000 bales of raw cotton, in value about \$3,000,000, used annually in the Dominion, being an increase in ten years of nearly 50,000 bales. In the Dominion there are now about half a million spindles, employing about 9,000 hands, with an invested capital of about \$8,000,000. I am afraid I am troubling the House with the details I have already laid before the hon. members, but if I may presume to trench on their patience, I propose to show how steadily inter-provincial trade has developed in Canada. From returns furnished by the Intercolonial Railway I find that the following movements took place in 1878 and in 1887 in passengers and articles carried both ways:

	1878.	1887.
Flour	Bbls. 637,778	753,480
Grain	Bushels 331,170	1,016,334
Live stock.....	No. 46,498	50,782
Lumber	Feet 56,600,000	161,190,900
Manufactures.....	Tons 140,858	
Other articles (not including fire wood).....	" 230,741	820,000
Total freight.....	" 522,710	1,131,334
Passengers	No. 618,957	940,144

Of the above, in both years, flour, live stock and lumber were local, as distinguished from through freight for export. As regards grain there were 440,454 bushels local freight in 1887 against 331,170 in 1878. The total increase of freight in 1887, as compared with 1878, was 608,000 tons, and speaking of the proportions between local and through freight, the general manager states that the increase is about equally divided. This would give an increase of local traffic equal to over 300,000 tons in 1887, as compared with 1878, or an increase of 57 per cent. The increase in the movement of passengers I regard as indicative also of increased inter-provincial trade. Taking some of the articles carried westward, the growth in this trade I

regard as indicated by the quantity of coal yearly transported by rail from Nova Scotia. For the several years, from 1879 to 1886, the following quantities were carried west by the Intercolonial Railway:

Year ended December.	Tons.
1879	570
1880	10,246
1881	30,829
1882	35,089
1883	54,891
1884	112,898
1885	165,791
1886	175,512

As a further evidence of this we may take the return of coal sales. According to the Nova Scotia Department of Mines in 1877, these were 687,065 tons, of which 95,118 tons went to Quebec, leaving for all other points 591,947 tons. The upper Provinces accordingly took 13 per cent. of the whole sales of Nova Scotia in 1877. In 1886, the return of coal sales was 1,373,665 tons, of which 538,762 tons were sold to Quebec, leaving for all other points 734,904 tons. It will thus be seen that the Upper Provinces took 40 per cent. of the whole sales in 1886 against 13 per cent. in 1877. The returns for 1887 show that the sales of coal to the Province of Quebec were 650,853 tons against 538,762 tons in 1886. For the past year, the Chief Superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway reports that the shipments of refined sugar westward were:

	Barrels.
From Halifax.....	88,996
" Moncton	56,992
Total	145,988

This trade did not exist ten years ago. A large increase is also reported in the transport of lumber, in the traffic of fresh fish to the Upper Provinces, and in the live stock business, the latter entirely in the local business and not in the carriage of cattle from the west for export. Each year sees new branches of inter-provincial trade opened up. Between the 16th September and the 8th October, 1887, shipments of oysters from Point du Chêne were:

To Montreal.....	3,143 barrels.
" Other Stations on Grand Trunk Railway.....	53 "
" Quebec.....	3,081 "
Total.....	6,267 "

As further evidence of inter-provincial trade, I find that the freight billed from stations in New Brunswick, on the Intercolonial Railway, and from stations in Nova Scotia, on the Intercolonial Railway and Eastern Extension, was:

1887	197,774 tons.
1880	47,142 "
Increase	150,632 " or nearly 320 per cent.

The New Brunswick Cotton Mills report an increase in sales of \$52,437 in 1887 over 1886, and total sales of \$599,147 during the past three years to the Upper Provinces. The Moncton Cotton Mills report an increase of \$12,495 in 1887 over 1886, and total sales of \$366,622 in three years to the Upper Provinces. The Halifax Cotton Mills report total sales to the upper Provinces in four years of \$528,400. The Windsor Cotton Mills report total sales in four years to the upper Provinces of \$137,522. The Nova Scotia Steel and Forge Company report total sales of their product to the Upper Provinces, during the past four years, of \$850,478. It is gratifying to note that in every instance the returns show a steady increase. Thus the shipments by railway of the products of the Steel and Forge Company in 1887 were 155 per cent. more in value than those of 1884, notwithstanding the decrease in price of 45 cents per ton in 1887, as compared with the average price of 1884. In addition to coal, the Intercolonial carried, in 1887, over 6,000 tons of stone, nearly 20,000 barrels of plaster, over 45,000,000 lbs. of iron, 13,300 barrels of

pickled fish, over 3,000,000 lbs. of fresh fish, 4,250,000 lbs. of dried fish, 750,000 lbs. of canned fish, and 16,000 barrels of oysters, all for the Upper Provinces. Besides these, numerous other articles of commerce, as well as railway plant and the like, have found their way to the Upper Provinces from the maritime section.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the hon. gentleman a comparative statement of the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway for the periods included in the statements he has just given?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will be able to furnish my hon. friend with that. I thought the question of inter-provincial trade was transcendent in importance, and that it would not be necessary to go into the question of receipts.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But it does go into it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would be very glad, in discussing the items in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, to furnish the information the hon. gentleman has suggested. It does, no doubt, go into it; but, after all, I must be excused for saying that I think it is a matter of secondary importance to the great one of building up a large inter-provincial trade between one section of our country and another. We must also bear in mind that there is a very large water-borne trade, as indicated by the shipping employed in coasting. The tonnage employed in the coasting trade between Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island in 1887 aggregated 9,358,735 tons, against 5,321,726 tons in 1877, an increase of nearly 76 per cent. Taking the three Maritime Provinces, in 1877 I find that the various ports of the section saw 12,268 arrivals of vessels, and as many departures. That seemed a good business, but so vast has been the change that in 1887 those ports witnessed 23,611 arrivals and as many departures of coasting vessels. In 1877 there were 21,323 arrivals and as many departures of coasters in the whole Gulf and Atlantic coast, and in 1887 the arrivals had risen to 33,330, with as many departures. Moving all along the coast and river line, as far up as Montreal, these coasting vessels have found in inter-provincial trade a development they never would have found confined in the limits of their respective Provinces. The increase in the number of arrivals and departures marks the development of trade and intercourse that has taken place between the Provinces by the sea and those on the St. Lawrence River. This development is the more marked because it has taken place during the very years that the Intercolonial Railway has been in operation. That railway is a continuous coasting vessel day and night conveying the goods of one part to the other parts of the Dominion, from the Maritime Provinces to the Upper Provinces, and *vice versa*. So great has been the increase of inter-provincial and of provincial trade, general internal commerce, that the demand for coasting vessels has gone on increasing until now there are nearly 60 per cent. more trips made in the year by the coasting marine of the country on the Gulf of St. Lawrence and Atlantic coast than ten years ago, and the tonnage employed has increased 76 per cent., showing the employment of a superior class of vessels. In the United States, as hon. gentlemen who have looked into this subject at all are, no doubt, aware, the completion of the railway has resulted in diminishing the enrolled and licensed tonnage employed in the Atlantic coasting trade. In Canada there has been found increasing employment for the railway and for the coasting vessel, the first showing an increase of freight carried of 116 per cent. in ten years, and the latter, judging from increased tonnage, of 76 per cent. As a single illustration of the growth of the trade between the Upper and the Maritime Provinces, I may state that the tonnage of vessels arrived at the port of Quebec from the Maritime Provinces during 1887 was 193,000 tons,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

being an increase of 33 per cent. over the preceding year, and an increase of 47 per cent. over 1885. Hon. members will be interested to learn, as a further evidence of inter-provincial trade, that the coasting trade of the whole Dominion has been steadily increasing, judging from the tonnage employed, until now it is double what it was ten years ago, as the following figures show:—

Tonnage.		Tonnage.	
1877	8,968,862	1883	15,683,566
1878	11,047,661	1884	15,473,707
1879	12,066,633	1885	15,914,421
1880	14,053,013	1886	16,368,274
1881	15,116,766	1887	17,513,677
1882	14,791,664		

If hon. members will allow me, I will here state to the House that the chief results of the Canadian trade in 1886-87 were pretty much as follows:—The total exports exceeded those of the previous fiscal year by \$4,250,000, being 8 per cent. in advance of the average of the 20 years of Confederation. The export of the fisheries show an increase of 15 per cent. over the average of the preceding twenty years, the total amount being \$32,000 more than in 1885-86. The export from the mines of Canada show an increase of 13 per cent. over the average of twenty years, but a decrease of \$150,000 compared with the previous year. The forest export shows a decrease of 7 per cent. compared with the twenty years' average, and a decrease of \$500,000 compared with 1886. I referred before to the fact that the great drought and the want of means to get the lumber and the material for its manufacture down the rivers, had a serious effect in checking our trade in lumber. The export of agricultural products show an increase of 80 per cent. over the twenty years' average, and an increase of \$1,200,000 over the year 1886. The export of animals and animal products show an increase of 50 per cent. over the twenty years' average and of \$2,200,000 over the export of 1886. The imports for home consumption were 8 per cent. more than the average for twenty years, and \$6,000,000 more than in 1886. The total imports were \$8,400,000 more than in the previous year. The imports of woollen manufactures were 28 per cent. more than the twenty years' average, and \$2,500,000 more than in 1886. The imports of cotton were 54 per cent. less than the twenty years' average and \$300,000 less than in 1886. The total tonnage of shipping employed in external trade was 14,000,000, being 130,000 tons more than in 1886 and 16 per cent. more than the twenty years' average, and, as I have said before, the total tonnage employed in the coasting trade was 17,500,000 tons, being 1,000,000 tons more than in 1886 and 21 per cent. more than the twenty years' average. The tons of freight brought into and carried out of Halifax by shipping increased 73 per cent. in 1887 as compared with 1878. The shipping carrying cargoes into and from Halifax in 1887 was 125 per cent. more than in 1868. Halifax increased during the past ten years in the tonnage of cargo carried in and out more than any other port, Montreal having increased 67 per cent. while Halifax increased 73 per cent. Having detained the House at some length with these statistics, which are always very dry, but which I think are not uninteresting, considering the great importance we all attach especially to inter-provincial trade, and to the fact that Confederation has become more than a name, that instead of its being a Confederation on paper, a mere union by which these Provinces are brought under one central Government, it is found that, notwithstanding some geographical difficulties from the great length and the comparatively narrow breadth of our country, a very rapidly increasing and a very large trade is growing up, showing the intimate commercial relations which are being established between one portion of our country and the other—I do not intend to detain the House by going over at any length the statistics which bear upon the year's progress, to which

I alluded a year ago, when making the financial statement. I have had prepared by Mr. Johnson a series of diagrams in the same form, though I believe somewhat improved, as those which were presented to the House last year, and I have had these placed in the hands of every hon. member, so that he may ascertain the exact position we are in and the progress we are making.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There are some new tables in this.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, there are some additional tables which I thought would be of interest to the House as illustrating the subject with which I am dealing, and that is, endeavoring to put before the House something which will give information as to the position which the country occupies, not only in regard to a large number of financial questions, but also in reference to the trade and commerce and development of the country, and I have had them put in such a form as to attract the attention, not only of the members of this House and the people of the country generally, but of any persons who may be desirous to take an increased interest in this country. The following are the figures of diagrams referred to:—

CANADA: Federal Gross Debt with Assets, for Years ended 30th June:—

	Gross Debt.	Assets.
1867 (Confederation created).....	\$ 93,046,051	\$ 17,317,410
1868.....	96,896,666	21,139,531
1869 (Better terms to Nova Scotia).....	112,361,998	36,502,679
1870 (Manitoba created a Province, debt \$472,090).....	115,993,706	37,783,964
1871 (British Columbia admitted, debt \$1,666,200).....	115,492,682	37,786,165
1872.....	122,400,179	40,213,107
1873 (Provincial Debts assumed, \$13,859,030).....	129,743,432	29,694,970
1874 (Prince Edward Island admitted, debt \$4,927,060).....	141,163,551	32,838,586
1875.....	151,663,401	35,655,023
1876 (Intercolonial Railway opened).....	161,204,637	36,653,173
1877.....	174,675,834	41,440,525
1878.....	174,957,368	34,595,199
1879.....	179,483,871	36,493,683
1880 (Intercolonial Railway finished).....	194,634,440	42,182,852
1881 (U. P. R. begun).....	199,861,537	44,465,757
1882.....	205,365,251	51,703,601
1883.....	202,159,104	43,692,389
1884 (Provincial Debts assumed, \$7,172,297).....	242,482,416	60,320,505
1885 (U. P. R. finished last spike 7th Nov.).....	264,703,697	68,295,915
1886 (Temporary loan to U. P. R. of 20 millions. Manitoba debt assumed, \$3,317,226).....	273,164,341	50,005,234
1887 (\$10,198,521 added to debt being purchase money of 6,793,014 acres of land from U. P. R.).....	273,187,826	45,873,611

CANADA: Taxation, being Customs and Excise Duties collected, during Years ended 30th June:—

	Excise.	Excise per capita.	Customs.	Customs per capita.
1868.....	\$ 3,062,598	\$.89	\$ 8,578,380	\$2.54
1869.....	2,710,028	.79	8,272,880	2.42
1870.....	3,619,622	1.05	9,334,213	2.70
1871.....	4,295,946	1.22	11,841,104	3.36
1872.....	4,735,652	1.31	12,787,982	3.54
1873.....	4,460,682	1.22	12,954,164	3.53
1874.....	5,594,904	1.46	14,325,193	3.74
1875.....	5,069,687	1.30	15,351,011	3.95
1876.....	5,563,487	1.41	12,823,838	3.25
1877.....	4,911,898	1.23	12,546,988	3.14
1878.....	4,858,672	1.29	12,782,824	3.13
1879.....	5,390,763	1.30	12,900,659	3.11
1880.....	4,232,427	1.00	14,071,343	3.24
1881.....	5,343,022	1.23	18,406,093	4.23
1882.....	5,884,860	1.33	21,581,570	4.87
1883.....	6,260,116	1.39	23,009,582	5.09
1884.....	5,459,369	1.18	20,023,890	4.43
1885.....	6,449,162	1.37	18,935,428	4.03
1886.....	5,852,905	1.22	19,373,562	4.04
1887.....	6,308,201	1.20	22,378,801	4.59

TOTAL Exports of Canada for Years ended 30th June:—

1868.....	\$ 57,567,858
1869.....	60,474,781
1870.....	73,673,490

1871 (Manitoba created a Province, 15th July, 1870).....	74,175,618
1872 (British Columbia admitted, 20th July, 1871).....	82,639,683
1873.....	89,789,992
1874 (Prince Edward Island admitted, 1st July, 1873).....	89,351,928
1875 (Revenue Tariff).....	77,886,979
1876 do.....	80,966,435
1877 do.....	75,875,393
1878 do.....	79,323,667
1879 do.....	71,491,255
1880 (Protective Tariff).....	87,911,468
1881 do.....	98,290,823
1882 do.....	102,137,203
1883 do.....	98,085,804
1884 do.....	91,406,496
1885 do.....	89,238,361
1886 do.....	85,251,314
1887 do.....	89,515,811

RELATIVE VALUE of 10 principal Exports (home production) from Dominion of Canada, Fiscal Year 1887:—

Wood and manufactures.....	\$31,166,530
Grains, barley, peas and flour.....	16,001,897
Animals.....	10,461,442
Cheese.....	7,108,978
Fish.....	6,875,810
Furs and hides.....	2,323,918
Eggs.....	1,825,559
Coal.....	1,522,272
Meats.....	1,094,076
Gold.....	1,017,401

TOTAL Imports into Canada, for Years ended 30th June:—

	Total Imports.	Home Consumption.
1868.....	\$ 73,459,614	\$ 71,985,305
1869.....	70,415,165	67,402,170
1870 (Manitoba created a Province).....	74,814,439	71,237,603
1871 (British Columbia admitted).....	96,092,971	89,917,452
1872.....	111,409,527	107,709,116
1873 (Prince Edward Island admitted).....	128,011,281	127,514,594
1874.....	128,213,582	127,404,169
1875.....	123,070,283	119,618,657
1876.....	93,210,346	94,733,218
1877.....	99,329,962	96,310,483
1878.....	93,081,787	91,199,577
1879.....	81,964,427	80,341,608
1880.....	86,489,717	71,782,349
1881.....	105,330,840	91,611,604
1882.....	119,419,500	112,648,927
1883.....	132,254,022	123,137,019
1884.....	16,397,013	108,180,644
1885.....	18,911,486	102,710,019
1886.....	104,456,611	99,602,694
1887.....	112,893,236	105,639,428

CANADA: Imports for Home Consumption, divided into Free and Dutiable, during Years ended 30th June:—

	Dutiable.	Free.
1868.....	\$ 43,655,686	\$ 28,329,610
1869.....	41,069,344	26,332,928
1870.....	45,127,422	26,110,181
1871.....	60,094,362	26,853,130
1872.....	68,545,718	39,163,398
1873.....	71,409,196	56,105,399
1874.....	76,235,863	51,168,316
1875.....	78,141,432	41,477,229
1876.....	60,243,346	34,489,872
1877.....	66,919,960	35,380,528
1878.....	59,778,589	3,422,988
1879.....	55,430,012	24,911,596
1880.....	54,182,967	17,569,393
1881.....	71,619,725	19,990,879
1882.....	85,757,433	26,891,494
1883.....	91,588,339	31,548,680
1884.....	80,010,498	28,170,146
1885.....	73,269,618	29,447,401
1886.....	70,658,819	28,443,875
1887.....	78,120,679	27,518,749

IMPORTS of Iron and Steel, and Manufactures thereof, into the Dominion for Home Consumption, for years:—

1868.....	\$ 6,885,365	1878.....	\$ 9,398,306
1869.....	7,285,780	1879.....	7,982,295
1870.....	7,750,667	1880.....	10,128,660
1871.....	10,803,645	1881.....	12,955,856
1872.....	15,913,119	1882.....	17,499,468
1873.....	25,435,020	1883.....	20,080,274
1874.....	20,700,387	1884.....	14,790,727
1875.....	18,199,198	1885.....	11,415,713
1876.....	12,985,117	1886.....	11,653,366
1877.....	11,082,321	1887.....	13,595,046

Discounts given by the Chartered Banks of Canada, June 30th :-

1868	\$ 50,500,316	1878	\$ 124,888,552
1869	53,573,307	1879	122,502,537
1870	62,252,569	1880	118,916,970
1871	83,939,756	1881	144,139,875
1872	107,354,115	1882	177,521,800
1873	117,646,219	1883	177,222,569
1874	133,731,260	1884	160,459,183
1875	123,786,038	1885	158,209,174
1876	128,645,238	1886	165,044,608
1877	126,169,577	1887	169,357,325

CANADA: Overdue Notes and Debts in Chartered Banks, proportion being to total amount borrowed from Banks for Years ended 31st October :-

1873	\$ 2 07	1881	\$ 2 68
1874	2 02	1882	1 9)
1875	4 73	1883	2 45
1876	4 30	1884	3 57
1877	4 45	1885	2 45
1878	4 58	1886	1 63
1879	4 90	1887	1 61
1880	4 24		

BUSINESS FAILURES in Canada, years :-

1873	\$ 12,334,000	1881 (Protect. Tariff)	\$ 5,751,000
1874	7,696,000	1882 do	8,587,000
1875 (Rev. Tariff)	28,843,000	1883 do	15,872,000
1876 do	25,517,000	1884 do	18,939,000
1877 do	25,523,000	1885 do	8,743,000
1878 do	23,908,000	1886 do	10,387,000
1879 do	29,347,000	1887 do	16,311,748
1880 (Protect. Tariff)	7,988,000		

CANADA Bank Notes in circulation during years ended June 30th :-

	Bank Notes.	Dom. Notes.
1868	\$ 8,207,079	\$ 3,795,000
1869	8,063,198	4,792,000
1870	14,167,948	7,294,103
1871	18,339,893	7,244,341
1872	25,040,077	10,813,548
1873	29,516,046	11,314,256
1874	26,583,130	12,175,579
1875	20,902,991	10,780,324
1876	20,288,158	11,534,731
1877	18,265,356	10,680,493
1878	19,351,109	10,435,696
1879	18,090,814	10,790,510
1880	20,186,176	13,565,959
1881	26,102,368	14,539,795
1882	32,229,937	15,786,538
1883	32,211,945	16,005,243
1884	29,654,611	15,344,474
1885	29,692,803	15,423,229
1886	29,200,627	16,289,452
1887	30,438,152	15,064,835

DEPOSITS by the People in the Chartered Banks of Canada, 30th June :-

1868	\$ 32,808,104	1878 (Rev. Tariff)	\$ 66,503,757
1869	38,823,333	1879 do	63,635,952
1870	50,767,100	1880 (Protect. Tariff)	77,891,498
1871	55,763,067	1881 do	86,507,571
1872	53,986,818	1882 do	99,100,729
1873	55,547,607	1883 do	99,364,750
1874 (Rev. Tariff)	65,991,047	1884 do	92,413,313
1875 do	58,367,942	1885 do	99,383,673
1876 do	63,320,858	1886 do	103,583,950
1877 do	63,241,128	1887 do	107,154,483

CANADA, Deposits by the People in Savings Branches, Building Societies and Loan Companies, for Years ended 30th December :-

1868	\$ 959,054	1878	\$ 8,269,295
1869	1,485,014	1879	9,426,148
1870	1,942,575	1880	11,713,633
1871	2,399,136	1881	13,460,268
1872	2,690,778	1882	14,241,783
1873	2,869,382	1883	13,954,461
1874	4,614,813	1884	13,876,516
1875	5,020,507	1885	15,435,084
1876	6,126,378	1886	17,712,885
1877	7,192,186		

DEPOSITS in Savings Banks of Canada, 30th June :-

1868	\$ 4,360,692	1878	\$ 14,222,074
1869	5,723,567	1879	14,702,715
1870	7,591,978	1880	18,237,496
1871	9,367,941	1881	24,331,202
1872	10,526,376	1882	31,098,718
1873	12,933,894	1883	35,189,426
1874	15,101,195	1884	38,063,116
1875	14,125,477	1885	41,990,776
1876	13,838,201	1886	45,072,886
1877	13,391,014	1887	50,944,785

Sir CHARLES TUPPER,

CANADA: Operations of the Money Order System for years ended 30th June :-

	Orders Issued. Amount.	No. Issued.
1868	\$ 3,352,881	90,163
1869	3,563,645	96,679
1870	3,910,250	110,021
1871	4,546,434	120,521
1872	5,154,120	136,422
1873	6,259,506	161,096
1874	6,757,427	179,851
1875	6,711,539	181,091
1876	6,866,618	238,668
1877	6,856,821	253,962
1878	7,136,895	269,417
1879	6,788,723	281,725
1880	7,207,337	306,088
1881	7,725,212	338,238
1882	8,354,193	372,248
1883	9,490,900	419,613
1884	10,067,834	463,502
1885	10,384,211	499,243
1886	10,231,169	529,458
1887	10,328,984	574,899

CANADA POST OFFICES.

Number of Post Offices :-

1868	3,638	1878	5,378
1869	3,756	1879	5,696
1870	3,820	1880	5,778
1871	3,943	1881	5,935
1872	4,135	1882	6,171
1873	4,518	1883	6,395
1874	4,706	1884	6,837
1875	4,892	1885	7,084
1876	5,015	1886	7,295
1877	5,161	1887	7,534

Distribution of Post Offices :-

Ontario	1 to every 64 square miles.
Quebec	do 142 do
Nova Scotia	do 16 do
New Brunswick	do 26 do
Prince Edward Island	do 7 do
British Columbia	do 3,250 do
Manitoba and North-West	do 225 do

Letters and Postal Cards posted (000 omitted) :-

1868	18,100	1878	50,455
1869	21,920	1879	50,840
1870	24,500	1880	53,600
1871	27,050	1881	57,810
1872	30,600	1882	67,500
1873	34,579	1883	75,749
1874	39,358	1884	79,680
1875	42,000	1885	82,209
1876	46,446	1886	86,110
1877	46,960	1887	90,658

Newspapers carried by Postal Department (000 omitted) :-

1868	18,860	1878	39,936
1869	18,700	1879	42,380
1870	20,150	1880	45,120
1871	22,250	1881	48,680
1872	24,400	1882	50,845
1873	25,480	1883	53,140
1874	29,000	1884	55,990
1875	31,300	1885	58,391
1876	38,550	1886	60,064
1877	39,000	1887	

Postal Revenue :-

1868	\$ 1,024,710	1878	1,620,022
1869	973,056	1879	1,534,363
1870	1,010,767	1880	1,645,017
1871	1,079,767	1881	1,767,953
1872	1,193,062	1882	2,022,098
1873	1,406,954	1883	2,264,384
1874	1,476,207	1884	2,330,741
1875	1,536,509	1885	2,490,962
1876	1,484,886	1886	2,469,379
1877	1,561,134	1887	2,603,266

Postal Expenditure :-

Table of postal expenditure from 1868 to 1877, showing amounts in dollars and cents.

RAILWAYS in Canada, 30th June :-

Table showing railway statistics in Canada for 1868-1877, including miles and population per mile.

Table comparing railway statistics for Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, and Belgium against Canada.

CANADIAN Railways, Passengers carried, for years ended 30th June :-

Table showing the number of passengers carried per capita on Canadian railways from 1868 to 1880.

RAILWAYS of Canada, Tons Carried :-

Table showing the tons of goods carried per capita on Canadian railways from 1868 to 1881.

SEA-GOING and Inland Lakes : Shipping employed, not including Coasting Vessels :-

Table showing shipping statistics (tonnage and sea-going vessels) from 1868 to 1887.

CANADA sea-going Shipping (arrived and departed) by nationalities :-

Table showing shipping statistics by nationality (British, Canadian, United States, Foreign) from 1876 to 1881.

Tonnage.

Table showing tonnage for various countries (British, Canadian, United States, Foreign) from 1882 to 1884.

CANADA Coasting Trade, registered Tonnage employed :-

Table showing registered tonnage employed in Canada's coasting trade from 1868 to 1881.

TOTAL Production of Coal in the Dominion, net tons of 2,000 Pounds :-

Table showing the total production of coal in the Dominion from 1868 to 1877.

NOVA SCOTIA Coal Sales (in tons).

Table showing coal sales in Nova Scotia by year, categorized by total sales and destination (Neighboring Provinces, other countries, Home consumption).

Analysis of sales to neighboring Provinces.

Table showing an analysis of coal sales to neighboring provinces (Quebec, New Brunswick, P.E. Island, Newfoundland) from 1868 to 1887.

TOTAL Consumption of coal in the Dominion, net tons of 2,000 pounds :—

1868.....Tons	714,893	1878.....Tons	1,665,814
1869.....do	636,704	1879.....do	1,748,164
1870.....do	859,630	1880.....do	2,094,844
1871.....do	852,217	1881.....do	2,260,680
1872.....do	1,227,653	1882.....do	2,708,654
1873.....do	1,398,403	1883.....do	3,085,639
1874.....do	1,454,636	1884.....do	3,556,673
1875.....do	1,362,363	1885.....do	3,439,745
1876.....do	1,466,531	1886.....do	3,515,769
1877.....do	1,751,031	1887.....do	4,110,778

FIRE Insurance in Canada.—Amount at risk Dec. 31st :—

1869.....	\$188,359,809	1879.....	\$407,357,985
1870.....	191,594,586	1880.....	411,563,271
1871.....	228,453,784	1881.....	462,210,968
1872.....	251,722,940	1882.....	526,856,478
1873.....	278,754,835	1883.....	572,264,041
1874.....	306,848,219	1884.....	605,507,789
1875.....	364,421,029	1885.....	611,794,479
1876.....	454,608,180	1886.....	586,733,022
1877.....	420,342,681	1887.....	633,523,697
1878.....	499,899,701		

LIFE Insurance in Canada. Net Amount in force :—

1869.....	\$ 35,680,082	1879.....	86,273,702
1870.....	42,694,712	1880.....	90,280,293
1871.....	45,825,935	1881.....	103,290,932
1872.....	67,234,684	1882.....	115,042,048
1873.....	77,500,896	1883.....	124,196,875
1874.....	85,716,325	1884.....	135,453,726
1875.....	84,560,752	1885.....	149,862,146
1876.....	84,344,916	1886.....	171,315,696
1877.....	85,687,903	1887.....	191,566,168
1878.....	84,751,937		

CANADIAN Bank Stocks, Highest and Lowest Quotations in Montreal during years ended Dec. 31st :—

No. of Banks.	Quotations.	No. of Banks.	Quotations.
1868... 12	{ Highest 111 1-10 Lowest 104 2-10	1878... 20	{ Highest 100 5-10 Lowest 83
1869... 13	{ Highest 120 Lowest 209 8-10	1879... 17	{ Highest 93 4-10 Lowest 74 5-10
1870... 13	{ Highest 134 7-10 Lowest 108 7-10	1880... 18	{ Highest 115 7-10 Lowest 89 1-10
1871... 14	{ Highest 143 7-10 Lowest 120	1881... 19	{ Highest 126 8-10 Lowest 113 8-10
1872... 16	{ Highest 132 Lowest 113	1882... 19	{ Highest 138 Lowest 118 8-10
1873... 16	{ Highest 120 8-10 Lowest 111 6-10	1883... 20	{ Highest 132 6-10 Lowest 111 6-10
1874... 17	{ Highest 122 8-10 Lowest 113 2-10	1884... 20	{ Highest 120 3-10 Lowest 99 6-10
1875... 20	{ Highest 121 1-10 Lowest 100 4-10	1885... 21	{ Highest 114 6-10 Lowest 100 6-10
1876... 20	{ Highest 112 3-10 Lowest 102 9-10	1886... 21	{ Highest 129 3-10 Lowest 113 1-10
1877... 20	{ highest 106 2-10 Lowest 93	1887... 19	{ Highest 137 2-10 Lowest 122 6-10

LOANS OF CANADA.

Loan of	Amount.	Nature.	Ave. Rate Interest.	Average rate at which taken.
1869	2,000,000*	{ 2/3 Guaranteed.... 1/3 Unguaranteed....	{ 4 p. c. 5 p. c.	Premium 5 12 11
1873	1,800,000*	Guaranteed....	4 per cent.	" 4 7 8
1874	4,900,000*	Unguaranteed..	4 per cent.	Discount 9 19 3
1875	2,500,000*	{ 1/2 Guaranteed... 1/2 Unguaranteed..	{ 4 p. c. 4 p. c.	" 18 4
1876	2,500,000*	Unguaranteed..	4 per cent.	" 9 0 0
1878	3,000,000†	{ 2/3 Guaranteed... 1/3 Unguaranteed..	{ 4 p. c. 4 p. c.	" 3 8 3
1879	3,000,000†	Unguaranteed..	4 per cent.	" 4 18 1/2
1884	5,000,000†	Unguaranteed..	3 1/2 "	" 9 0 0
1885	4,000,000†	Unguaranteed..	4 "	Premium 1 1 8 1/2

* Sinking fund of 1 per cent.
 " " " " for unguaranteed.
 † No sinking fund.
 Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

TOTAL debt payable in London, July 1st, 1887 :—

Rate of Interest.	Amount.
3 1/2 per cent.....	\$ 24,333,333
4 ".....	140,856,599
5 ".....	2,433,333
6 ".....	4,052,473
Total.....	\$171,675,736
Interest paid.....	<u>\$6,850,745</u>

Average rate of interest :—1867, 5.55 per cent. ; 1874, 5.35 ; 1877, 4.74 ; 1882, 4.39 ; 1887, 3.99.

PRICES of Canadian Securities in London, in month of March :—

5 per cents :—1868, 86 1/2 ; 1872, par ; 1873, 108 ; 1874, 108 ; 1875, 108 1/2 ; 1876, 107 ; 1877, 108 ; 1878, 108 ; 1879, 109 ; 1880, 112 ; 1881, 114 ; 1882, 114 ; 1883, 114 1/2 ; 1885, 113 ; 1886, 116 ; 1887, 114 ; 1888, 118.
 4 per cents :—1875, 92 ; 1876, 92 ; 1877, 94 1/2 ; 1878, 94 1/2 ; 1879, 95 ; 1880, 97 ; 1881, 104 ; 1882, 106 ; 1883, 105 ; 1884, 106 ; 1885, 106 ; 1887, 106 1/2 ; 1888, 115 1/2.
 3 per cents :—1885, 92 ; 1886, 97 ; 1887, 100 ; 1888, 109.

I do not propose to detain the House very much longer, but, before sitting down, there are two or three questions to which the House will no doubt expect me to allude. When making the financial statement a year ago, I was obliged to state to the House that there was one cloud on the horizon. I think I would hardly be wrong in saying that there was a cloud both on the political and the commercial horizon ; and that cloud was the very unpleasant relations which at that time threatened to arise between us and our great neighbors to the south of us—between the United States of America and Canada. I am happy to be able to congratulate the House on the present occasion, upon that cloud having been entirely swept away ; and I am glad to be able to give to the House the most conclusive evidence that, I think, could be required on that point, by reading brief extracts from very high authorities, and which, I think, the House will regard as entirely conclusive upon that question. I will first read an extract from the Message sent by President Cleveland to the United States Senate, in submitting the treaty that was recently arranged at Washington between Great Britain and the United States of America, in which that gentleman used the following language :—

"The treaty now submitted to you has been framed in a spirit of liberal equity and reciprocal benefits, in the conviction that mutual advantage and convenience are the only permanent foundations of peace and friendship between States, and that with the adoption of the treaty now placed before the Senate, a beneficial and satisfactory intercourse between the two countries will be established, so as to secure perpetual peace and harmony."

Mr. Bayard, in a letter which I recently had occasion to quote, and which was made public in the United States, and which he addressed to parties who had invited him to go to New England to make a speech, said :

"Conciliation and mutual neighborly concessions have together done their honorable and honest work in this treaty, and paved the way for the relations of amity and mutual advantage."

I think, Sir, with that evidence, I am justified in congratulating the House that the only cloud that we could see upon the horizon has entirely passed away. The House of Commons of Canada have ratified that treaty by their action, and I have no doubt that the other branch of Parliament the Senate of Canada, will ratify that treaty ; and I am still sanguine that that treaty will not be rejected by the Senate of the United States of America. But, as I said before, come what may, we have the fact placed on record from the very highest sources connected with the administration of that great republic, that the Government of Canada and the Parliament of Canada have been prepared, by mutual concession, to ratify a treaty which would dispose of the question that was causing so much unpleasantness between the two countries ; and whatever may be the action of the Senate of the United States upon this question, I think I am not too sanguine in expressing the conviction that

nothing will occur to disturb that continued harmonious intercourse between the two countries, that friendly reciprocity of good neighborhood, that will not only dispel any cause of anxiety in regard to our relations with the great republic, but will lead us to anticipate a larger and freer commercial intercourse than has hitherto taken place. I do not intend to ask the House, in going into Committee on Ways and Means, to make any alteration in the tariff. As I said before, nothing is more important in regard to the trade and business of a country, than confidence on the part of commercial men in the permanence of existing arrangements; and I feel that we can scarcely do a greater service to the country and to the development of our best interests, than by showing that it is not necessary continually to change our tariff arrangements. I am satisfied that no gentleman who has ever held the position that I now occupy as Finance Minister, has been less troubled than I have been with applications for a change of tariff. I am quite certain that my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when he held that position, had a hundred applications for a change of tariff during every year that he administered the office of Finance Minister, for every single application that I have had during the present Session. I may be told that a hint which we gave to the country, rather discouraged applications; but at the same time I believe that it has, to a large extent, arisen from the fact of a general satisfaction upon the part of the country with the tariff which we now have upon the Statute-book, and a disposition not unnecessarily to disturb it, but to allow it to have an opportunity of being fairly tried and fairly tested. A year ago it became my duty to submit a very startling proposition to this House in regard to the iron industry of the country; it became my duty to make a very radical change in the tariff in regard to that industry. I think, considering the difficulties to which I have adverted, that capital is extremely cautious, and that the capital required for the establishment of new iron industries is so enormously large, still we have every reason to be satisfied with the indication we see that there will be no want of capital in a short time, and that at no distant day we shall be able to manufacture, on Canadian soil, and with Canadian ore, all the iron—and a very enormous consumption *per capita* it is—that is used in our country. It has been a source of great gratification to me to be able to read to the House, as I have done, the evidences that we have on all sides from parties connected with the development, not only of the iron industry, but parties who are engaged in the various manufactures of iron, of uniform satisfaction; and I am safe in saying that I have not received from any source, from either a company or any important and prominent individual desiring to invest money in the iron industry, a single remonstrance against the very great change that was made a year ago. I have been pressed, and strongly pressed, to take another step in that direction, for the purpose of having steel rails manufactured in our country. I mentioned to the House a year ago that Canada was the only country in the world possessing 12,000 miles of railway within its borders, that did not manufacture its own steel rails, and I had the evidence presented to me that, by giving proper protection, such protection as we gave the other branches of the iron industry, we might succeed in establishing rolling mills for steel rails. But we had to take into consideration the fact of the enormous importance of the railway development of a country like Canada, and under those circumstances we have, although we considered it a subject worthy of attention, whenever it can be properly taken up—but considering the great and vital importance of railway extension to the prosperity of this country, we felt that we must postpone, at all events, for this year, making such a change as would lead to the establishment of rolling mills in this country for the manu-

facture of our own rails. I am glad, as I say, to be able to state to the House the uniform satisfaction that seems to be expressed all over this country in regard to the present tariff. I will not say more upon the subject than refer to the Bill that I propose to introduce in connection with the resolutions that are on the Table, when we go into Committee on Ways and Means, and that is to a large extent to meet the changes in the Act proposed, in what I have termed the Mills' Bill. I need not remind this House of what I said a few days ago, that both parties in this House, whether in power or out of power, had been exceedingly anxious to obtain a return to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, or such reciprocal trade relations as were enjoyed between Canada and the United States under that treaty. I am bound to say, I am quite certain every hon. gentleman who has looked into the subject with the care and attention I have,—and no doubt, considering its importance, a great many hon. gentlemen have done so,—I am bound to say that I believe this country would be greatly disappointed if the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 were re-enacted. While that treaty gave the most undoubted stimulus to the trade and business of Canada, while that treaty, advantageous as it was to Canada, was still more beneficial to the United States than it was to us, I cannot forget that a great change has taken place in this country and in the United States in a great many very important points that would bear upon the operation of that treaty if it were re-enacted to-morrow. But the House is perfectly aware that all the efforts, and they have been great and continuous, made by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House when in power to obtain a return to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, have proved abortive. It would, perhaps, be a waste of time to go into the causes that have resulted in that; suffice it to know that all our efforts in that direction have ended in failure. The House is aware, from my statements on a former occasion, that we not only endeavored to obtain a re-enactment of the reciprocity treaty as a question of treaty, but that we also endeavored to promote a freer intercourse of trade, freer commercial relations between Canada and the United States, by the placing upon our Statute-book for a very long period what was held to be a statutory invitation to the United States to meet us half-way in reference to certain articles. Those articles did not cover all the articles that were in the reciprocity treaty, but as long ago as 1849, Canada, before Confederation adopted that clause, and it has been re-enacted in every re-enactment of the Tariff Act, I believe, from that time down to the present period. The object of that was to direct the attention of our American neighbors to the fact that we were anxious to promote freer commercial intercourse between the two countries. It appears that certain articles that were named in that statutory clause were made free two or three years ago in the United States. Attention was not drawn to it, I believe it escaped the attention of hon. gentlemen on either side of the House, and the attention of the Government was not drawn to it until a very recent period.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Excuse me for mentioning it, but attention was drawn to it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We had an hour's discussion on it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In 1886.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then I must say, in justification of myself, that I do not think I was here in 1886.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think you were not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At all events I do not remember, and I am not as a rule deficient in memory, the subject

having been brought under the notice of the House, and although I have been a tolerably close observer, whether here or abroad, of what has transpired in this House, I do not remember to have seen any reference to the subject. If, as the hon. gentleman says, and I must of course, accept his statement, attention was drawn to it, I regret my own attention has not been drawn to it. I may here mention that no communication down to this hour has been had with Her Majesty's Government on the question that certain articles contained in that statutory invitation had been made free in the United States, and I make this statement as I wish to correct an improper impression that has gone abroad that we had been in communication with Her Majesty's Government on this subject—but when at a very critical period in the relations between the United States and Canada our attention was drawn to the question, by the Government of the United States, we felt that under all the circumstances the wisest course to pursue was to meet the proposal that had been made and to put on the free list the articles that were contained in that clause and which had been made free by the action of Congress. I see a very erroneous impression is abroad in many quarters as to the effect of these resolutions which are placed upon the Table with a view to the amendment of that clause, or rather to its repeal and the substitution of a somewhat different clause, and that is that the effect of that action will be to destroy the effect of the proclamation which put the articles named on the free list. That is an entire misapprehension. Parliament clothed the Governor General in Council with power to put certain articles under certain conditions, upon the free list, and, that power having been exercised, those articles are on the free list of Canada and duties can only be imposed on those articles by the re-enactment of a new tariff placing duties upon them. I mention this because it has been stated in the press, I do not consider it is an attempt to misrepresent the position, but it is a statement likely to create a very erroneous impression on that point. I have drawn the attention of the House to the fact that the difficulties having been removed by the Treaty between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain and between the Governments of Great Britain and Canada, at a very early period we found a Bill introduced by Mr. Mills, Chairman of the Commission on Ways and Means, placing a number of articles in which we are very much interested in Canada, upon the free list. And I will say this, that it is one thing to make a treaty and another thing to make a statutory arrangement, to make a legislative reciprocity. You may be induced to put a large number of articles into a treaty that you do not desire to be made free, that if you had your choice you would not put on the free list, but you agree to it for the purpose of getting other articles there which you very much desire to be there; consequently a treaty is made a matter of mutual arrangement, of mutual concession, and it has the advantage that being a treaty it cannot be affected during its continuance by any legislative action on the part of one country or another. But under legislative reciprocity the whole thing is entirely changed, as the House will see, and we cannot imagine for a single moment that the policy of that great country is going to be materially influenced by any reference to Canada. When we take the proposal to put lumber on the free list, as it is proposed in the Mills' Bill, a Bill regarding which I still entertain a very sanguine hope, that it will become law during the present session of Congress. I say when we find that to be the case, we know at once that it is not for the purpose of furthering Canadian interests. It is done simply because in carrying out the policy of the democratic party of the United States, they desire to make that article free in the interests of their own country, and in the interests of their own people. So in regard to a large number of other articles. But, as I have said, that proposal

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

in the Mills' Bill is coupled with the statement that lumber will only be free to countries that have no export duty on logs. The consequence was that I prepared this Bill of which I have given notice in the resolutions, by which the export duty can be taken off logs by an Order of the Governor General in Council. If the Mills' Bill, a month hence, become law, and lumber be made free, our lumber would still be met in the United States by the same duty as before the passage of that Act. Consequently it became necessary, as every gentleman in the House will see, that in order to give Canada the advantage of having this large industry relieved from the heavy duty which is imposed upon its products in the United States of America, it became absolutely necessary to arm the Governor General in Council with power, when that Bill became law, to repeal the export duty on logs, in order that we might enjoy the advantage that is thus given under that Act. But, Sir, we must not forget that although lumber may be made free, although a large number of other articles in which we are greatly interested may be made free under that Bill, that it is only an Act of legislation. It is not a treaty, it is not a matter of arrangement for ten or twelve years, as on former occasions of reciprocal action between the two countries which was arranged by treaty. We have the disadvantage of knowing that there is not that fixity in legislative arrangements that there would be under a treaty, but counterbalancing this we are left in Canada as free as the statesmen of the United States are left, to alter or modify our legislation, and under a reciprocity of tariffs each country remains perfectly free from Session to Session, to make just such changes in extending the free list or in curtailing it and imposing duty upon articles that have previously been made free, as they had before. There is no obligation resting or binding upon either country, and, under those circumstances, I felt that it was right for the protection of Canadian interests that we should modify this clause and only embrace in it such articles as we were all quite satisfied it would be in the interest of Canada to make free, whenever they were made free in the United States of America. Salt stands in the same way. In the Mills Bill it is provided that salt shall be made free, but only that coming from such countries as do not charge duty upon salt going into that country out of the United States. So in the same way as in reference to lumber, in order to get the advantage of that Bill, if it were to pass to-morrow or a month hence, it was absolutely necessary the Governor General in Council should have power to deal with that subject so as to put salt on the free list, and give—as I have no doubt that action would give—a very great impetus to that very large and important industry in the Province of Ontario. Now, Sir, I do not think it will be necessary for me to say more in reference to that, but I want to draw the attention of the House for a few moments to a subject of very considerable importance. When I was standing here a year ago I congratulated the House, and I congratulate the country upon the fact, that the anxiety that parties wishing and desiring to invest their capital in the manufacturing industries of this country and in the development of our industries, had, in consequence of the doctrines held previously by the Liberal party, disappeared on account of the action of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I congratulated the House, and I congratulated the country, upon the fact that the great leader of the party opposite—I refer to the Hon. Mr. Blake—who so long led with so much ability in this House the party opposed to the Government—I congratulated the House that in the most formal and authentic manner, that hon. gentleman, on a most important occasion, on the eve and in the very throes of a general election, had declared to the people of this country that the antagonism of the Liberal party to the policy of protecting Canadian industries

had ceased, and the hon. gentleman not only spoke with the high authority which attached to his name, and which attached to his position, but feeling that it was desirable on an occasion of that kind that there should be no misunderstanding; that everybody in this country should understand that we were as one upon this great question which had been so long a subject of such fierce controversy; referred especially to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and undertook to state to the country that he was expressing that hon. gentleman's views and expressing the views of the great party of which he was the leader when he made that important announcement. I do not hesitate to say that as a party man, as one who believes very sincerely that the best interest of Canada is intimately bound up with the success of the great Liberal Conservative party in this country, I read that announcement of Mr. Blak's with a good deal of dismay. Looking at it from a party standpoint I felt that he had made a great stride on the march to the Treasury benches. I always felt secure that so long as that hon. gentleman kept his party in battle array against giving such fostering protection to the industries of Canada, as had been found necessary to vitalise them and bring them into existence, that we were safe. But I felt that, however much we were in danger by the fact that the hon. gentleman had stepped upon a higher plane and placed himself before the people of this country in a position that took away one of the strongest arguments we could present to the country to induce them to keep hon. gentlemen opposite discharging the important functions of a loyal and constitutional Opposition—I say, Sir, although I felt this, I felt also that the loss to my party was more than counterbalanced by the gain to the country, in the assurance to the capitalists of the world telling them: You need not fear, you are no longer in danger, there is no party with free trade colors nailed to the mast, you need not fear that if we get into power we will destroy your investments. It reassured not only the capitalists, Sir, but that body which is of more vital and greater importance than the capitalists, the laboring class of this country. In informing the laboring man who had been lifted by this policy of fostering our industries from the condition of helpless poverty into one of comfort, the laboring man would no longer tremble at the thought of hon. gentlemen opposite obtaining a position on this side of the House, and discharging the administrative functions of the Government of the country, because they were told that all these fears might be at once and for ever thrown aside, and that the Opposition had shown that it was possible that they could learn something. They had shown that it was possible for them at last when face to face with the great throbbing pulse of the public sentiment of this country, to ascertain what the people of this country had deliberately resolved upon, a policy that the people had deliberately and again and again affirmed was the true policy to be pursued in this country. Still, Sir, I need not tell you with what regret I learned that all these congratulations that I had offered to hon. gentlemen opposite, all these congratulations I had offered to this House, all these congratulations I had offered to this country, had to be re-called. I need not tell you, Sir, the regret with which I learned of this—not again as a party man, because, looking at it from a party standpoint, I felt that hon. gentlemen opposite could do us no greater service as a party than to fall back from the high position they had taken, and to take back this deliberate announcement made in the most formal way to the people of all Canada as to what the future trade policy of hon. gentlemen opposite would be. Well, Sir, what was proposed? Why, Sir, when that great and distinguished leader of the party was obliged, by causes which we all deplore, to deprive the Parliament of Canada of the great advantage of his presence, we know that very soon, notwithstanding the

eloquence and amiable qualities of the gentleman who has so worthily succeeded him, notwithstanding that he is a gentleman whom we all respect, we found that the Liberal ship was drifting without a rudder. Instead of the firm hand of the captain on the tiller, we found a vacillating hand. The hon. gentleman with his conservative instincts—so conservative that I have always wondered, ever since I have had the honor of meeting him in this House, that he was not on our side instead of where he is—I say the hon. gentleman, with his conservative instincts, when it was proposed to go back on the policy propounded by his leader and accepted by his party, and deliberately sanctioned by the people who sent them to this House—when it was proposed to the hon. gentleman to go back on all that, he hesitated long; and when it was propounded to him further that we should take so radical a step as to virtually change the constitution of our country, the hon. gentleman showed more than a disinclination to be led into that course. But, Sir, we found the Liberal ship, having lost its rudder, in the hands of the hon. gentleman opposite, without apparently knowing in what direction to attempt to move. We found it drifting upon the rock of commercial union. Sir, I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman did not commit himself to that policy; I hope, for his own sake, and for the sake of the record that will remain of him as a public man after we all pass away, that he did not commit himself to that policy; but it cannot be forgotten, Sir, that hon. gentlemen holding high and commanding positions in the party, were ready to adopt commercial union as the policy of the Liberal party. We know, Sir, that commercial union was propounded by Mr. Wiman, a gentleman of great ability, a gentleman of immense pecuniary resources, and I think I would not be doing him a particle of injustice if I were to add—for it is no disgrace to him—a gentleman of unbounded ambition, living in the city of New York and a resident of the United States for many years; and I congratulate him on his success most heartily. If we do lose a man, if a Canadian goes to the United States, I care not in what capacity, I want to see him occupy the highest and most important position he can occupy. But, Sir, what did we see? We found that gentleman prepared to place himself at the head of the great Liberal party of Canada. We found that gentleman, not only with the ambition, but the vanity, notwithstanding the great names and the great ability possessed by a large number of gentlemen in that party, to aspire to place himself at their head, and dictate to the Liberal party of Canada what should be their policy with respect to the most vital and important and momentous issues in this country. Well, Sir, it is a great advantage for a movement to have a man of unlimited pecuniary resources associated with it. Everybody knows that in these days it is no detriment to a cause to have men in it who have not only the will, but the means to put their hands in their pockets to advance its interest. Mr. Wiman had those advantages, and I do not hesitate to say he had the still greater advantage of being a man of marked ability. Well, Sir, what was the result? Why, Sir, he soon—whether by some human device or not, we are not able to fathom—secured the services of two leading journals of Canada, the *Globe* newspaper and the *Mail* newspaper, to advocate the cause of commercial union. But, Sir, we found not only these two leading journals committing themselves to the policy of commercial union, but we found one after another of the great lights of the Liberal party giving more than countenance to that policy. Where is it now, Sir? Why, Sir, a discovery was made, and I feel that a word of praise is owing to the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) in this regard. I believe he is the man who held out the beacon light to keep the great party with which he is connected from drifting on the rock which he had the sagacity

to see, would have consigned it to political perdition. We not only found that hon. gentleman becoming alive and awake to the dangerous direction in which his party was drifting, but we very soon found that he had influence enough to rescue the organ of the Liberal party from a policy that would have undoubtedly ended at an early day in the utter destruction of the party. And what is the result? The result is that Mr. Wiman, with all his money, with all his ability, with all his ambition, stands to-day alone on the policy of commercial union, without a follower, without a supporter, in the whole of Canada. That, Sir, is the position. He found himself face to face with the loyal British sentiment that is too deeply rooted in the hearts of Canadians to allow them for one moment to adopt a policy which every man with a particle of sagacity must see would result in Canada either occupying the most deplorable and contemptible position that any free country could ever occupy, that of having its tariff and taxes imposed by a Government with which it had no connection, or taking the next and inevitable step, of becoming a part of that great country. Brought face to face with that loyal sentiment, which fills the breasts of Canadians to an extent as great as it does those of the people of any portion of Her Majesty's Empire, the ship was steered away, and, Sir, what for? Only to escape destruction on the rock of commercial union, to be stranded on the shoals of unrestricted reciprocity. There it lies to-day, Sir, a great party, a party possessing men of the highest order of talent, a party embracing a great body of the independent yeomanry of this country, who give it an enthusiastic support, a party possessing every quality necessary to lead it to power except fixed principles, in accord with the sentiments of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope my hon. friend will allow me to take that back, if he supposes me to use the expression in the sense of unprincipled. Not at all. What I say is this, and I say it in no invidious sense—I say that the seeking of power, the desire to obtain power for the sole purpose of governing a country, is, in my judgment, the most unworthy one that could ever stimulate a party. I say that the object of obtaining office must be, if it is to be useful to the country, inspired by the conviction that the attainment of power will be the means of enabling the party to carry out such a policy and such principles as will promote the progress and prosperity of the country. When I speak of the want of principle, I speak of it in that sense; I speak of the want of any fixed principle that will commend itself to the judgment of the independent yeomanry of Canada and inspire confidence in the party which seeks their suffrages.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Something like the standing offer that you refer to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will not occupy the time of the House much longer, but I want to draw the attention of the House for a single moment to the supreme folly of any Canadian statesman talking about unrestricted reciprocity. I put aside as a minor matter the question that in order to get unrestricted reciprocity you must bring the people face to face with enormous direct taxation. That I take to be admitted by the gentlemen opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If they do not, they ought to admit it, for it is plainly to be seen. No man who has yet undertaken to give during the long debate, to which I was sorry not to have the pleasure of listening but which I read, a single statement asking this country to commit itself to what I conceive to be the mad folly of unrestricted reciprocity, has ventured to put before this House or for-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

mulate any system by which it could be carried out if we got it to-morrow. If they say they are going to let the United States supply Canada with everything without a farthing of tariff being imposed on it, where is the revenue to come from? The United States are perfectly able to supply this country with everything we require, and I want to know in that case where is your revenue to come from? But, I am not going to waste the time of the House in discussing the wildest chimera that was ever put before a sensible people. I put aside the question of the enormous direct taxation that would crush the people of this country. I put aside the question of imperilling the industry, the capital, the labor of this country, as they would be imperilled. I put aside the fact which everybody knows, and which my hon. friend admitted, when he stood here battling with heavy deficits and struggling to make the revenue of this country meet the very moderate necessities of this country, the hon. gentleman then was impelled to pursue a very economical and moderate course in reference to public expenditure. I say, when he was face to face with deficits, when he, as Finance Minister of Canada, told the people of this country that he could not add a small percentage to the duties on imports, that he could not increase the revenue to even a small extent unless he did it by direct taxation —

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not say that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend says he did not say that, I will say that his memory and mine are not together on that question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And he knows better perhaps than I do; but I understood the hon. gentleman to say, when he was admitting a serious and formidable deficit, that he would be glad to provide for it, but that he did not know of any means of further increasing the revenue except by direct taxation.

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

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says I misunderstood him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I suppose I have misunderstood him. But independently of that, what is the fact? Why, he knows that Canada was then the slaughter market of the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He knows that every interest in Canada was paralysed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not a bit of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows that every interest in Canada—that is my opinion—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is all right, but you said I knew.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That Canada was paralysed by being made a slaughter market for the United States. Does the hon. gentleman want to take Canada back to 1874, 1875, 1876, and 1877?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. She was in a great deal better position then than she is in to-day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does he want to allow the enormous capital, the great skill, which has made the United States to-day one of the foremost manufacturing countries of the world, sweep our younger industries, with their smaller capital, out of existence, and compel the labor of this country, which, after all, it is our most vital and important consideration to keep in our midst, to

go, as it had to go in those dark years of Canada, down to Boston and New York, to do in another country the work required to be done in Canada, and which a subsequent Canadian Government found that Canadians could do on Canadian soil? I have used a strong term; I have said this scheme of unrestricted reciprocity is a folly, a mad folly; and I say so for this reason: that if every man in this House was of opinion that Canada should commit suicide—as it would do by adopting unrestricted reciprocity—I say if that was the position of every man of both sides of the House, we would have no more chance of obtaining unrestricted reciprocity with the United States than we would have of dictating to the Imperial Parliament what Ministers should advise Her Majesty. I can scarcely find any simile or language that would show the utter futility of adopting such a policy. This subject has been discussed now for many months, it has been put forth in the most captivating form by the ablest men on the opposite side of the House, both in this House and abroad through the country, and they have found papers so wanting in information and so blindly subservient to party influences as to advocate their scheme—and what has been the result? Why, point me to a paper in the United States, republican or democratic—show me a single paper possessing the slightest influence in that country that would ever give support to a scheme which would take away the barriers between the trade of Canada and the trade of the United States, and leave Canada free to admit the products of England,—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER—and the other parts of the world.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is what you call unrestricted reciprocity.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say you will search in vain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I dare say.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You will find no man in Congress who will support such a scheme. Mr. Butterworth, in his Bill, provides that nothing shall be done until there is an arrangement by which all this is to be managed. In these vague terms, he seeks to get over the difficulty, but he knows that neither in the Senate, nor in the House of Representatives, nor in the press, nor among the public men or statesmen of that great country, could you find a man occupying influence or position who would dare to stand up in that country and propound the policy that Canada should have free trade with the United States, and make as low a tariff as she pleased at the same time with England.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I dare say not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the reason why, in my judgment, I am not using too strong a term, when I say that a madder act of folly for a party to commit itself to could not be discovered, if they offered a premium to any person to discover it. Yesterday these hon. gentlemen stood face to face with the people of Canada with a policy that everybody understood. Yesterday they stood face to face with the people of Canada declaring that they had learnt something by their long term in Opposition, and were prepared, if entrusted with power, to protect the labor and the capital and the industry of the country. To-day they have escaped sudden destruction on the rock of commercial union only to be stranded on the shoals of unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You were very near there yourself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says I was very near there myself. I am puzzled to know what sort of a mental organisation a man must possess who cannot

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

discover the distinction between an unrestricted offer and unrestricted reciprocity. When as a negotiator, when as one of Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries, it became my duty to ascertain whether the United States were prepared to meet us half way or to do anything to remove the obstructions to the freer commercial intercourse which we all desire, when I was in that position, I put an unrestricted offer before them certainly, but did I say anything about unrestricted reciprocity? What was that offer? Did it commit me to anything except that I was prepared to negotiate in regard to the question of freer commercial intercourse? The hon gentleman said, you made an unrestricted offer. I said I did, and I did so deliberately, because if the statesmen of the United States were prepared to offer us unrestricted reciprocity, I wanted to know it, but I was not committed to it. I said that I was prepared to negotiate the settlement of the fisheries, difficulty on the basis of freer commercial intercourse, but I ask any hon. gentleman on the other side if I would not have had a perfect answer to any proposition, either that the proposal did not go far enough or that it went too far.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You made an offer, but you did not mean it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says that I made an offer which I did not mean. That would be a very mean thing to do. I think my hon. friend cannot mean that. I made an offer in a broad and comprehensive form, meaning exactly what I said, that I was prepared or that the British plenipotentiaries, who authorised me to make the offer, were prepared to negotiate the settlement of the fisheries question upon the basis of greater freedom of intercourse between the United States and Canada; but did that commit me to unrestricted reciprocity? I was asking for what every public man in this country, every man on both sides of this House, has endeavored to obtain and has asked for over and over again.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If they accepted your offer, would not that have committed you?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it would not have committed me to unrestricted reciprocity. I tell my hon. friend, as I have already explained, that, if they had accepted the offer and had said: Yes, we will settle this question on terms of greater freedom of commercial intercourse, and had then said: We are prepared to negotiate in regard to those terms, and had asked: What greater freedom do you wish? I would have formulated the greater freedom which we desire and would have put a distinct statement before them. Then I would have been bound to formulate my policy and to say how far I was prepared to go or how far I required them to go in order to negotiate the question on that basis. If I had to take up more time to teach hon. gentlemen the difference between an unrestricted offer and unrestricted reciprocity, I should despair, and I will save my breath for something more important. When we took up this question of fostering our native industries, many parties in England attacked me in reference to it, and asked: What do you mean by turning your back upon the English free trade policy and taking up the United States protective policy? I said: If you were placed in our position, with a population of five millions alongside of a country with sixty millions of people, and with only an invisible line dividing the two countries, you would understand what we mean. I said to them, as I have stated in this House, that no Canadian statesmen can formulate a fiscal policy for this country without having regard to the policy of the great nation to the south of us; and I said further that it was of the greatest interest to Canada to have the freest intercourse possible with them, consistent with safe-guarding the best

and highest interests and institutions of the people of Canada. Now, what do you find? You find the republican party of the United States standing firm by a protective policy, you find them standing by a policy of high protection for American industries. That is their policy. Do you find any free trade party in that country? If you think there is any such party, read Mr. Mills' Bill, and that is the exposition of the views of the administration of the United States and of the great democratic party. Do you find any free trade in that Bill? I have shown that he proposes the enormous reduction on all the iron industries of the United States from 43½ per cent. to 41 per cent. That is the free trade proposed under Mr. Mills' Bill. He proposes, it is true, what is also our policy, to make raw materials and natural products free, but that is also a protective policy. Everything that makes the living of the artisan cheaper and furnishes the raw material to the manufacturer cheaper, enables you to raise the same revenue and at the same time to protect the article with a lower tariff. There you have the great statesmen of that country, who have been able to excite the admiration of the civilised world by the high condition of prosperity and progress into which they have brought their country; you have republican and democrat united in demanding and maintaining a system of protection for the capital, for the industries, and for the labor of the people of the United States. This is their position, and it is ours. I do not intend to weary the House with any further remarks, except to say that, although I have had the unpleasant duty to perform—and I hope my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will not press me too hard on that ground—of showing that we have had a little check on our onward progress, he must not forget that the policy which was adopted of fostering the industries of this country so strengthened the hands of the Government and of Parliament, so filled the treasury of the country, as to enable us to construct public works of the most gigantic extent, and of the most undoubted importance to every section of this country; he must not forget that Canada has built these great public works—and not only one side but both sides of the House have been concerned in that, because hon. gentlemen opposite completed the Intercolonial Railway, as far as it can be said, I suppose, ever to be completed—from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the people of Canada have found the means to construct one of the most gigantic works that any five millions of people in any part of the world have ever been able to construct, and yet our credit stands to-day at the highest point ever reached. We have found means to stimulate the various interests of the country, we have found means to promote every industry except lumber, which, I hope, in a very short time is going to have its in-rings, under the Bill which I am at present laying on the Table. We have a country vast in extent, illimitable in resources, whether by sea or land; we have inexhaustible riches in the seas which surround us, and they are in our own hands to develop them. We have a mercantile marine which would be the pride and admiration of any country, and which is only surpassed by that of four nations in the world. Sir, I remember the hon. gentleman opposite, on one or two occasions, endeavoring to cover me with ridicule because I made a calculation of how much wheat could be grown in the North-West by 100,000 farmers, cultivating 320 acres of land each, with a yield of 20 bushels to the acre. What does he say now? Will he repeat that to-day when we have the facts before us, that 16,000 farmers in Manitoba and the North-West of this country, have produced from 13,000,000 to 16,000,000 bushels during the past year? Sir, the abnormal difficulties that were experienced there, the inexperience of the country by the new men who went into it, and a variety of other difficulties, have disappeared, and so far as the development of that country is concerned,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

we are now entering upon a career of rapid advancement that I believe will, at an early day, give us much greater surprises than that which is at this moment occupying the attention of thoughtful agriculturists over the civilised world, that is, a country producing 50 and even 60 bushels to the acre, upon the average, over large farms. I do not mean to say that is the average in the country, but I mean to say that, on a number of large agricultural holdings in the North-West, when the grain is threshed out, it measured from 50 to 60 bushels per acre, covering the whole crop on the farm. Hon. gentlemen opposite will be as glad as I will be if that statement turns out to be true. I say, under the circumstances, what has Canada to be afraid of, if we have accomplished all this, if we have brought our country to the position which she occupies to-day? There is no member of this House who does not know that both in England and the United States Canada is beginning to attract an amount of attention that a few years ago the most of us would have believed it impossible to attain. I say, Sir, what have we to be afraid of, with a hardy, enterprising and intelligent population, with men who, man for man, are ready, in a fair field, to enter into competition with the men of any other country in the world—with a fair field, not handicapped mind you, but with a fair field—I say, what have we to be afraid of? Sir, we have the most abundant evidence that it is only necessary for us to have confidence in ourselves, and to devote ourselves unsparingly in the future to the great task of developing the inexhaustible resources of this country. Then, with a great population, whenever the time comes that, as hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think, we ought to have the management of these matters entirely in our own hands, we shall be able to enter, upon even terms, into negotiations with other countries for the extension of our commercial relations. I say, Sir, that we not only have the advantage of this great domain, with its inexhaustible resources, but we have over us the flag of the mightiest empire in the world, and under its ægis we can go forth with greater confidence than any man can possess, representing a community of only five millions of people, we can go forth knowing that in the remotest section of the world that flag is waving over our heads, that there are behind us an army, a navy, and a moral force of a great empire that will give Canada all the protection that she can desire. Sir, under these circumstances, to throw away our birthright for a mess of pottage, to go looking for commercial reciprocity with a foreign country—even if we could obtain it, I say a policy of that kind would be, in my opinion, to make us forget what Canadians never will forget, the gratitude they owe to the great empire of which we form a part, and the duty of building up on this northern portion of the continent of America, a power to which every Canadian will feel proud to belong.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Call it six o'clock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps it would be as well, but I wish to say one or two words to the hon. gentleman. I regret extremely, for his own sake, that he was not present during the reciprocity debate. It would have interested us all to have heard what he had to say then. Had he been present then, he never would have talked the intolerable rubbish he has done to-night about unrestricted reciprocity. But I agree with him that it is not possible just now to enter into a discussion of that subject, and so, as the hon. Minister has suggested, I will call it six o'clock.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the New York, St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Wood, Brookville)

Bill (No. 30) to authorise the town of Kincardine, in the county of Bruce, to impose and collect certain Tolls at the Harbor in the said Town.—(Mr. Rowand.)

Bill (No. 61) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance may be said to be properly divided into three parts. The first position was a candid and businesslike statement of the affairs of the country, carefully prepared and carefully read; a departure no doubt from our ordinary custom but one which, under the circumstances, I do not think anybody ought to object to, inasmuch as it is extremely desirable that a Minister of Finance in making such a statement should guard against any incautious or ill-considered words, which might, peradventure, be afterwards used, or misunderstood, to his detriment. I have my doubts, Sir, if the hon. the Minister of Finance quite clearly saw the full import of all the statements which he made in the early part of his speech. I have my doubts whether he entirely comprehended their bearing on certain proposals to which he alluded, very gingerly indeed, in the course of the discussion, but of which we will hear more, I do not doubt, before this debate is closed, and assuredly before this House is prorogued. The second part of his speech was mainly devoted to an advertisement, or, perhaps, I might more properly describe it a prospectus, lacking nothing in fulness of accuracy and detail, of the Londonderry steel works and all that pertains thereto, saving and excepting a list of the shareholders past, present and to come, but possibly this may be in the documents the hon. gentleman handed to the reporters. But in the third part of his speech, the old Adam asserts itself, and we heard once more those thundering tones and impassioned declamations, with which the hon. gentleman was wont to tickle the ears of the groundlings on his side of the House, when he had the honor of sitting here and when we had the honor of sitting on the opposite benches. There was the same glorious inconsequence, there was the same magnificent audacity, and the same superb self-confidence which has so often led the hon. gentleman to wrestle with facts, and so often resulted in facts getting the worst of it. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to say which we are to admire the most, and I use the word admire rather in the American sense than in the English in this respect, whether it was the tender solicitude for the welfare of the Liberal party displayed by the hon. gentleman lest we had made a mistake, and thereby put off indefinitely our chance of returning to office which the hon. gentleman (no doubt most sincerely) implied, that he desired in the interests of the country, if only we would alter our position in one little matter, or the hon. gentleman's grand and magniloquent explanation of the devotion to fixed principles, which has so uniformly distinguished not only the hon. gentleman but all the hon. gentleman's colleagues in all the many years we have been acquainted with them. It does infinite credit to the hon. gentleman's command of face, when we recall the events of the last few months and recollect that the apostle to-night of fixed principle is the same Minister of Finance, who was a member of the self-same Cabinet about a year ago, when they explained to the British Government and to this House, that the concessions demanded by the Americans could not possibly be made to them without

treason to their country and without utterly destroying the entire value of our fisheries, and who twelve days ago came down with propositions to this House enforced with all the hon. gentleman's eloquence and energy, in which he proved to us most conclusively that his late colleagues (or his present colleagues I should say) had not quite fully understood the situation, that they had gone a little too far, and that he in his wisdom had come to see the necessity of arriving at a totally different conclusion and to make them see it too. Sir, is this adherent, this apostle as I said, of fixed principles the self-same hon. gentleman, a member of the self-same Cabinet who, twelve months ago, compelled this House by an enormous majority to declare that disallowance must be rigorously practised in Manitoba at the peril of the most tremendous consequences to the people of this country who had invested so many million dollars in developing that country, who about three months ago, as the papers laid on the Table of the House show, addressed a formal communication of the greatest weight to the English Government, in which they pointed out that the greatest interests of Canada would be imperilled if these pernicious Manitobans were permitted to construct a railway of 60 miles to the American frontier; and who are at this present moment in the act and instant—not of free grace or free will, but on compulsion, applied directly to them by these same despised Manitobans—of proposing to us to add to the enormous burdens of the people of this country in order to compensate a well-paid corporation for giving up a monopoly which those men of fixed principles told us could not be given up without the greatest peril to this country? Are they the self-same parties who a few weeks ago declared—although there the hon. gentleman was not so inconsistent as the rest of them—that it was in the highest degree treasonable and traitorous to this country to ask that certain goods which the Americans had put on their free list, should also be placed on ours, and who, about a week thereafter, at the instance of the hon. gentleman, who had the good sense to see where their senseless obstinacy was leading them, issued a proclamation to do that which they declared, only a week before, could not be attempted without treason to this country? Sir, one is almost tempted to ask: are there, if I may be permitted to use the phrase, two Tupperes or one Tupper in the field? We know that the hon. gentleman can fill two quite different places rather irreconcilable under our constitution. But are there two wholly different gentlemen, one of whom was present twelve months ago and one of whom is present to-day? I rather think not; I rather think that when nature made the mould in which the hon. gentleman is cast, she broke it forthwith; and perhaps it was just as well. Sir, here we have this same hon. gentleman, who is so touchingly afraid lest the Opposition should become inconsistent, declaring in one breath—and there I agree with him—that Canadians in a fair field are able to hold their own in any country under heaven, and in the next breath deprecating competition by these same Canadians with the people of the United States. We have had these gentlemen boasting of what Manitoba has done in spite of a vile tariff, a viler land policy, and a vilest railway monopoly; and we hear this same hon. gentleman, who is responsible for the tariff and the land policy, and more than any other man in Canada for the railway monopoly, absolutely congratulating us on the progress which is likely to ensue in Manitoba when these disabilities—and most of all this last disability—are removed. Sir, we had the hon. gentleman declaring, in one breath, that unrestricted reciprocity was a folly, and in the next admitting that he had offered that same thing, just to see what the Americans would say about it. Sir, the hon. gentleman told us—and there again I rather agree with him—that it did not commit him to anything. What, Mr. Speaker, in the name of wonder, could commit this Government or any member of

it to anything, I should like to know? He asked us why it was that the Liberal party never reminded the Government of the statutory offer of the United States—as if it was our business to acquaint them with what passed in the United States. I have the *Hansard* of 1886 under my hand, showing that for an hour I, myself, my hon. friend from Bothwell, and others of my hon. friends here, pleaded with the hon. gentleman, who sits behind him, not to impose those enormous and exorbitant duties on green fruits and other similar articles coming into the country, because the Americans had made them free, and because, as I told him, we were bound, by our statutory offer likewise, to put them on the free list. The hon. gentleman declared, and perhaps declared truly, that I had a hundred applications to add to the burdens of the people in the shape of new taxes for one which was made to him. Sir, that may be true. What, I should like to know, have the hon. gentleman and his colleagues left untaxed? Look over the free list from end to end, and can he or any of his friends point out to me one single article which enters into the general consumption of the people of Canada that is left untaxed, save only the articles of tea, and one particular species of coal? The hon. gentleman desires to know if we should go back to 1874. Sir, there is no such luck for the people of Canada. I would to heaven that we could go back to 1874. I would to heaven that we could undo the villainous mischief, the era of folly and extravagance which have disgraced the history of Canada during the last ten years. But, Sir, unhappily no such thing is possible, and we must recognise the changed situation. The hon. gentleman declared—and upon my word, audacious as he is, I wondered to hear any man in his position, or any position, make such a statement—that the effect of putting additional duties on iron was to produce new discoveries of iron ore in the neighborhood of Port Arthur and elsewhere; and he also declared, on the authority of a gentleman who had been greatly enriched by his iron taxation, that he never heard of a consumer who complained of those duties. Sir, the hon. gentleman must have been deaf in both ears. If there is one subject more than another on which complaints have been rung into my ears from the day the hon. gentleman put on his duties to the present time, it is the oppressive incidence of those iron taxes on vast classes of our population. And then, Sir, the hon. gentleman wound up by declaring that no man in the United States, no party in the United States, and not one single journal of repute in the United States, would go in for unrestricted reciprocity, but he did not add, as defined by our high commissioner and plenipotentiary, Sir Charles Tupper. Sir, I agree with the hon. gentleman in this, that if our proposition had been such as he defined it to be, if it had been one for annulling and repealing the whole system of trade of the United States, and for turning Canada into a vast smuggling depot from which people at pleasure might import goods into any part of the United States, it was the maddest folly to propound any such proposition. But, Sir, when did any man in this House, when did any journal of the Liberal party, or any other party, ever profess to expect that the Americans would entertain any proposition for unrestricted reciprocity which at the same time meant free trade with England? If the hon. gentleman had done me the honor to read the speech I delivered on the question, he would have seen that several pages were devoted to pointing out that it was of the essence and necessity of any proposition made by Canada for unrestricted reciprocity, that we must discriminate in certain lines of goods against England and all other countries; and I defy the hon. gentleman to say that he can name any journal or any man of note in the United States, who, if that had been explained to them, who, if the proposition had been placed before them as I have placed it in my speech before this House, would have

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

declared that they would refuse to consider it. If the hon. gentleman will look at the language of Secretary Bayard, if he will look at the language which President Cleveland, time and again, has addressed to the Congress of the United States, if he will look at the language used by Mr. Butterworth in his Bill, he will see that he is wholly mistaken in supposing that such a proposition as the one we advanced has been refused or criticised in an unfriendly fashion by the distinguished gentleman to whom I have referred, or, for that matter, by any other public man of mark in the United States. But it is interesting to note—and I call on my hon. friends to take special note of it, I call on the press to take special note of it, I call on the people of Canada to take special note of it—that the hon. gentleman by his own words admits that he and his party are utterly unable to solve or to grapple with this problem. I well believe it. There is no doubt whatever that to grapple successfully with the great enterprise to which we have set our hands, requires the greatest prudence, and the greatest economy. There is no doubt it requires a knowledge of the first principles on which honest taxation should be based, it requires zeal for the welfare of Canada and not for retaining place by grants to combines and trusts and monopolies; it requires statesmanship and patriotism—a statesmanship and patriotism not of the order which, in two periods amounting together to fifteen years, has trebled the debt and the taxes of the people of Canada; not of the order of statesmanship and patriotism which has succeeded in those periods in driving away something like two millions of people from our shores; not of the order of statesmanship and patriotism which succeeded in provoking two rebellions in the North-West and would have provoked a third, had these hon. gentlemen not cooled down in time and surrendered to force and threats what they would not give to justice and reason. For the rest, I have to tell the hon. gentleman what he, as a medical man of renown must know, that it is not our business to prescribe until we are called in. If he and his friends cannot solve this problem, I can tell him that we can, and are prepared to do it in case of need. But I am not going to commit the *gaucherie* of drawing up a budget, out of which he may take such plums as he pleases, and hold me responsible.

Mr. HICKEY. Very sour plums.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was inclined to smile at the tribute which the hon. gentleman paid to my worthy friend, Mr. Blake. I have no hesitation in saying that in the language he used with respect to that eminent statesman, he spoke the simple and literal truth; but it is most noteworthy that these worthies on the other side never discover the purity, or the statesmanship, or worth of any Liberal leader until that Liberal leader is out of their way. They belong to the tribe, they are the true spiritual descendants of that people whose fathers stoned the prophets and whose descendants built their tombs. So long as Mr. Blake was here, using his great power to unmask the schemes of those hon. gentlemen, how few compliments were paid to him from those benches. So long as my hon. friend Mr. Mackenzie was able to lift his voice, as he was wont to do, in defense of the right and truth, so long was his reputation not particularly respected by these hon. gentlemen, but when these two gentlemen have been stricken by the hands of disease, we find all of a sudden hon. gentlemen opposite are awakening to their great virtue and patriotism, particularly if they think any word of theirs can, by any possibility, be twisted to the detriment of the Liberals who survive. I would not wonder that if anything should happen to me and I were compelled to absent myself from political life, I might be canonised in my turn. My patriotism, my loyalty, my statesmanship, and all the rest of it might be flaunted in

the faces of my hon. friends on this side, if any good opportunity presented itself, by hon. gentlemen opposite. But I am on the whole content to be where I am; I am not anxious for premature exaltation in that way.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Even at the price?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Even at the price. I must, however, on behalf of my hon. friend, Mr. Blake, take serious exception to the very gross misconstruction which was placed on his words by the hon. the Minister of Finance. What did Mr. Blake say? I know what he said. I know what Mr. Blake meant, and I have to tell the hon. gentleman this: Let him take my hon. friend's speech from end to end, and you will not find one syllable in it in favor of protection, or in approval of the National Policy. What my hon. friend did was to point out, in very express and pointed language, the monstrous injustice of the present tariff, more particularly as it affected the poorer classes of the community and the agricultural classes. What he did was to point out how very grievously the interests of consumers at large had been set at naught in the framing of that tariff, and it is noteworthy that in that very speech, and even in that part of the speech—because they will not quote the speech, they quote merely fragments from it which suit their purpose—but even in that little fragment quoted my hon. friend expressly declared, in so many words, that relief from these difficulties was to be sought in freer trade relations with the United States. What else he did say was this, and hon. gentlemen opposite are welcome to make the most of it: He did state that the folly and extravagance of which those gentlemen and their friends have been guilty for the past ten years had most grievously complicated the whole question, that it would take time and consideration to work our way through it, and, furthermore, that the parties whose interests were affected had the right to be heard. That is what my hon. friend, Mr. Blake, said, and that was a proper and statesmanlike utterance. I agree with that. I say undoubtedly these gentlemen have complicated the case; I say that time and consideration are required to deal with it, and I say, also, that the parties concerned have a right to and should be heard. But that was all. And I may tell hon. gentlemen this: I made not quite as many speeches as did my hon. friend, Mr. Blake, but I addressed, in all probability, about 100,000 voters in various parts of Ontario, previous to the last elections, and in not one single, solitary speech that I made did I fail to point out to the audience I addressed that the position was so seriously complicated by the extravagance and folly of the Government that I saw no chance of any great permanent relief except in much freer trade relations with the United States, and if the hon. the Minister of Finance wished it, I could bring witnesses, not by the score or by the hundred, but by the tens of thousands, to testify that on every possible occasion I indicated freer trade relations with the United States as the one avenue of relief which was opened to the people of Canada. We can judge perhaps better of the extraordinary accuracy of the hon. gentleman in regard to Mr. Blake's speech, by remembering what he said but a few hours ago with respect to Mr. Mill's new tariff Bill. I have here the speech dated 29th April, in which Mr. Mills introduced that Bill to the Congress of the United States, and I will call the attention of the House to the language which Mr. Mills used with respect to that Bill, as to which the hon. gentleman gave us to understand that it is practically a protective measure. What says Mr. Mills?

"The policy which is being pursued now, may for a while suit the demands of the capitalists who have money invested in the various factories and enterprises of that kind in the country. They may be able by the aid of these pools, trusts and combines, which seem to be springing out of the earth all around us, to secure for a time the capital invested. But what, I ask you, is to become, in the meantime, of the poor laborer

when they shut off their fires, when they turn him into the streets and determine that they will limit the product of their establishments in order to keep up prices so as to save the profits on their investments? And yet they call this the American policy. I repel it, Sir, it is not American. It is the reverse of American. That policy is American which clings most closely to the fundamental idea that underlies our institutions and upon which the whole superstructure of our Government is erected, and that idea is freedom—freedom secured by the guarantees of Government; freedom to think, to speak, to write; freedom to go where we please, select our own occupations; freedom to labor when we please and where we please; freedom to receive and enjoy all the results of our labor; freedom to sell our products, and freedom to buy the products of others, and freedom to markets for the products of our labor, without which the freedom of labor is restricted and denied. Freedom from restraints in working and marketing the products of our toil, except such as may be necessary in the interest of the Government. Freedom from all unnecessary burdens; freedom from all exactions upon the citizen except such as may be necessary to support an honest, efficient, and economical administration of the Government that guarantees to him protection to 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.' Freedom from all taxation except that which is levied for the support of the Government; freedom from taxation levied for the purpose of enriching favored classes by the spoliation and plunder of the people; freedom from all systems of taxation that do not fall with 'equal and exact justice upon all'—that do not raise the revenues of Government in the way that is least burdensome to the people and with the least disturbance to their business."

I think that, when having access to that document, which was as free to him as to me, the hon. gentleman should have so thoroughly misconceived the spirit of Mr. Mills' resolutions, he can hardly be held to be a very good or a very accurate guide as to the meaning of a particular passage in Mr. Blake's speech at Malvern. For the rest I feel that, to a certain extent, this debate has been discounted. A good deal that might properly come in in the course of the Budget debate has been anticipated in our debate on unrestricted reciprocity, and I must add that, while I was disappointed that the hon. gentleman was not present during the other debate, I was also somewhat disappointed in the line which he has taken to-day. I had thought, and I had some reason to think, that the hon. Minister had recognised in a great measure the difficulties of our situation. If he has, and I am not certain that he has not, realised these difficulties, then the statement we have heard is only another proof of the extreme difficulty, even in the case of a capable and resolute man, as I admit the hon. Minister to be, retracing his steps and getting out of the difficult position into which the country has been plunged. I thought he had seen the signs of the times, and I think that to some extent he does see them, and that he saw the changes which are imminent in the United States and how they would inevitably affect us, but the hon. gentleman, perhaps, is indifferent, perhaps he has made up his mind to leave us, and under those circumstances it may be that the hon. gentleman does not care needlessly to embroil himself with his colleagues further than he has already done. Still, it is to be regretted, because the hon. gentleman had, to some extent, the opportunity, if he so saw fit, of bringing about a great and wholesome alteration in the policy of this country; and, as I have said on another occasion, I am inclined to believe that the hon. gentleman really and truly desired to do so, although circumstances were too strong for him, and he was obliged to leave the work he had begun unfinished. I noticed that, in his preliminary remarks, the hon. gentleman called our attention to the fact that he had expected a deficit of \$300,000 on the transactions of the year 1887, and that, by some remarkable exercise of skill and ingenuity, that deficit had been avoided. I proceed now to point out to the House how it was that the misfortune of having to declare a deficit has been avoided. I find that the first expedient which suggested itself to the hon. gentleman was a simple one, to be sure. The hon. gentleman stated, as you will observe, that, whereas he had expected a deficit of \$300,000, he found himself unexpectedly in possession of a surplus of \$27,313, and this is the way in which that pleasant result was brought about: For the last four or five years, after discussion, after special

agreement on the part of his leader, it has been arranged and agreed that receipts for Dominion lands sold in the North-West shall go to capital account, and that the expenditure for surveys and purposes of that nature were also to go to capital account. That has been done ever since 1880, as these public accounts show. What does the hon. gentleman? All of a sudden he reverses the policy formally enunciated by the Prime Minister, and charges the expenditure to capital account, but credits the amount of \$191,781 for receipts on account of sales of Dominion lands to income; and so, unexpectedly as he says, he converts a deficit of at least \$300,000 into a surplus of over \$97,000. But the hon. gentleman was not then at the end of his resources. In former years, under his predecessor for two successive years, the cost of suppressing the rebellion in the North-West was properly charged to consolidated revenue, inasmuch as we had nothing but gunpowder smoke to show for that expenditure; but it was not convenient to do that on the present occasion, and so the hon. gentleman opens a new account which he calls a territorial account, and he credits to that \$293,917 on account of this North-West Rebellion expenditure, instead of charging it in the ordinary way. Thus, by getting rid of items which his predecessors had charged to consolidated revenue for years and years, to the amount of \$456,000, he forces a balance of \$97,313. The hon. gentleman's original statement, it turns out, was perfectly correct, because the actual deficit was \$348,996; but it was not convenient to have a deficit reported when he was leaving the Finance Department, and, so, by a species of legerdemain, this deficit has been turned into a surplus. It is very ingenious, but I am sorry that the hon. gentleman, for the sake of producing a wholly fictitious balance, should have allowed himself to be a party to what is purely and simply a case of cooking accounts. If you take the Public Accounts for 1887, you will see that, from 1881 to 1886, not one farthing of the receipts for Dominion lands was credited to the consolidated fund, and you will also see that the present Postmaster General, during his time, most properly and correctly charged to ordinary expenditure the very large sums which were expended in 1885-86 for the purpose of putting down the rebellion in the North-West and defraying the losses incurred thereby. Now, in that respect, I am bound to say that the Postmaster General set the Minister of Finance an excellent example, and it is very much to be regretted that he departed from it, more particularly after the special agreement which was entered into on that subject between myself and the First Minister, and to which, for fear of accident, I will call the attention of the Minister of Finance, because I really think the item ought to be reversed. This matter came up as far back as 28th April, 1880, and after some discussion between myself and the present Premier, after I had pointed out the necessity of having the account arranged in this way, if he chose to charge the expenditure for that service to capital account, he replied:

"A special land account can be kept for this, for which credit will be given for all moneys received, and in which all charges for surveys, &c., will be charged."

That promise was repeated the year after, and an account was opened, as I have shown, for four or five successive years by the hon. gentleman's predecessor. Now, Sir, I will not detain the House at present by pointing out, as I have often done before, the fact that it is a very dubious policy indeed to allow expenditure for ordinary rolling stock on the Intercolonial Railway to be charged to capital account. I think the good sense of the House is with me in thinking that such matters as rolling stock on the Intercolonial Railway should certainly come under current account; otherwise we will never be able to know where we stand as regards the expenditure upon that railway. I have my doubts whether it is altogether in consonance with sound book-keeping to go on keeping a perpetually open account for every building

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

that we choose to add to the enormous pile of buildings which we have already erected here for parliamentary purposes. I think it is time that that account, also, should be closed. However, I am not going to insist on that. The other points I have alluded to, I think, admit of no dispute, and they show only too clearly that on the present occasion the public accounts of Canada have been cooked, and cooked to the extent of \$456,000, so as to convert a real deficit of \$350,000 into a nominal surplus of \$97,000. Sir, in reviewing the estimate which the hon. gentleman has brought down for 1888-89, and as to which he correctly stated that he believed a large addition would have to be made for public works and mail subsidies, I find that he proposed to spend \$35,421,000. Now, the hon. gentleman gave us no hint whatever as to what amount would be required for mail subsidies, but I am strongly inclined to believe that we will be fortunate if we escape, under existing circumstances, with less than about \$500,000 on that account. I fear, also, that, looking at the experience of previous years, which is the only guide we have, that the Indians and Mounted Police together are likely to absorb a couple of hundred thousand more than the hon. gentleman has estimated for. There is no doubt whatever that he will have to ask for at least \$500,000 additional for public works. It is probable that railways and canals, judging from the statements of this current year's expenses so far, which the hon. gentleman himself brought down, and for which I am indebted to him, in which I observe a charge of \$477,000 in addition to the large sum already asked for on railway expenditure—it is only too probable, I say, that we may add at least \$200,000 more to the amount estimated for railways and canals. For interest, as I understood himself to admit, something like \$200,000 is likely to be charged; and, if we are to have an Election Act at all, there remains the necessity of providing for the registration of voters, which on the plan laid down by the hon. gentleman, cannot be done for less than \$250,000. Now, Sir, the total result is this, that we have arrived (and this is substantially in accord with the statement of the hon. gentleman) at an annual expenditure of \$37,000,000 a year, and if we have a Franchise Bill, of thirty-seven millions and a quarter, not to speak of other matters which I shall presently allude to. Sir, the hon. gentleman admitted candidly and frankly, and it is to his credit, that, so far as he could not see, things had come to such a pass that our probable income would hardly exceed \$36,000,000 and our expenditure would be about \$37,000,000. So that we are not only confronted with a past deficit as I said of \$300,000 or \$400,000 and I fear a possible deficit for this year, but an almost certain deficit on the hon. gentleman's own showing of \$1,000,000 for 1889. Now, I say that is rather a serious state of affairs and more particularly as the hon. gentleman made no proposition whatever for the purpose of grappling with that deficit. He trusts to the chapter of accidents, he leaves it to his successor. Sir, the time was when I recollect that the hon. gentleman used to denounce such a policy in most ferocious language, in fact he could find hardly any words sufficiently severe to stigmatise my colleagues and myself when, under very peculiar circumstances, we thought it was the lesser of two evils to save the people from excessive taxation and to face a possible deficit of \$1,000,000 a year. Now, it is important that we should be accurate here, because, although the hon. gentleman treated the matter very lightly indeed, there can be no doubt that there are very heavy liabilities looming up before the people of Canada. The House will remember that I took occasion to warn the hon. gentleman, last year, of the inevitable result which would ensue from the grant which he proposed to make to Prince Edward Island. I pointed out to him that if he gave half a million to that island on any pretext whatever, he must lay his account to be confronted with similar

demands from all the other Provinces in the Confederation. I pointed out to him, also, that this pernicious system of railway subsidies, which he is now apparently desirous of stopping, involved consequences which could not be stopped, that he had opened the door wide and he could not shut it. He had laid down a principle which involved the necessity, if the case was fairly and honorably dealt with, of dealing with it on a large and generous scale, and of compensating those localities which were not provided with railroads, or had spent their own money in providing themselves with railroads. I pointed all that out, and if the hon. gentleman had any doubts as to the correctness of my foresight on that occasion, I think that the resolutions passed at the Interprovincial Conference which took place a few months ago, must have roused him from his dream and dissipated his delusion. There, Sir, he finds that the Premiers and the Ministers of the various Provinces united in council, took the ground, and took it, so far as I can see, incontrovertibly, that the present Government, by their conduct in violating the federal constitution, by their conduct in making these grants without reason, or any special cause, to particular localities and particular Provinces, had utterly destroyed the whole financial basis of this Confederation. As the hon. gentleman well knows, they proceeded to formulate their demands, involving, if these demands are acceded to (and the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have rendered it exceedingly difficult to find any just ground for refusing them) involving an addition to the public burthens of about a million and a half a year, that is to say, if capitalised, an addition to our total indebtedness of something like 40,000,000. Then, Sir,—and a remarkable omission it was—from beginning to end I did not hear one word used by the hon. gentleman to point out to us the fact that there is now on the Journals of the House a proposition by himself and his Government, involving a charge of \$525,000 a year for 50 years to come in favor of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Not one word respecting that very heavy liability did the hon. gentleman say. Sir, the hon. gentleman might have, with propriety perhaps, deferred the discussion of the details of this measure until these resolutions were before the House; but in a financial statement the hon. gentleman, I think, was bound to call the attention of the country to the fact that engagements had been entered into by the Government of which he was a member with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company involving a charge for more than the lifetime of every man I now address of \$525,000 a year. I am not going to discuss that in detail, I will merely say at the present moment that seems to me to be trebly objectionable. It seems to be objectionable, in the first place, because the hon. gentleman apparently does not propose to give us any data by which we can estimate the real value of the rights we are called upon to purchase; nor do I think it would be possible for him to give it. In the next place, it is quite clear that the concession will involve other very large concessions to various other portions of the Dominion, that we will not be allowed to guarantee this half million a year to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, without making concessions to other parts of the Dominion that will involve a loss of many millions of our assets and practically an addition of hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to our public burden. I might add that it appears to me, likewise, that the hon. gentleman and his friends were guilty of very gross negligence in this, that when they were making concessions in times past to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, when that company was suing them for aid, which it was necessary for it to receive, although cautioned and warned by us of the necessity of arming themselves with power to deal with this very monopoly, they obstinately refused to do so. They had the power then to have got control of the monopoly question into their own hands, and if they had thought it was in the public interest they

could have maintained it, but under those circumstances we would have been free agents in dealing with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I need not comment on the utter violation of pledges made time without number by hon. gentlemen to this House and to the people of this country. Here is another finally final, final, final, final bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, every man knows, and none better than the First Minister and none better than the Finance Minister, that the moment the ink is dry on this contract new propositions will be made, new demands will be made; the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is certain to have some other proposition to make, and it will seek to rescind its bargain when convenient that it should be rescinded. Nor did the hon. gentleman, although he has formally announced, or his colleagues have formally announced to this House that there were negotiations now going on with the Island of Newfoundland for its admission into the Union, say one word to us of those negotiations, or did he ever allude in the slightest way to the responsibilities we might be called on to assume, and the additional burdens that might be imposed on the people of this country if we entered into any arrangement with that Island. I warn those hon. gentlemen that they have no right to entangle this country further at the present time. That is a matter to be gravely considered. There might be situations, there might be occasions on which it might be reasonably prudent for us to consider the question of the acquisition of Newfoundland; but I say, and I will prove it before I sit down, that of all conceivable times and periods this is the most inopportune to add largely to the burdens of the people of Canada. We have past experience to warn us. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that it was a most unwise and ill-judged step, on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite, to precipitate as they did the union of British Columbia with us, although there was a great deal more to be said for that step than can be said for the present negotiations with Newfoundland. It did no good to British Columbia, and it very seriously hampered and embarrassed our whole future, and I am afraid the premature forcing on of that union was one of the greatest mistakes in point of state-manship, that was ever committed; it was at least ten years too soon, and it would have been infinitely better, both for us and for the people of British Columbia, had they retained their autonomy for that space of time. Sir, I fear again we see Imperial interference. I am afraid the British Government, finding Newfoundland a troublesome colony to deal with, are egging on hon. gentlemen opposite, without much regard to the interests of the people of Canada or the people of Newfoundland in order to rid themselves of the trouble; and I call the attention of the House again to this, that in dealing with Newfoundland there is a series of unsettled and troublesome questions which have bothered and perplexed the British Government for many a long year past. Why, it is well known that one of the most thorny questions in diplomacy are the rights which the Government of France still assert over a large part of the Newfoundland coast; and does the hon. gentleman suppose, does this House suppose, after the experience we have had of our fate in dealing with our own acknowledged coast rights in Nova Scotia and elsewhere, that if we get possession of Newfoundland with all these questions unsettled, Imperial necessities would not compel us to play second fiddle to the people of France just as they have compelled us to play second fiddle to the people of the United States on the fishery question. Sir, I have no time to speak of all the other propositions alleged to be in the air, although the hon. gentleman has declared that, with certain exceptions, which he was too wise to specify in detail, he and the Government want to stop all expenditures on public works and all expenditures on capital account. Who does not know that there are de-

mands for canals, for railways, for bridges across our great rivers, who does not know that all these different proposals are being pressed on hon. gentlemen opposite, and that under certain political exigencies these demands will be conceded? I should like the House to consider what the sum would amount to if these projects or demands for which the hon. gentleman has opened the door so wide be carried out? I venture to say we will not escape from our settlement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, including sums we will have to pay to other parties to get their support to the bargain, for one penny less than \$25,000,000. I venture to say that if we allow ourselves to be entangled in negotiations for the acquisition of Newfoundland, it will mean a charge of about \$1,000,000 to the annual expenditure of this country in one way and another over and above all we can obtain from that colony. I venture to say that sooner and later, and probably sooner than later, hon. gentlemen opposite will find they will have cut the ground completely from under their feet by their past actions as regards the demands of the several Provinces, and they will have to concede to them a sum which, if capitalised will amount to \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 more. There is a sum equal to \$100,000,000 of added debt, if those sums were capitalised, staring us in the face, largely in consequence of the unexampled imprudence and folly with which hon. gentlemen opposite have conducted the affairs of this country. Sir, I say this has arisen to a very great degree from one fundamental error, I might add from one fundamental crime, in that from first to last hon. gentlemen opposite have deliberately disregarded the very essence of a federal constitution. From first to last they have grasped at more than they could manage, they have insisted on taking the second step before they have taken the first, and now we see the consequences of that folly. Some weeks ago I showed, and I will not repeat what I said, where this had landed us. The Finance Minister might possibly have made a better defence of the conduct of the Government than his colleagues made had he been here then, but up to the present time the facts I then advanced have met no refutation, have hardly met with a contradiction. We had the flimsiest apology for the deplorable condition into which the hon. gentleman's party has brought Canada. Now, Sir, it is perfectly notorious that from the first, the present leader of this Government never liked the federal system, never approved of it and never believed in it. I will not say that he has maliciously and of set purpose applied himself to destroy the federal constitution, but I will say this, that the worst foe of the federal constitution would have acted precisely as that hon. gentleman has done. I say that from first to last, in every possible shape and way, the hon. gentleman has set himself to destroy and undermine the leading principles of our constitution. And at what a cost in men and money to Canada has that been done? Why, Sir, from 1867 to this present year of 1888, our own records, our own census returns, our own statistics show that the conduct of the hon. gentleman has cost us about one million of native-born Canadians and about three-quarters of a million of immigrants who sought our shores intending to stay here. In that same space of time, if I am to include the indebtedness which the hon. gentleman is now prepared to incur, he has added something like \$200,000,000 to our national debt. In that same space of time, if you regard, not the nominal sum which goes into the treasury, but the real addition to the taxes of the people, the hon. gentleman has added about \$30,000,000 a year to the annual taxation—the real genuine taxation which comes out of the people's pockets. That, Sir, is a record of which very few other men indeed, in this or any other country, can boast, and there is no doubt, Sir, that the hon. gentleman for once, at any rate, in his life, spoke the exact and simple truth, when at Quebec some months ago, he declared that one thing his

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

friends might be certain of, and that was: If the wretched Grits succeeded him they would find no surplus to dissipate. Never, Sir, was there a prophet who so thoroughly believed in his own prophecy, and who is more determined to keep his word than the hon. the First Minister. Now, Sir, I am going to address myself to-night to two or three matters of great practical moment to the people of this country. And first of all, I shall point out the relative expenditure of Canada as compared with the expenditure in England and the United States, in those matters which are not fixed charges and which are under the control of Government and of Parliament. You will recollect, Mr. Speaker, that we were told that no economy could be practised; no substantial economy could be practised in the affairs of Canada. We were told, Sir, that with such skill, and with such excellence were our affairs managed that it would be practically impossible for me, or for anybody else to affect any material reduction. Sir, I am content to point to my past record. We found a controllable expenditure of some \$9,000,000 a year and we cut it down to something like six and a-half million dollars, and, Sir, what we did before we can do again. But what I want to call your attention more particularly to is the actual present controllable expenditure of Canada and the United States. I have here, Sir, the Treasury returns of the United States, and I call the attention of this House to them for a few moments. It is a very curious thing, and will well repay examination. The actual expenditure of the United States for the past year amounted to \$267,000,000 all told. Of that \$75,000,000 were for war pensions, \$47,000,000 for interest on debt, and some one hundred odd millions were for army, and navy, and such purposes as these. The total expenditure, less the army and navy charges and war pensions, and items such as we place under "collection of revenue," the total expenditure of the United States for purposes such as we call controllable expenditure, with the solitary exception of the expenditure on our militia amounted to \$54,732,000, the rest was for army and navy and interest and pensions and customs and inland revenue charges, and here are the details in my hand. The United States, Sir, with 60,000,000 of people require \$54,000,000 for all ordinary purposes of expenditure, including \$6,000,000 deficit on post office, that is to say they carried on their controllable expenditure for just 90 cents per head, and about the same amount I notice is estimated for the year 1888-89. What is our expenditure? As needed Canada expends on similar items:

Civil Government.....	\$ 1,300,000
Legislation.....	700,000
Superannuation and Judges' Pensions.....	290,000
Public Works.....	2,250,000
Indians.....	1,200,000
Mounted Police.....	800,000
Fisheries.....	400,000
Penitentiaries.....	360,000
Justice.....	700,000
Emigration Account.....	350,000
Franchise Bill.....	300,000
Miscellaneous.....	500,000
Light-houses.....	600,000
Minor items.....	300,000
Mail Subsidies and Ocean Service.....	700,000
Deficits Post Office and Public Works.....	2,000,000
Total.....	\$12,950,000

Assuming our population to be 4,500,000 whites or 4,600,000, if hon. gentlemen opposite like, our controllable expenditure for the same purposes is \$3 per head nearly for the people of Canada as against 90 cents per head for the people of the United States. This is a fact that may well make hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House ponder, and if they want the details I shall be happy to supply them to the Minister of Finance or any of his friends. More than that, Sir, those hon. gentlemen per-

haps will object to the United States as being a Republican country, and they are too proud to take a lesson in much needed economy from republican countries. I have looked to the expenditure in England and I find in England a similar state of things to the United States. England be it remembered is a country having a legislative form of Government and a comparison, therefore, is not fair to England. It is too much in our favor, unless I were to include our subsidies which I do not propose to do. I find in England, excluding services of education and similar services and their legal expenditure, I find their civil list amounts to £1,000,000 sterling; their public works, £1,708,000; their civil departments, £2,468,000; their foreign and colonial services, £617,000, to which we have nothing to compare. Such of their non-effective and controllable services as may be fairly put in comparison is £500,000; miscellaneous, £48,000. So that, Sir, in England they contrive to discharge substantially the same services that we discharge for \$12,950,000 (or deducting our charges for justice \$12,200,000), they in England discharge those for £6,321,000 sterling or about \$31,000,000 a year with a population of 36,000,000 of people, being nearly the self-same amount per head that the people of the United States require. You get, Sir, this rather remarkable result, that we in Canada, a young nation and by no means as wealthy a nation as England or the United States, for those controllable services which are under the special charge of the Government and Parliament, and in which economy can be exercised, require to-day per head about three times as much as is needed in England or the United States. What makes this matter very much worse in my judgment is this: This huge expenditure, for huge it is, either in comparison with our resources, or in comparison with the expenditure of England and the United States is raised under a system of taxation of which I say that it would be hard to find in any other country a system more oppressive to the great mass of the people. Now, Sir, that is denied by Ministers. When I made this statement in the course of a recent debate the late Minister of the Interior took occasion to say that under the present system poor men could get on practically without any taxation at all. Sir, I take issue in the strongest possible terms with any such assertion. I say in the first place that no system of indirect taxation can spare the poor man if it is an extensive system of indirect taxation and not supplemented by heavy direct taxation. I say, in the second place, that our system is especially a bad one. Our system taxes the poor man's food, or many portion of it; it taxes his tools, it taxes his medicine, it taxes his clothes, it taxes his furniture, it taxes his crockery, and everything that he uses, except possibly the one article of tea. All other things, with the exception of certain descriptions of food, are heavily taxed under our tariff. He was followed by the hon. Minister of Marine, who declared, like the hon. Minister of the Interior, that the tariff does not press on the poor man; and challenged us to name any article the duty on which pressed on the poor man. Sir, I reverse the challenge. I challenge him, I challenge the hon. Minister of Finance, I challenge any and all of those gentlemen, to name one single article which enters into the consumption of the poor man which we import which is not taxed, except the one article of tea. You can get old masters free, you can get rough diamonds free, you can get raw cottons and other articles for the benefit of the manufacturers free; but you will not find on our free list one single thing that enters into the consumption of every man that comes in free except the one article of tea. Then the hon. Minister of Marine undertook to dilate on the case of the farmer, declaring that every article that goes into the food of the farmer's family escapes taxation. What about sugar, I should like to ask him? Does it not go into the food of the farmer's family, and does it escape taxation? What about dried fruits, rice and a host of minor articles? The hon. gentle-

man is virtuous, no doubt, but he would surely admit that there must still be cakes, even if he would cut off the ale, which some people deem a necessary article of consumption. Now, Sir, the truth is this: Our system of taxation, among its many other evils, is especially hard on the thrifty workingman and artisan. I have the details of the average expenses of an ordinary family, of which the head possesses an income of \$400 a year; I have had several estimates given me, and have made a sort of rough average of the amount of taxation paid in Canada by an ordinary mechanic receiving that income, and having a wife and three or four children. I find that such a family will consume about 200 lbs. of sugar, on which the taxes, although not necessarily going into the Treasury, amount to at least \$5 a year; it would consume of dried fruits, rice, and similar articles about \$10 worth a year, on which the taxes would amount to \$3; its clothing—and it is a low estimate—amounts to about \$85, on which the taxes amount to about \$30 a year; and when you take into account the increased cost of their outfit of tools, furniture, bedding, crockeryware, &c., there is not the slightest doubt that their annual taxes on these items amount to not less than \$10 a year. In other words, an ordinary artisan or mechanic receiving \$400 a year, is taxed under your tariff, though the taxes do not necessarily go into the Treasury, but are often imposed for the benefit of some trust or combination, to the tune of \$48 a year on the average. And, Sir, where in some cases, as in the city of St. John, you may fairly make an addition in consequence of the taxes on fuel, flour and meal, the taxes of such a mechanic would be increased some \$8 or \$10 more. Now, Sir, I turn to England. Hon. gentlemen are always quoting England. I wish they would pay her the compliment of an enlightened adoption of her system. An Englishman, with an income of 30 shillings a week, which is almost equivalent to \$400 a year, only pays necessary taxes—I am not speaking of excise taxes, which are voluntary—at the outside on 20 lbs. of tea, amounting to \$2.50, and on an equal quantity of dried fruits to that consumed here, amounting to about \$1 per annum. So that the English artisan, or operative, or mechanic, with \$400 a year escapes with a taxation of \$3.50 a year, while his Canadian brother has to pay \$48 a year under this beneficent tariff, which the Ministers of State tell us does not practically add one farthing to the expenditure of the poor man. Why, Sir, the very organ which hon. gentlemen opposite have lately established in the city of Toronto, had a calculation the other day which I was rather amused to see, in which it pointed out that a man with an income of \$500 a year was apt to run behind under existing circumstances to the tune of \$60 or \$70 a year; and it stated rightly that that was a very unfortunate condition for thrifty, industrious mechanics to find themselves in. Now, Sir, I will point out further that this is exceedingly aggravated by the incidence of the specific duties which hon. gentlemen opposite have imposed. Sir, I need hardly waste many words on this subject, because it must be obvious to everybody who gives the subject one moment's reflection, that when you raise a large portion of your revenue from specific duties, they must necessarily press very heavily and unjustly on the poor man, and give an undue advantage to the wealthy consumer. Now, I find that in such articles as coarse tweeds, for instance, which are worth about a shilling a yard, there is an *ad valorem* duty of 20 per cent. and a specific duty of 7½ cents per pound; so that the man who uses such tweeds has to pay from 44 to 46 per cent., while the rich man using tweeds costing 7 or 8 shillings a yard only pays 20 or 25 per cent. The same is the case with such articles as blankets, on the cheaper kinds of which the duty amounts sometimes to 70, 80, 90 or a 100 per cent., as compared with a duty of 20 or 25 per cent. on the richer and superior article. I am

quite aware that it is one of the misfortunes of a heavy tariff that when you have heavy duties they constantly provoke fraud, and it is very much easier to prevent frauds, by imposing specific duties, than it is by imposing *ad valorem* duties; but there is also this result: that a specific duty conceals from the people the weight of the taxes and the extreme injustice of those taxes to the poor man in favor of the rich. The hon. gentleman was good enough to devote a large part of his speech to an eulogy of the beneficial results of those enormous taxes on iron which he imposed last year, and he had recourse to a very old and very stale artifice. Instead of pointing out to us what was the precise amount of the duties imposed on those kinds of iron which went most into consumption, he masses his duties together and says that the average is only so much. Now, I have here a statement from a gentleman in the trade, in which he points out that the hon. gentleman's charges are now as follows:—On pig iron, which at present—or when this estimate was made out—was worth about \$12 a ton, the hon. gentleman places a duty of \$4, amounting to 33 per cent.; on puddled bars, which were worth at the time of this estimate, \$16 a ton, the hon. gentleman charges a duty of \$9, or 60 per cent.; on ordinary bars, which were worth \$22 a ton, he places a duty of \$13, amounting to about 60 per cent. also. These are not, by any means, the worst of these duties. There are some duties which range up to 75 per cent. or 80 per cent., and I will call the attention of the House to the way in which those duties affect an ordinary farmer, in order that we may see what right the agricultural classes have to consider that their interests are protected under the present tariff. Some time ago, I caused to be made by an exceedingly competent party an estimate of the amount of iron which would be used in a very ordinary dwelling house if erected by a farmer. I find it would require some \$60 to \$80 worth of iron, on which the duty ranges from \$24 to \$36 in the articles required. I find that stoves and cutlery, of one kind or another, would cost about \$40, on which the duty would amount to \$12 or \$15; I find that in building his barn, the farmer would require iron to the value of \$64, on which the duty would be \$20 or \$25. Such ordinary tools as he must have would cost \$20 with a duty of \$5. If, as very frequently is the case now in Canada, owing to scarcity of wood, and, as is almost universally the case in the North-West, he found it necessary to use wire fencing on his farm, he would probably require for an ordinary farm about 30 cwt. on which he would have to pay some \$45. That is a mere illustration of the incidence of this taxation on iron, as regards certain necessary expenditures on an ordinary farm. But if you want to see how mischievously, how grievously the whole future of the country is compromised—and the words are not too strong—by this suicidal policy of taxing what has now become a prime necessity in farming operations, because no man requires cheap and good iron more than the farmer, I must refer you to the case of a farmer going to Manitoba with the intent of occupying a considerable quantity of land and hoping to bring it into cultivation in a short space of time. In the case of the four first articles I have named, the dwelling, stoves, barns and tools, the estimate is pretty much the same. On the first four items, the Manitoba settler would be mulcted in about from \$61 to \$75. Of wire fencing he would probably require a considerable amount—because there is no wood at all suitable for fencing in most parts of Manitoba—he would probably require about 50 cwt., on which he would have to pay a tax of \$75; and in order to farm properly in Manitoba, the farmer must have a large quantity of agricultural implements, not less, as I am informed, in order to start fairly and properly, than \$600 or \$700 worth. Well, on those implements our beneficent Government, for the purpose of encouraging settlement in Manitoba, has placed a duty of 35 per

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

cent., and has, at one blow, in that article alone, added \$200 to \$250 to their cost. When you add to that the enormous taxation on clothing, bedding, lumber, furniture, even the tarred paper used in his shanty, and on every article the settler needs, you must allow for at least \$120 or \$140 more. And it is absolutely demonstrable that this policy of high taxation practically inflicts a fine of \$400 or \$500 on every settler who goes from Ontario to Manitoba and desires to farm any considerable quantity of land and possesses means enough to supply himself with the proper outfit. This may be said to be in some cases a little mitigated by the exemption on settlers' effects, and that, perhaps, applies with more force to persons who come from the older countries as regards the latter line of articles, but it is of no use to settlers coming from the other Provinces of the Dominion, and those are the most valuable settlers. I might add further that the effect of these huge taxes on iron is inevitably to add to the cost of working and constructing railroads, and in that respect hits the farmer both ways. You tax him on everything he requires for his outfit, and you likewise tax the railroads which convey his produce to market, and thereby rob him still further of the proceeds of his toil. I was rather surprised to hear the hon. gentleman tell us, with all our experience in these matters, that really, after all, although he had put on this enormous taxation, manufacturers are so kind and so good to us that they do not take full advantage of the taxation; and that although he has put on a tax of \$2 a ton on some articles, he found by experience the manufacturers only take \$1.25 out of us. We should have some explanation of this benevolent feeling on their part. They do not want, perhaps, to pinch the people too suddenly, or, what is the most probable explanation, they have not had time enough to form a combine or trust, and so we have escaped with a charge of only \$1.25 instead of \$2. But the hon. gentleman knows well that this enormous taxation which he has put on, in addition to all the other evils I have described, tends most seriously to interfere with the proper sanitary condition of our cities. It is a direct impediment to the putting down of gas works and the construction of water works. It is preposterous nonsense to talk of these things being given to us by these manufacturers as cheaply as if there were no extra duty. What does the hon. gentleman take us for? Does he not know we have a committee of this House investigating at this moment the various arts, and modes, and ways in which these manufacturers, after brief competition, combine together to put prices up to the highest point that the taxation imposed by the Government will allow. That is the most preposterous argument I have ever heard advanced. If these gentlemen can manufacture as cheaply as we can buy in other countries, what need have they of a protective tariff at all? Sir, I say that this whole policy is both foolish and wicked, and I warn hon. gentlemen and I warn the House, and, as far as I can, I warn the country that we are only beginning to feel the results of this foolish policy. Why, consider for one moment what the tax of \$40 or \$50 a year on frugal, industrious mechanics, factory operatives, artisans, and people of that kind, means. It means nothing more or less than depriving them of the means of making provision for themselves and families in their old age. The tax you take out of them for the purpose of enriching your friends of the manufacturing associations, wisely used, would supply these men, if they chose to put the money away, with the means of effecting an insurance to the amount of \$2,000 or \$2,500, to be paid them when they attain the age of sixty years, or to be paid their families on their demise. It would enable every man to provide himself with a home and a reasonable plot of ground attached. More than that, let the hon. gentleman consider what a terrible disadvantage all this is likely to put us to in entering into competition with our neigh-

bors. We are on the eve of great changes in the American tariff policy, and if we go on loading down our farmers and artisans with this heavy taxation at the self-same moment when the people of the United States are reducing theirs, I can tell the hon. gentleman that he will find that we will be exposed to a very much more intense competition with them than we have hitherto experienced. Now, there are a few fallacies and errors which are constantly cropping up, some of which I noticed in the hon. gentleman's remarks, and in regard to which I would like to say a word or two. In regard to this alleged cheapness which he told us we would obtain from the promotion of home manufactures, in the first place, it is a most dubious question whether there is any increased cheapness at all. I believe that, in a great many cases, it will be found that our manufacturers, when they say they are giving us cheaper articles, are really deteriorating the quality, as has been done in other cases and in other places; but, supposing this is true, if these men can manufacture as cheaply at home as goods can be manufactured elsewhere, what need is there of hedging them round with an artificial protection? Are they not perfectly able to compete in the open market with other people? So far as there has been any reduction in the price of goods, it has arisen from worldwide causes, from causes largely affecting the cheapness of the raw material which enters into the manufactures, and in no way or shape or form is it due to the increased taxation which we have heaped upon ourselves. Then, I would like to say a word or two as to the fears of our manufacturers. As I conceive, the real danger to the manufacturers of Canada will begin the moment the United States reduce their present heavy tariff. Then, as Mr. Chamberlain pointed out, American manufacturers will become very formidable rivals not only to English manufacturers but also to Canadian manufacturers; then there will be a slaughter market in earnest; your present tariff will be inadequate to keep them out, and the manufacturers, not being able to send their products to the United States, will suffer ten times more than they did in the old time of the so-called slaughter market. I am quite aware that the manufacturers are now in some respects in a difficult position. They need, and they know that they need, a much larger market than they now have; and the better class of our manufacturers are in favor of obtaining admission to a larger and freer market. There is no doubt whatever in my mind that, in the case of a great many manufacturers, the cost of production has been increased by the operation of this tariff. Their workmen require more wages in order to live in comfort under the increased cost of articles under the tariff, and, more than that, the necessary effect of a high tariff is to utterly destroy the export trade, as to which we have had proof advanced time and again by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson), and as is shown conclusively by the Trade and Navigation Returns. Then, we find in the last place, that the artificial and foolish stimulus which is given to placing capital in certain particularly favored lines, ends in producing a home competition which is much more formidable than the foreign competition, or results, as we have seen, in inducing the manufacturers to combine together for their own profit, but to the great injury of the consuming public. There is another fallacy which is constantly advanced by the hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not think the Minister of Finance mentioned it to-night, but it is often brought before the attention of the House. That is the fallacy that it costs nothing to the people of this country to assume provincial debts, that, though a Province is managed as foolishly or as extravagantly as you will, it costs nothing if the Dominion steps in and relieves the Province from the results of its extravagance. I deny that altogether. I say that is contrary to the fundamental principles on which our federal constitution is based. I

say it is at once a wrong to the Dominion and to the Province, and I have regarded from the first with the greatest possible apprehension the consequences of the policy which the hon. gentlemen have introduced, and which having now been adopted, renders it almost imperative that we should revise the whole basis of Confederation to see if it be possible to adopt some system, or some scheme, by which we can put an end, once and for all, to the incessant forays which are made on the Federal Treasury. I think we have shown that a most radical reform is necessary. We have indicated to the hon. gentlemen how that might best be obtained. We have pointed that out at length, though, as the hon. gentleman was not here at the time, I will briefly review the uncontradicted and uncontroversial reasons which have led us to this conclusion. We pointed out how formidable has been the movement of population as against us. We pointed out that in 20 or 25 years we have lost 2,000,000 of our people, or of those who came here in order to settle in Canada. We pointed out that in that space of time there has been an enormous reduction in the volume of trade, measured *per capita*, so that, in 15 years, the total volume of trade, *per capita*, is 50 per cent. less than it was long before this policy was introduced. We pointed out that the hon. gentlemen have contrived in that time to treble our debt and to treble our taxes. We pointed out—and it is one of the very few points that the hon. gentleman attempted to contravene to-day—that there had been a complete failure to create an inter-provincial trade of any magnitude. We did not deny that there had been some intercourse, but we pointed out that so weak and feeble was the current of trade that, after all the enormous expenditure to which we had gone for the construction of the Inter-colonial Railway, hon. gentlemen were unable to make that railway pay its own working expenses by many hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, and there can be no better proof than that of the total failure of their efforts to create a genuine inter-provincial trade. If that inter-provincial trade could be properly obtained, it would not be necessary to convey goods from one part of the country to the other at less than the cost of transport, and that is what has constantly been done on that railway, and that is the real cause of the constant deficit which has already been pointed out in regard to that road. The hon. gentleman, on other occasions, has been compelled to admit that this augmentation of trade of which he boasts has been obtained absolutely and entirely by conveying goods on that road below the cost of transport, and there can be no greater condemnation than that admission of the policy which he has adopted. As for his allegation touching the large increase in the coasting trade, it may be as well to remind him of the explanation which was given a short time ago by one of my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island, who pointed out with great force that the nominal increase of trade was almost entirely due to the fact that the customs regulations were more strictly enforced, that there were not any more ships or any more real business, but that more reports were made of vessels which went from one port to another, and that there was hardly any increase in the coasting trade, if there was any. We have pointed out the lamentable failure which had attended the efforts of the hon. gentlemen to settle the North-West in spite of the enormous expenditure of money which has been made there. We have pointed out their failure to make their other public works pay. We have pointed out that practically there were but two customers for Canada to deal with, the people of England and the people of the United States, and we have shown very good reasons for believing that, were we able to obtain free trade with the United States, our commerce would spring up by leaps and bounds, that it would vastly increase, and that it would be more than one hundredfold in excess of

all we are ever likely to obtain by all the steamship subsidies, all the delegations, all the arrangements which the hon. gentleman can make with the antipodes, or with South America, or with all the ends of the earth, to which he proposes to send his trusted friends. And we pointed out also the fact, bearing very heavily on us at present, that we had completely reversed our position towards the United States, that whereas we started on our career with a debt one-third that of the United States, with taxation only one-third that of the United States, our debt to-day was two and a-half times as great as that of the United States, and our necessary taxation was at least 50 per cent. greater than the necessary taxation of the United States. Well, what answer was made to all that? Why, Sir, practically every one of the facts I stated were admitted. I do not believe a single fact of importance was challenged; I know that not a single fact which I advanced was overthrown. There were two feeble attempts made to reply, and two only; one was as to the value of lands in the Province of Ontario, and another was as to the egress of population from 1873 to 1879. Now, I will say a word or two on that subject. My statement was, and I repeat it here, that there has been, within the last few years, a decided and heavy fall in the actual selling value of property throughout the Province of Ontario. What was the reply of the hon. gentlemen? They did not dispute my assertion that there had been a fall in the actual selling value, but they said: Look at Mr. Blue's statistics, and you will find that Mr. Blue reports a small increase in the estimated value of farm lands in 1887 as compared with the average value of farm lands for several years back. Well, I looked at Mr. Blue's statistics, and I found this very important fact: I found that Mr. Blue gave the value of land in the Province of Ontario as follows:—In 1883 the number of acres in occupation was 21,458,067; the value of land, \$654,793,000. In 1887 Mr. Blue gives the total quantity of land at 21,799,017 acres, that is, 340,950 acres more; and he gives the value of land, not the selling but the estimated value, at \$636,883,000, being just \$17,909,000 less than in 1883, and, Sir, that was the case, although 340,000 acres of new land had been added, and 560,000 acres more had been cleared. Therefore, according to the authority that these hon. gentlemen quoted, the value of land in Ontario was less in 1887 than it was in 1883 by 28,000,000, after allowing for the additional acreage brought in. Sir, it so happened that on the very day and hour that I was speaking a gentleman well acquainted with this subject addressed a letter to me of which I will read a short extract to the House, and I beg the House to note that this letter is dated on the 12th of March, 1888, two days before I had made this statement in the House of Commons. This communication is as follows:—

"In my almost daily communication with the farming community as inspector for a loan company here, on knowing something of the strain put upon the country at the present time, I have been led to study the situation seriously, and I am convinced that the country never was in a more serious plight, financially, than it is at present. Lands that could have been readily sold in Western Ontario five and six years ago at \$60 to \$80 per acre, cannot find a market now at \$40 to \$50, and in any township there are dozens of farms for sale and no buyers, and it is very difficult to say what the end of such a state of things will be, except we get relief from some quarter.

"No doubt you will have the report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries thrown in your face in contradiction of the statement as to depreciation in value of farm land, and while I am free to admit that they are computed honestly, probably from the best data obtainable still, as to the value of farm lands, they are terribly misleading. The number of acres sown in wheat, oats, barley, &c., quantity of cleared and wild land, &c., are probably returned complete, and from the average of this return the tables are computed. A farmer can tell exactly how many horses, cattle and sheep he has, also how many acres he has in wheat, oats or barley, but if he gives the price of his land he invariably puts it down at the highest price he has ever been offered, or bases his figures on some price generally that has been paid in his neighborhood, adding for improvements he has made in the meantime at cost, hence the misleading character of that portion of the statistics. I have gone over these sheets carefully in townships where I knew the parties and the farms well,

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

and found that it was generally the best, most independent and enterprising farmers who made returns, and while they gave the other statistics correctly, they invariably place their land at a great deal more than it is worth and we find the same thing occur in applications for loans."

I shall not trouble the House with the remainder of this letter, which is in the same strain, as it is somewhat longer than I care to read through at the present moment. Now, here is a communication volunteered to me by a man whom I know to be exceedingly well acquainted with the value of land in Ontario. I, myself, have had large experience for many years in dealing with farm lands in various parts of this country, and I know for a positive fact that you cannot obtain to-day, in many parts of the country, within 20 or 25 per cent. of the price which was freely and readily paid for farms but a few years ago. But I have a challenge to give to the hon. gentlemen, if they dispute my assertion, if they think that the actual selling value of land has maintained itself. There is no use in appealing to statistics as to estimated values, but it would be in their power, as the Government of Canada, to apply to those men who are practically conversant with the selling value, to apply to the sheriffs, the registrars, the county attorneys and county judges, all of whom, in various ways, are continually made acquainted with the actual selling value of land. If they dare to dispute my assertion, let them apply to these authorities, and I venture to say that they will find that I am only too well justified in the statement I make, that there has been a large and formidable reduction in the selling value of land throughout a great part of the Province of Ontario. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen on many occasions have dared to talk to us about the egress of the population from Canada, they have dared imply that there was as great an exodus from Canada while Mr. Mackenzie controlled the affairs of this country, as under their régime. Sir, I have the same statistics before me to which they appealed, and I call the attention of the House to the absolute increase which took place in Ontario in two periods of seven years, one period from 1872 to 1879, covering the whole period during which Mr. Mackenzie held the reins of power; the other period from 1879 to 1886, covering seven years while hon. gentlemen were in power. Sir, we find that, in Ontario, the total population increased in seven years, from 1872 to 1879, by 250,782 souls; in other words, the natural increase was maintained within a very small fraction. The rural population of Ontario increased from 1872 to 1873 by 80,958 souls. We turn to the period from 1879 to 1886, and we find that under hon. gentlemen opposite the total population of Ontario, in a similar period, increased just 145,000 souls, as against 250,000 under the régime of my hon. friend Mr. Mackenzie. We also find that the rural population increased 15,631 souls, from 1879 to 1886, as against 80,958 in Mr. Mackenzie's time. So, Sir, the actual increase of the Province of Ontario was very nearly double in the seven years for which Mr. Mackenzie was mainly responsible to what it was under hon. gentlemen opposite, and the increase of the rural population, the farming population, the true backbone and sinew of the country, was five times as great under Mr. Mackenzie as it was under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite; and that, be it remembered, in spite of a very large immigration which came in during the latter seven years as against a very small immigration which came into this country in the first seven years to which I have alluded. As to the allegation that the poor pay no taxes, I will say no more; I think I have dealt sufficiently with that particular misstatement. But I have this to say, that our position now is such that it requires the most serious consideration at our hands. What is it in brief? In brief it is this: We have contracted a huge debt, huge in proportion to our population and in proportion to our resources, a debt almost as great per head as that with which the Americans emerged from

their civil war. For that debt we have nothing whatever to show except a parcel of assets so unprofitable that they involve an annual charge on the people of this country of not far short of one million dollars a year in order to make up the difference between the working expenses and the receipts we obtain from that source. We are on the eve of risking an enormous increase of our indebtedness, as if our position was not already sufficiently serious. We have been, I say, most scandalously extravagant in every particular of our controllable expenditure. Why, I turn to the 'United States' accounts, which after all afford the best ground for comparison, because they have a federal constitution on which our own was very closely modeled; and I call attention again, as I have called attention before, to this very remarkable fact, that forty years ago, in 1845, the United States, having an army and navy to maintain, having considerable pensions to pay, were able with twenty millions of people to conduct their whole expenditure for \$22,919,000 a year, while Canada with 4,500,000 or 4,600,000 souls requires, according to the statement of the Finance Minister, \$37,000,000 to discharge the expenditures which the United States, with an army and navy to boot, discharged for \$23,000,000 in 1845. I have pointed out that our controllable outlay is so great that to-day, for about the same services, we charge the people of Canada three times as much as the people of England or the people of the United States are charged. I have pointed out likewise that our system of taxation is most injurious to the workingman, that the thrifty workingman who denies himself for the sake of his family all luxuries, whether tobacco, spirits, beer or wine, is obliged to pay for the necessaries of life for himself and his family one thousand per cent. more than a workingman in the same position in life has to pay in England. I have pointed out that this is aggravated by specific duties so constructed as to compel the poor man, who under our indirect system of taxation is already taxed out of all proportion to his means and income, to pay fifty per cent. while his rich fellow citizens pay twenty-two or twenty-three per cent. I have pointed out that these taxes appear to be so designed and levied as to be specially injurious to the farming population above all other portions of our population, and that has been aggravated in a high degree by these identical iron duties, for the imposition of which the Finance Minister takes so much credit, and that they are specially calculated to impede the settlement of the North-West and Manitoba, on the rapid progress of which so much of the future of this country depends. One thing must be admitted. If the design of hon. gentlemen was to keep down the farmers and impede settlement they have been remarkably successful for they seem to have succeeded, according to the statistics I have quoted, in bringing the rural population of Ontario to a perfect and complete standstill, and in the case of Manitoba where we ought to have had to-day four hundred thousand or five hundred thousand people, they have been so successful in impeding settlement that in the same period of time during which Dakota has acquired three hundred thousand or four hundred thousand people, composed largely of Canadians, we have only added thirty thousand people to the population of Manitoba. I think it is desirable we should put our views on record. I think that there is good reason we should do so, because it appears to me that the danger is always looming nearer. It appears to me that my hon. friends would do well in future discussions to emphasise the fact that a very great change is imminent in the United States and that great change is likely to affect the people of Canada very seriously. The hon. gentleman cannot be ignorant of the very remarkable position taken by President Cleveland in his recent Message to Congress. He knows what that foreshadows, that a great party in the United States have inscribed "reduction of taxation" on their banners, and that there is every reason to believe that those

banners will lead them to victory at the next Presidential election, and I would call the hon. gentleman's attention and the attention of the House to the language in which the highest authority in the United States spoke of that system of protection to which the hon. gentleman would have us believe the people of the United States are fondly wed. Says President Cleveland:

"But our present tariff laws, the vicious, inequitable and illogical source of unnecessary taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of the duty measures the tax paid by those who purchased for use those imported articles. Many of these things, however, are raised or manufactured in our own country, and the duties now levied upon foreign goods and products are called protection to these home manufactures, because they render it possible for those of our people who are manufacturers to make these taxed articles and sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid duty."

The Finance Minister will note that President Cleveland agrees precisely with the doctrine which I have laid down, and which has been constantly laid down by this side of the House, as to the effect of those vicious, inequitable and illogical tariff laws. President Cleveland goes on to say:

"So it happens that while comparatively a few use the imported articles, millions of our people who never use and never saw any of the foreign products, purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles. Those who buy imports pay the duty charged thereon in the public treasury, but the great majority of our citizens who buy domestic articles of the same class pay a sum at least approximately equal to this duty to the home manufacturer. This reference to the operation of our tariff laws is not made by way of instruction, but in order that we may be constantly reminded of the manner in which they impose a burden upon those who consume domestic products as well as those who consume imported articles, and thus create a tax upon all our people. Nor can the workers in manufactures fail to understand that while a high tariff is claimed to be necessary to allow the payment of remunerative wages, it certainly results in a very large increase in the prices of nearly all sorts of manufacturers which in almost countless forms he needs for the use of himself and family. He receives at the desk of his employer his wages, and, perhaps, before he reaches home, is obliged, in a purchase for family use, of an article which embraces his own labor, to return in the payment of the increase in price, which the tariff permits, the hard earned compensation of many days of toil."

And he goes on to point out at great length and with great force how this vicious and inequitable taxation hampers the farmer and prevents him competing on fair terms with the inhabitants of every country in the world, and how greatly for the interest of the American farmer it is that those taxes should be swept away. So the Ways and Means Committee, have likewise pointed out at very considerable length to their fellow-countrymen, what is the assured and inevitable result of that vaunted home competition of which we have heard so much and which was said to be so certain and so likely to produce cheapness and to reduce prices to the people of this country if they would only consent to go on for a little raising their tariff higher and higher and excluding foreign goods from importation. Here, Sir, is an extract from the report of the Ways and Means Committee, which I commend to the special attention of that hon. gentleman:

"There is a persistent pressure by manufacturers for the specific duty, because it conceals from the people the amount of taxes they are compelled to pay to the manufacturer. The specific duty always discriminates in favor of the costly article and against the cheaper one, and therefore it imposes a heavier burden as it goes down from the highest priced articles to the lowest. This discrimination is peculiarly oppressive in woolen and cotton goods, which are necessaries of life to all classes of people."

Then it proceeds to point out that the inevitable result of excluding foreign goods, is, first of all, to produce an intense home competition, and next, and very speedily, to bring together under "combinations" and "trusts" all the manufacturers of a particular article who will make rules to close as many manufacturing as are necessary to keep the highest price of the goods they produce up to the highest possible figure. President Cleveland's message, and the statements of

the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Bill which has been recently brought into the United States Congress are undoubtedly glad tidings for all honest toilers in the United States. But they are also this: They are a warning for the people of Canada and to the Government of Canada, to set their house in order, and the hon. the Minister of Finance is too able and capable a man not to know what the consequences are likely to be to us if we refuse to accept that warning. The hon. gentleman knows right well that if the American taxes are largely reduced, as most probably they will be, that we may prepare ourselves for a most intense competition with American producers in all walks of life, and that that competition will assail not merely our farmers but our manufacturers in every possible shape and way, and that if our position is further injured, with further heavy taxes of the sort which he has been imposing, we may also look to see a redoubled exodus of our people, of far greater proportions than we have already had to deplore in this country. Now, Sir, I will not dwell further on that unpleasant theme. This one thing is certain: Every million of fresh debt which we add to the encumbrances of this country, every dollar of yearly expenditure which we incur, every new liability we assume, are all and each of them a fresh nail in the coffin of the commercial and political independence of Canada. Every one and all of them mean, Sir, an additional millstone around our necks, an additional fetter on our hands and a fresh disadvantage in coming to fair and free trade relations with the people of the United States, in which, as I have said, the best and truest safety of the people of this country lies. Within the last 20 years it appears to me that there have been two possible policies, either of which might have resulted in great advantage to the people of this country. One of those policies was the policy developed by my hon. friend Mr. Mackenzie in his time. That was a policy of prudence, a policy of economy, a policy which meant to solidify the ground as we went on. That hon. gentleman, with his native sagacity, saw that there was great danger to us if we persisted in heaping up debt and taxes in the reckless way which had been done for some years before he succeeded to power. He saw the danger, and his policy would have gone far to prevent it if it had been adhered to. I think my hon. friends will do well to note, and to call the attention of their constituents, and the people of Canada, to the results which most assuredly would have followed if Mr. Mackenzie's policy had been adhered to. First of all, there would have been a vastly reduced taxation. In the next place, there is no doubt whatever the people would not have been driven out of Manitoba and the North-West. We would have today something of the same state of things as on the other side of the line in Dakota. We would have had a population of 500,000 at least of the best settlers in the world, and we would have had an extra volume of trade backwards and forwards of \$100,000,000. We would have had a taxation of \$20,000,000, instead of a nominal taxation of \$30,000,000, and a real taxation of \$40,000,000 or \$45,000,000. Our position with respect to the United States would have been infinitely better than our position is to-day. We would have been a thousand times in a better position to make a good bargain than that which we can possibly hope to make under the present condition of things; and, Sir, in every way it would have been to the great advantage of Canada, if they persevered in that policy which had been inaugurated under unusual disadvantages by my hon. friend Mr. Mackenzie. There is a second policy which might lead to equally good results and that was the policy which was lately propounded from this side of the House; a policy which recognised the altered situation, a policy which proposed an effective remedy for all those evils which I have pointed out, and which not one of the Ministers nor any of their supporters have been

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

able effectively to contradict. The hon. gentlemen may rest assured of this one thing; they may rest assured that the Liberal party is not drifting without a policy or without a rudder either. They may rest assured that we will fight it out on the lines we have commenced, they may rest assured that our policy will be fought out on every hustings, in every farm yard, by every fireside from one end of the Dominion to the other. It is a very silly thing to suppose that we are going to quail before any adverse vote, or a hundred adverse votes such as those recorded here the other evening. It is an error arising only too naturally out of our form of representative institutions to suppose that a nominal majority in this House should by any chance represent the real strength of parties in the country, and that applies, no doubt, to hon. gentlemen opposite whilst they were in Opposition as well as to our position when we are in Opposition. But, Sir, least of all does it apply to a question like this, which was not brought before the people at the last general election. I will give the House a very few figures which may convince some of those hon. gentlemen—if anything can convince them—of the sort of majority on which they are depending as evidence that the people of Canada are determined to maintain their present policy and maintain themselves in the future. I find that at the last general election there were cast in this Dominion 659,452 votes. Of these there were cast for the Government candidates 332,485; there were cast for the Opposition, 326,967. The difference in favor of hon. gentlemen was about 5,500, and that, too, it will be remembered, when in Ontario, at least, we voted under a gerrymander, which had the practical effect of disfranchising at least 4,000 or 5,000 Reform votes. In Ontario the Government carried 173,821 votes against 170,950 cast for Opposition candidates. And, Sir, in my own riding, in the riding of my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), and in the riding of my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville), there were Reform majorities left unpolled, because we did not want them, which would have wiped out that majority in Ontario altogether. Sir, I say their so-called majority was a fraud and obtained by fraud; aye, by fraud, by villainous fraud, it was that the people of Canada, or at any rate the people of Ontario, were deprived of the right of electing those men whom they would have elected. The fact is that a change of one-third of one per cent. would have placed my hon. friend on that side of the House, and those hon. gentlemen on this side in as great a minority as they are in a majority to-day. And I tell hon. gentlemen this: They talk of the will of the people being shown by the majority of the Government in this House; I say there are other assemblies which represent the will of the people fully as much as this House does which are nearer to the people, which are elected under a much honester system, under a system in which there are no returning officers or deputy returning officers selected to frustrate the will of the people; and to-day I have reason to believe that resolutions in favor of unrestricted reciprocity would be carried in every legislative assembly from one end of this Dominion to the other by just as large majorities as that cast against us here the other night. Now, Sir, I warn the Government to take heed. I cannot hope to influence the hon. Minister of Finance, because I understand that he is not going to give us the light of his countenance much longer, which for certain good reasons I regret. But I warn the Government that it may be in their power to obstruct and delay for a short time what they well know is the true current of the popular will on this subject; but if they do that, they do it at their peril. You may dam it up, you may divert it and delay it; but the consequence will be that the pent-up waters will rise higher and higher until they sweep away you and, perhaps, much else that you would not like to be swept away. Now, I think it well that our views on this matter should be put on formal record, and, therefore, in amendment to the motion that you leave

the Chair, I move that all the words after the word "That" be left out, in order to add the following:—

The net debt of the Dominion of Canada was \$140,362,069 on the 30th June, 1878;

That the net debt of the said Dominion was \$228,235,786 on the 31st March, 1888;

That the total annual expenditure of the Dominion was \$23,503,158 for the year ending 30th June, 1878, and \$35,658,161 for the year ending 30th June, 1887;

That the estimated expenditure for the year ending the 30th June, 1889, is \$35,421,440, wholly apart from divers known unprovided expenditures which will raise the total amount likely to be expended to at least \$47,000,000, being an increase of the net debt to the amount of \$88,000,000, and of the total annual expenditure of \$13,500,000, in the space of 11 years;

That the said debt and expenditure have increased in a ratio very far in excess of the increase of the wealth and population of the country during the said interval;

That the said expenditure is provided for by a system of taxation so adjusted as to press with extreme and unjust severity upon the thrifty and industrious producer, and especially upon all farmers, day laborers, mechanics, artisans, and factory operatives, who are at present subject to a customs taxation on articles necessary to life and comfort amounting to nearly one thousand per cent. more than that levied upon members of the corresponding classes in Great Britain and Ireland;

That the mischiefs caused by the present system are further aggravated by the very general substitution of specific for *ad valorem* duties whereby the injustice of the existing mode of taxation and the unfair preference shown to rich consumers over the less wealthy is at one and the same time increased and concealed, and that it is expedient that the said injustice should be remedied, and that the wealthy classes should be compelled to bear their fair proportionate share of the burden of taxation;

That this House views with alarm the extremely rapid increase of the debt and taxation of the Dominion, especially in view of the fact that there has been contemporaneously a very great reduction in the debt and amount required for necessary taxation by the United States, and that this House is of opinion that any considerable addition to the debt or taxation of the people of Canada will work very great hardship to the great bulk of the population and will tend powerfully to place them in a position of great disadvantage as regards the people of the United States, besides seriously prejudicing their chances of securing improved commercial relations with the people of that country.

Mr. McLELLAN. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate. The resolution which the hon. gentleman has offered is so long that it is impossible for us to grasp the different points at once, and the House is so thin that I think the debate had better be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have listened with so much attention to the speeches made on both sides to-night that I think we shall require a little time to digest them. Therefore, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 30th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose, with the consent of the House, to make a motion without notice. We are getting on very late in the Session, and, as the House knows, to the general regret of the Parliament of Canada, His Excellency the Governor General will leave here at the end of May. It will, I am quite sure, be a matter of great gratification to him to be enabled to wind up his administration by proroguing the present Parliament, and I would invite the assistance of the House, in the purpose of expediting business so that that object might be accomplished. I am quite sure that the moment I mention this it will receive the general assent of the House if the public interest and the state of public business will allow it; of course, not otherwise. On looking over Public Bills and

Orders, I do not see that there are very many matters of such paramount importance that we could not facilitate business by giving more time to the measures in the hands of the Government; and if the House will permit, I will move that after answering questions, Government measures should, on Wednesdays, as well as on the other days which are now appropriated to Government measures, take precedence.

Mr. LAURIER. I am quite sure that on this side of the House we will do everything in our power to assist the hon. gentleman in bringing the business of the Session to a close, consistent with public exigencies. I do not think we would have any objection on this side to allow the Government to take next Wednesday and the other Wednesdays following, but I would suggest that the two Bills on the Temperance Act be first on the Orders of the Day for next Wednesday and take Government business afterwards.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not the Prohibition Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. No, only the Bills to amend the Scott Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that is a very good arrangement.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would it not be considered a little invidious to other members who have charge of Bills, not to allow the whole of Wednesday for Public Bills and Orders, instead of giving preference to these two Temperance Bills? I do not think it would make much difference if the whole of next Wednesday were given to public Bills and Orders.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is just the next Wednesday that will make it of importance.

Mr. LAURIER. I made the suggestion because the hon. gentleman some time ago said full opportunity would be given to have those Bills expedited.

Mr. LANDRY. I do not wish to say a word in objection to the motion proposed; but in justice to a Bill I introduced, seven or eight days after the opening of the Session, and which is of considerable importance to the district I have the honor to represent, I must say a word in its behalf. I introduced this Bill at an early day in order that I might have an opportunity of testing the feeling of the House on its second reading, and I have watched it ever since, but it has not been reached, and it is evident, if this suggestion be agreed to, that it will not reach its second reading this Session. It does appear to me that if in the early part of the Session the hon. gentleman would not propose the adjournments at the early hours he generally does, private members would have a better opportunity of having their Bills put through.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The time for members not connected with the Government to press their measures is early in the Session. If an hon. member is in charge of a measure and desires to carry it through, he must see that it is translated, printed in French and English, and put on the paper early. Then he can best ensure its being taken up by the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It would be well for the Government to do the same thing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the early portion of the Session, there seems to be a general reluctance on the part of the members to put through their measures.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Especially the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is giving us a confession so far as his Government was concerned. We will not confess the same thing. The only chance private members have, in our short Sessions, is to have their measures printed and put on the paper early.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not propose to make any objection to the arrangement arrived at with regard to the Temperance Bill, but the hon. the First Minister had better understand that the discussion on the Bill in the hands of the hon. member for Lanark will certainly exhaust Wednesday. He need not expect to have any of Wednesday if that Bill is to remain first on the Order. The second Order, an Act in relation to railway employes, gets the go-by according to this arrangement, unless the hon. the Minister of Finance will say that the Government propose to go on with their railway legislation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They do.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then that Bill can be dealt with at the same time.

Mr. LANDRY. I would not want the observations of the leader of the House to go to my constituents, and to be interpreted by them in such a way as to imply that I had neglected to proceed with my Bill. What I said was that I presumed these Bills were printed and translated in their regular order, and that was the way in which I understood the proceedings of the House. I do not think there was any neglect on my part in reference to this Bill, and when the leader of the House proposes the adjournment of the House at an early part of the Session, it is difficult for a private member to oppose it. At this stage of the Session, I do not suppose there is any possibility of reaching the Bill, but I certainly wish that the Government should state at the early part of the Session that there will be no possibility of reaching a Bill, instead of reserving the statement till a time when it is too late to proceed with it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If I am here next Session, I shall do so.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose the leader of the Government intends to leave Monday to private members?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Monday is a day on which notices of motion come first, and the hon. gentleman is taking the only day on which Public Bills can be reached. Several of the Notices of Motion are of very much less importance than some of the Public Bills; and I would suggest that, instead of taking Wednesday, the hon. gentleman should take Monday. That will give him the same number of days, and will leave the half of a day for Public Bills and Orders.

Mr. McCARTHY. Or take Wednesday's business for Monday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to that, but, in the first place, I may say that some of the Notices of Motion are really more important than the Public Bills. The list of Public Bills and Orders is not very important, as a rule. Then, on Monday, for whatever reason it may be, there is always a thin House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the Government can get on faster.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are so confident in the merit of our measures that we like to have the House full in order to have the meed of approbation which we receive from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it would be only reasonable, if only one day is left to private members, that it should be a day on which all kinds of business introduced by private members might have a chance of being taken up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection that for the rest of the Session the routine for Monday shall be that laid down for Wednesday. In giving that, we will take

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the whole of the Wednesday, as we may take the Temperance Bills on Monday.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think there is any reason to believe that we cannot reach Public Bills and Orders to-day. Unless there is a debate which we cannot foresee upon some Notice of Motion, we may reach Public Bills to-day. At any rate, we make a sacrifice at the end of every Session, and in every Session a number of Bills must be slaughtered at the end.

Mr. CHARLTON. There was no proposition made to interfere with the proceedings to-day, but simply to take Wednesdays after to-day for the Government and to allow the proceedings of Wednesdays to be applied to Mondays after to-day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would like very much to take the whole of next Wednesday, with the view of expediting business, and we will give next Monday the same routine as Wednesday would have. We are certain in that way to get these two Bills upon Monday, and it will not throw them back at all.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman intend to proceed with the Bill which was promised in relation to the North-West, or has that been abandoned?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It stands for the second reading. It has been kept back by the difficulty of settling the boundaries of the constituencies, and I think we have that settled now, and the Bill is in the hands of the printers.

Mr. LAURIER. That leaves two heavy Bills.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, this is not a heavy Bill. It is only to allow them to elect an Assembly, according to the Bill of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), with as few alterations as possible, leaving the new body, altogether elected, to lay their views as to the future before Parliament at our next Session.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman follows the suggestions of my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Mills), I am sure it will be a good Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it intended that they should have an executive or an administrative body?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How is the Governor to get on?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have copied the Bill of the hon. gentleman *verbatim et literatim*, so that he can easily show how this system will go on without an executive.

Motion agreed to, as follows:—

That Government measures have precedence on Wednesdays for the remainder of the Session after Questions to be put by Members, and that the order of business for Mondays hereafter be the order of business for Wednesday, under Rule 13.

FRATERNAL AND BENEVOLENT SOCIETIES.

Mr. DICKINSON, moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 115) respecting Fraternal and Benevolent Societies. He said: It is well known to members of this House that societies of a fraternal and benevolent nature exist throughout this Dominion, and the membership of such societies is already large. I am informed that they number over 200,000 throughout the Dominion, and this Act is intended to protect the beneficiary in such societies, but it applies more especially to societies which grant privileges of pecuniary benefit to their members or to those who partake of the nature of insurance, as well as other societies which grant

those benefits. The Bill provides for a government inspection and audit of such societies, and also that such societies shall have the privilege of depositing with the Government such sums as may be made necessary by the regulations of the Treasury Board. The Act will not apply to societies doing business within the bounds of only one Province; it only applies to societies doing business in more than one Province, or throughout the Dominion. The Act is promoted more especially by the Independent Order of Foresters, which has been in existence some six years, and has now a membership of nearly 9,000, with a surplus on hand of over \$90,000.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 116) to amend the Civil Service Act, chap. 17 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: In presenting this measure, I may say that it deals only with matters of detail of minor importance, with the exception, perhaps, of one provision made in order to prevent the personating of candidates at examination, and copying and procuring copies of answers, or procuring papers for examination. There is also a provision that the entrance, promotion and qualifying examinations shall be held only once a year. The other details of the Bill will be more fully explained on the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 117) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act, chap. 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: I may state, in introducing this measure, that it is limited to three dispositions, though the volume of the Bill might suggest that it contains a greater number of new provisions than it really does. The three provisions are these: First, prohibiting the insertion, on the list of voters, of the names of persons disqualified for bribery or other corrupt practices; second, to provide means for printing all the electoral lists at the Government printing office, thus reducing the cost of printing by a very large figure; third, to provide that no revision of the lists should be made this year. It has been found impossible to make a revision this year, as it is desired that the lists should be printed at the Government printing office, which is not yet ready. A large saving will be effected in the printing, as will be seen in the report of the Secretary of State, for the next first revision, and for all subsequent revisions. Compared to the cost of printing of the last revised lists, the difference will be as between \$180,000 and \$7,000 or \$8,000.

Mr. LAURIER. I may say at once that my hon. friend's provision for having the printing so far from the different electoral districts, will, I fear, involve endless confusion. As to the last provision of the Bill, suspending the Act once more, if it were coupled with a provision to have the electoral franchise in the meantime carried out in the different Provinces, I would approve of it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I hope to be able to satisfy my hon. friend in respect to the other provisions of the Bill when it comes up for its second reading. I know the prejudices and the wrong impressions that have been created in the public mind, but I hope that all these will vanish when explanations are given to the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman made just as confident a promise as did his leader when the Franchise Bill was under consideration. We predicted, on this side of the House, that it would cost at least a quarter of a

million dollars to prepare the voters' lists. Our estimate was largely exceeded, and \$410,000 is the charge against the Treasury for preparing the voters' lists for a single year. Now we have in the Province of Ontario a voters' list prepared, a non-political list, made by representatives of the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I want to know whether county councils are not non-political bodies? I want to know whether the people have not the same opportunity of electing their party friends on county or township councils as they have in electing members of this House? I want to know whether, in the preparation of these voters' lists, municipal bodies do not act fairly as between the respective parties, and whether the county judges, who are appointees of the Government here, are not the ultimate arbitrators in deciding whether these lists are not properly prepared? Now we can use those lists without their costing us anything, and without requiring personal supervision, because they are prepared by those who live on the spot, who know the parties. I want to know whether the Government are not prepared now to adopt the lists prepared by municipal bodies? The hon. gentleman can amend his Bill without difficulty; he can relieve the country of this extraordinary burden that has been imposed upon it; he can restore to the people the representation which has in many cases been taken away from them. The hon. gentleman dared not put his Bill in operation last year, he dare not put his Bill in operation this year. An hon. friend informs me that he can name a county in which there are more than a thousand electors left off, who, if an election was to occur to-morrow, would be disfranchised. Yet hon. gentlemen persist in imposing this extraordinary and unnecessary burden upon the people in order that the voters' lists may be manipulated by them and their friends.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think that Canada, in respect to this Franchise Act, occupies a unique position among the Anglo-Saxon commonwealths of the world. We have upon the Statute-book an Act which is confessedly, in a measure, unworkable, and too expensive to be put into operation every year—confessedly so from the fact that the Government have twice suspended the operation of that Act. Now, the practical knowledge we have derived from the carrying out of that Act fairly, bears out the observations made by the Opposition when the Bill was under discussion in this House. It was asserted that its operation would be very expensive; and the expense of its operation has proved to be fully as great as was asserted by the Opposition. It was asserted that the operation of the Act would entail very great public inconvenience, and that proved to be the case upon the revision taking place when the voters' list was revised for the only time under that Act. It was asserted that the fact that there would exist in each Province two separate sets of voters' lists would create great difficulty and confusion; and that has proved to be the case. In the preparation of our voters' lists we follow a course different from that pursued in any British community. In England the voters' lists are prepared by the overseers of the poor, and those gentlemen are municipal officers elected by the people. The revision of the voters' lists in England is a judicial act, performed by a revising barrister, who is appointed, not by the Government, but by the courts. In British colonies, so far as my investigation goes, the voters' lists are formed in the same manner—it is a municipal Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Every colony has a separate law.

Mr. CHARLTON. But there is no British colony where the Government assumes this power. It is conceded to be

a popular right for the people to exercise in all the colonies, except in this country. If we look to the United States we find that in every one of the thirty-eight States of the Union the preparation of the voters' lists is a municipal act, and the revision is a municipal act in every State except in Oregon, where the list is revised by county court judges. We have a cumbersome, unworkable, tyrannical Act in existence, which has been shown to be such by the experience of the people. Experience bears out every charge made against the Act when it was under discussion in this House, and the Government could not do better than return to the old common-sense principle of adopting the provincial franchise in each Province. That principle was adopted in the American Union when the constitution was adopted. After full discussion, and after four different plans had been thoroughly discussed, the members of the constitutional convention of the United States deliberately adopted the plan of having the qualification of a voter in every State the qualification that would be required for voting for a member of the most numerous branch of the Legislature in each State. That system has worked well for more than a hundred years, and no one would dream of the possibility of adopting such an absurd regulation as to give Congress control of the voters' lists, and have two sets of voters' lists, one for state and another for national purposes. We shall be obliged to abandon the present system, and the sooner we abandon it the better. The sooner hon. gentlemen opposite accept the inevitable in this matter the better it will be for their credit, and for the interests of this country. The common sense principle is to decide that the qualification for a voter for a member of the Dominion House shall be the qualification required in each Province for a voter for a member of the Legislature of that Province. It is a simple, inexpensive, common sense system, which would work no injury, and would enable us to dispense with all the costly machinery connected with the present system, together with the inconvenience caused to the public, and with the confusion which results from having two lists, by which one-half of the voters do not know whether they are on one list or the other, or possibly whether they have a vote at all. I counsel the hon. gentlemen opposite to amend the Bill by adopting the provincial franchise and return to a common sense system again.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). Any one who has a practical acquaintance with the printing of the lists will know that the scheme proposed by the Secretary of State will never work. When the lists are printed in the various places there are always a great many errors, both in the christian and surnames, and also in the post office addresses. The county court judge being on the spot goes over them and revises them, after which they are reprinted and accuracy, as far as possible, is secured. If the work is done here I can see no system by which these errors will be corrected, but the evil existing in the present system will be intensified. I wish the leader of the Government would once for all adopt the proposal made on this side of the House some time ago and simplify this matter. He has provided a large number of franchises, being driven onward by the force behind him. In this democratic country where wealth is, perhaps, more general than in other countries and where the people, man for man, are better educated politically than in other countries, there is only one logical course to pursue, and that is to provide residential manhood suffrage. That is a proposition which would meet with great favor throughout the country. It is a proposition which we urged some years ago; it is a proposition which the logic of events will compel the Government to accept, and it would be a graceful act on the part of the Government if they were to repeal all the other clauses of the Bill and enact one clause giving residential manhood suffrage.

Mr. CHARLTON,

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Secretary of State thinks that when he made this explanation it would be a perfectly satisfactory one to this side of the House. The hon. gentleman must have been very much mistaken indeed if he thought he could satisfy this House or members on this side of the House with the Bill in its present shape. He has a very easy way of stating, not only to this side of the House, but to his own side of the House and the country as well, that the Bill would be a satisfactory one, at the same time forgetting that the Government have not ventured to carry out this Act for the last two years. They have suspended the operation of their Act for one of two reasons: either, because they were afraid of the outlay involved, especially in view of the statement the Minister of Finance expressed the other day that the Government sought to exercise prudence and economy; or it was because the Act is as distasteful to their own supporters as it is to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Look at what is going on in the country to-day. We have had elections going on almost every week since the House met, and yet to-day in different counties—for example, in Russell where there is an election now going on—there must be a large number of electors who possess ample qualifications but are unable to vote. It is an arbitrary and a cowardly act, to take away from the people the right to express their opinions at the polls. In Russell, Kent, or in any county where an election is in progress, there are many people who are in a position to be voters, but who, at the will of the Government, are disfranchised. This is an arbitrary Act, and it shows clearly that the Government do not carry out the provisions of the measure both on account of the expense involved and because they know that it is just as distasteful to their own people as it is to hon. members on this side of the House. Does the hon. Secretary of State propose to carry on that Act from year to year until the general election? The hon. gentleman shakes his head. Why not put the Act in force to-day? Why not bring in an amendment that it shall be revised in cases where elections are to be held? If the hon. gentleman will bring in an amendment to his proposal that revision will take place whenever an election is to be held before the House meets next year, it would not be so objectionable, but to defer this from year to year and to disfranchise a large number of voters—not voters, I will correct myself again, but people who are qualified to vote and who would be voters if they had the opportunity—is a very bad principle, and the hon. gentleman brings in a Bill here to-day to prevent their being put on the list. I repeat, Sir, that it is an arbitrary Act and it will be viewed, I believe, by hon. members on both sides, and by the country generally, as an attempt to interfere with the liberty of the people in the proper choice and election of members to represent them in this House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) is in a warlike mood to-day. He opened the sitting of this House by defending, in a soldierly manner, those premises against a fanciful invasion. He now appears to defend the country against an injury which does not exist.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes, it does.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is all well to say: "Never say die." The gentlemen on the opposite side were very badly defeated when the principle of this Bill, which I desire to amend, was before the House; but not being satisfied with the defeat they met there, they went to the polls, and they told the people that the measure brought by the Government would be a ruin to the country. The people would not believe them and defeated them. Now they speak of our predictions that the principle of the Bill would not cost much to carry out. Nobody on this side of the House made such a statement. We all knew it would

cost a great deal of money, and that the introduction of a completely new system necessarily involved a large expenditure. But what was the result of the predictions on the other side? My hon. friends, when the discussion comes up, will be astonished to hear how unfounded were their predictions. They told us that it would cost not less than three-quarters of a million of dollars.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is so, and I will prove to my hon. friends that they made that prediction. I have made a little collection of those terrible predictions that have gone into smoke, as most of their predictions have.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It costs too much anyway.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I agree with my hon. friend, it has cost too much, but the Government are anxious now that it should cost very little. I will satisfy my hon. friend here, if it is possible to satisfy him, as well as the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, perhaps not all on this point, which is the main part of this Bill, that we will reduce the expenditure to its minimum. It is useless to go on with the discussion now on the introduction of the Bill. It is always better to speak in time, and it is always a great deal of saving of words and of valuable time if we discuss only when the proper time comes. My hon. friends have now been fighting a Bill which is not yet before the House, and a Bill of which they do not know one of the provisions at the present moment. It has been said to us that we have protracted the introduction of this measure for two Sessions. I will give a reason for that at once. The first reason was that we could not introduce the amendments and the modifications which we proposed in this Bill before the House passed the Printing Bill. Last year after the Printing Bill was introduced we thought we could print those voters' lists at the Government Bureau, but it may startle members of this House to know that thirty printers working all the working hours of the day would take ten months to print the 6,150 pages of those lists. Those lists will be ready in due time and they will all be prepared for next revision. We have not been able to do it this year because it was physically impossible to do it. My hon. friend has made a complaint that we have not made a provision for any election imposed on the House by the death of members. Death has been busy amongst us since the beginning of this Parliament, but I hope we will be spared from any further calamities. We have had death enough amongst us and I hope we will not soon have any new elections from such a cause. It is not right to prevent a county from being represented in Parliament because of the revision of the lists, and the revision would take three or four months, and we know that members of the House always ask that election writs should be issued immediately. It is but right that those who have run the race on the political ground of their county, when the court has decided the race was not fair, that they should begin on the same ground again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I understand the objection. My friends say that new-comers should have a right to ask that their vote should be put on the new list, but I do not see that there is any harm done to one side or the other, if the new election takes place with the same list. It may be that a few electors would ask for the privilege of voting when a new election comes around, but that is not a very great loss to the country if they do not vote. In the olden times, lists have been left for three, four and five years without any revision at all in many constituencies. It was not, perhaps, quite desirable to leave a few electors without a vote, but it was not sufficient to place the interests of the country in danger. I think I will be able to show my friends, when moving for the introduction

of the Bill, that the provisions will be acceptable to them, and that it will reduce the expenditure to such a degree that they will find the system quite workable and far from being expensive.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The argument of the hon. the Secretary of State shows how important it is that the revision should take place. He admits that the cost has been too much, and that was the point which this side of the House made in our arguments against the Franchise Act. The amounts may have varied but there is one thing clear, as the hon. gentleman admits, that the expenses are too great.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said that for the first time it was too large.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The reason given by my hon. friend for not printing the list implies that the expense for the second time would be nearly as great except that he hopes to reduce it in the manner that he points out. The members on this side of the House stated that it would be a great expense to the country, and that prediction has been verified. The Secretary of State is endeavoring to reduce that expense by printing all the lists throughout this Dominion, from Prince Edward Island to British Columbia, at Ottawa. Those lists have got to be divided, and it seems to me that so far as this plan is concerned if it does not increase the expense, it will increase the inefficiency of the lists to a very large extent. It was bad enough as it stood on the first revision, but it will probably be worse now, and where any difficulty took place on the first revision it was supposed that the inaccuracy might have been corrected in the second revision. It is my experience, and I think it is the experience of every member of this House that names were left off the list of electors, which had a right to be put on. It might not have been any harm, as the Secretary of State says, but if one man is deprived of his rights of franchise it is a wrong done to them and through him to the entire people. I know a gentleman in the county represented by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), a gentleman who is the local member for that constituency, and a gentleman of wealth, and to-day he is not entitled to vote for a member for the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Was it because of a mistake of the printer?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Whether in the printing or not his name has been left out. I can give several instances of this kind where names have been omitted last year and where the people thought the mistake would be rectified this year. By this delay now proposed, the people will be again deprived of their franchise. It seems to me that we had better go back to the original principle. So far as the Province from which I come is concerned we have a cheap mode of registering the voters which commends itself to the people, and which is controlled by the people through their revisers—revisers appointed by the municipal authorities and not responsible to the Local Government. It is a cheap and inexpensive mode, and every man who has a right to the franchise can have his vote.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I quite sympathise with the member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) in the instance he has given to the House. He refers to Mr. Killam as not being on the list, and I sympathise very strongly with Mr. Killam, because he left the county of Westmoreland where he would have voted against my hon. friend who represents that county, and who could afford to have one adverse vote, and came to Albert to vote against me there.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to point out that the remarks made by the hon. the Secretary of State were the most powerful arguments that have been adduced against the

operation of this measure. The hon. Secretary of State tells us that in the preparation and printing of these lists at Ottawa the time of thirty or forty men will be employed for at least ten months. Now, Sir, contrast that with the fact that the lists under the Provincial franchises are prepared without expense to the Dominion, and speedily, and when prepared, are more suitable for the purposes for which they are designed than the lists my hon. friend is to expend ten months in preparing here. This fact illustrates more forcibly than almost anything that has been said in this discussion, the cumbersome and unreliable character of this huge, clumsy piece of mechanism.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has rather trespassed on the rules of the House in making a second speech on the introduction of a Bill, and before we have the Bill before us. The discussion has almost entirely gone off on the question of whether the Franchise Act which was passed some two years ago should be repealed or not. Well, that is a fair question for discussion. But that was a reform Bill, which was deliberately adopted by Parliament; it is the law of the land, and like any other reform of a constitutional nature, it is a portion of the constitution of the country, and if it is to be altered it should be altered with due consideration, and after full discussion of the merits of the Bill itself. But this measure of my hon. friend has nothing to do with that Franchise Bill. It simply relates to the printing of the voters' lists; you ought not to mix the two subjects together. One is a reform Bill. If we should adopt the suggestions of hon. gentlemen opposite, and return to the old system of adopting the franchises as they exist in the different Provinces, we should have to have a new election. But hon. gentlemen opposite are not quite agreed as to what the reform is to be. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says, let us return to the old system, and let the voters' lists as prepared in each Province be the governing franchise. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), says we must come to manhood suffrage.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say that is the alternative if you do not take the Provincial lists.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is quite a different proposition. One says, let us have manhood suffrage; the other says, no, we will let each Province state what the franchise is to be.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So your constitution provided.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We would fall between two stools if we took the contrary advice of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We would be satisfied no matter what way you fell.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If hon. gentlemen state what they want, we will consider it.

Mr. LAURIER. You heard for six weeks, three years ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen did not agree then. They discussed the franchise for six months, I think, but they did not agree.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We did agree.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And if they had brought the force of their united intellects and power to bear upon the question, perhaps the Government would have been forced to succumb. But we escaped defeat. On the contrary, we gained a great victory, so far as numbers constitute a victory, in the carrying of that measure. Now, we are not proposing such a measure as we discussed then; this little Bill of my hon. friend is simply a measure, as he says—and when hon. gentlemen opposite see it they will probably agree with him—which will greatly economise the expense

Mr. CHARLTON.

of preparing the voters' lists. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says it is a unique system, which exists in no country in the world, that the Government should regulate the voters' list. The Government do not pretend to regulate or interfere with the voters' lists.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh, yes, you do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are prepared under the Act by a revising officer in each county, who is in most cases a judge.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, in most cases a judge; and I have not heard any statement that these revising officers have behaved partially. The Government have nothing to do with the preparation of the voters' lists, but, when the voters' lists are made up by the revising officers, the simple proposition of the Government is that they shall be printed in an economical manner; and to that proposition we expect to get the assent of both sides of the House when they see the measure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman let me ask him a question? I understood the hon. Secretary of State to say that it would take ten months to print these lists. The hon. gentleman knows that, as the law now stands, the printing goes on simultaneously all over the country in each electoral district. Now, under this proposition ten months will be occupied in the printing of the lists, and twelve months will pass by before a list can be revised—at all events before some of them can be—so that lists will be in operation in some counties a year before they are in others. Will the hon. gentleman tell us how he proposes to get over that difficulty? because he must see that it is a serious one. Our experience shows that ten per cent. of the old voters go off, and ten per cent. of new voters come on every year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Not five per cent.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A good deal more than ten per cent. in some cases.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am speaking of the average.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am speaking of the average too. I would ask the hon. gentleman how he proposes to overcome that difficulty?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The system is understood. The lists are settled by the revising officers. The printing of the lists will take considerable time, no doubt. I rather think my hon. friend has exaggerated the time.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said it would take about thirty men ten months to do the work, but it will be done in a shorter time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You can easily get the necessary number of men to print the lists. When they are once printed they are stereotyped, so that when a list has to be revised, the names to be taken off are picked out, and the names to be added are put in the form; and that will take hardly any time. An enormous saving will be effected by having the lists stereotyped, and having them altered from year to year when the revising officers make their returns.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I may perhaps be allowed to make a suggestion, which if accepted may greatly shorten the debate on this Bill when it comes to be considered. I would invite those hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, who would wish to see practically the simple manner in which these lists are going to be printed, as well as the cheapness and regularity of the system, to go to the printing office, where the Superintendent of Printing told me he would be ready not only to give explanations of the system;

but to show hon. members, especially those connected with printing establishments, its practical operation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says it will take thirty or forty men ten months to prepare the lists, so that at any rate one-half of the voters' lists used in a general election would be those of a prior year, and all the Government would have to do to carry an election would be to find whether a particular list was favorable, or unfavorable, and to get the lists changed in the order to suit them.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend does not understand one thing. When the lists are all prepared, let us say that there is about ten per cent. to be added in the revision. That would be ten per cent. of ten months; and it would take one month when ready, as they will be in three or four months from now to make the corrections. At every revision, not more than one month would be required to make the corrections. My hon. friend will say it is not right to have that delay, but as every district will not be prepared at the same time, the Superintendent of Printing stakes his reputation that not a single constituency will have to wait a single day for its lists, unless the revising officers delay them on purpose.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman said it would take ten months to make 215 lists.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Those are the lists we are now making, but when printed the type will remain standing. Motion agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 69) to confirm a mortgage given by the Central Railway Company to the Central Trust Company of New York, to secure an issue of debentures.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. Corby.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the York Farmers' Colonisation Company.—(Mr. McCulla.)

Bill (No. 114) To amend the several Acts relating to the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto.—(Mr. Small.)

RIMOUSKI CUSTOMS COLLECTOR.

Mr. FISET asked, Whether it is to the knowledge of the Government that Mr. J. A. Martin, Collector of Customs at the port of Rimouski, is a trader, carrying on business at the present time? If so, whether it intends to take any action in the matter?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government has lately been informed that Mr. Martin, the Collector of Customs at the port of Rimouski has been carrying on a trading business. That will be investigated, and if it is correct, he will be called upon to give up business or to resign his position.

CAPE BRETON RAILWAY CONTRACTORS.

Mr. CAMERON asked, Whether the Government intends to adopt means to compel the sureties of Sims & Slater, contractors on the Eastern Section of the Cape Breton Railway, to pay laborers and others who were employed by the said Sims & Slater on the construction of that section of railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Any legal means the Government may have to get these matters settled, of course the Government will take.

PUBLIC WORKS IN THE COUNTY OF RIMOUSKI.

Mr. FISET (Translation) asked, Whether the Government have expended during the course of the past year, the sums voted during the last Session and mentioned at page 55 of the Estimates for the year ending the 30th June, 1888, to wit:—Matane, completion of the breakwater, \$500; Bic pier, to complete, \$750; River Blanche, repairs, \$2,000; Rimouski River, \$1,000? If not, what are the causes which have prevented the Government from expending the sums so voted for the repairs and improvements above stated?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) The hon. member made a mistake as to the column of items voted for the year 1888. If he refers anew to the Estimates of last year, he will see that the items he mentions were voted for the previous year, and that they have been expended during the previous year.

WHARF AT MATANE AND AT RIVER BLANCHE.

Mr. FISET asked, Whether the Government intend to insert in the Supplementary Estimates, the sums necessary for repairing the wharf at Matane and at River Blanche, as well as for the completion of the Bic pier and the improvement of the River Rimouski?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot give an answer presently to the hon. member. As soon as the Supplementary Estimates are brought down, they will give him the answer to this question.

CONTRACT OF MESSRS. ISBESTER AND REID.

Mr. CAMERON asked, Whether the Government have reasonable ground to believe that Messrs. Isbester & Reid will have their contract finished before the expiration of the time limited by their contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. All I can say to the hon. gentleman is that we hope these contractors will finish their work before the time fixed by their contract.

PILOTAGE AT NORTH SYDNEY.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, Have the pilotage authorities for the port of North Sydney, Cape Breton, made the yearly returns required of them by the Pilotage Act of 1873? Has the Government taken any, and what steps, to ascertain if the superannuation fund has been, and is now being properly administered by the said pilotage authorities? Has any security been taken from such pilotage authorities, or any of their officials, for the proper distribution of such fund?

Mr. FOSTER. There is no pilotage authority for North Sydney. That is included in the general pilotage authority of Sydney. I do not know that any superannuation fund has been established, but I think there is a fund for the widows of pilots, as I find some items in the accounts for that purpose. No security has been taken for the distribution of such fund; it does not appear to be required. I will further look into the matter.

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LANGELLER (Quebec Centre) moved for:

Copies of all notices calling for tenders, and of all tenders received, for an improved postal service across the Atlantic; and, also, for copies of all correspondence or documents respecting the said service.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw this motion, because it would not be in

the interest of the public service that these papers should be laid before the House at present.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec Centre). Am I to understand that the Government propose to take some action in the matter during the coming summer, or is it proposed to leave the service as it is? The object of my motion was to obtain some information in which the public at large and people of Quebec in particular, are greatly interested, that is to say, when we can expect to get an improved postal service on the Atlantic. Sometime ago rumors were published in the newspapers that the Government were to enter into a contract with a certain company for an improved mail service; while not more than a week or two ago, the papers published rumors that the Government did not intend to do anything this year, that they intended to leave matters as they are. This matter has been pending for a long time; it is within the recollection of those who have been members of this House since 1835, that there has ever since been a question of having such improved mail service. The Government then proposed to give a new contract to the Allan Steamship Company. The members on this side of the House opposed the renewal of the contract. We all agreed that it would be better to pay a little more, and get a better service than to pay even a comparatively small sum and get no service at all. This is a very pressing matter indeed, and a deputation came from Quebec to Ottawa to interview the Government regarding it a short time before the Session. At the present time we are paying for a mail service to Europe, and our own people do not avail themselves of the mail steamers which are subsidised by the Government. I consider that it is an injustice to other steamship lines which ply between Quebec or Montreal and Europe, that one particular company should be singled out and favored by getting a subsidy for doing a service which is considered so inferior to the lines plying between New York and Europe, that even our own merchants scarcely use the line from Quebec at all. Every winter I see our merchants leaving Quebec to go to New York, and taking the Inman or Cunard steamers, or even the French steamers, to go to Europe. This is very much to be regretted, and I consider it is a waste of money to this country to be subsidising any line unless it is sufficiently well equipped to take our own people to Europe, and even people from the United States. I regret very much that the Government do not intend to give this information to the House, not even to say when they will be able to give that service. I do think there could be no objection to laying before the House the tenders that have been sent in. I understand there are only two or three; the secret of these tenders seems to be what we call in French a *secret de polichinelle*, that is a secret that every one knows. It is known that one or two tenders have been sent in, and also, almost the exact amount, and the terms of each tender, are known generally by those who are engaged in that business. It is very desirable that the Government should be in a position to give us more precise information on the subject, a subject of the greatest interest to the public at large. In the meantime, while we do not get that improved service, we are going on wasting money that is being paid to an insufficient service, to the detriment of other lines which get no subsidy.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I stated just now why we could not bring these papers before the House. I will ask the hon. gentleman to be kind enough to renew his question and his remarks when the Supplementary Estimates are discussed, on the item relative to mail service on the Atlantic. That will give him an opportunity of bringing up the subject again, and then the Minister who has special charge

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

of that matter will be here, and will be able to give him all the information that the House can desire.

Motion withdrawn.

CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT QUEBEC.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec Centre) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council, reports, papers and documents touching the seizure made on F. O. Vallerand, at Quebec.

He said: I should like these papers to be brought down as soon as possible. I know the facts regarding the case of Mr. Vallerand very well, but I desire to know the facts relating to the seizure connected with Mr. Levi, which was a more important one. In the one case that of Mr. Levi, the goods seized were returned; in the other case, that of Mr. Vallerand, they were not returned. The case of Mr. Vallerand was that of goods seized on account of an error committed by a clerk and done in good faith. In the case of Mr. Levi it was a seizure of diamonds and precious stones. After some time the goods were returned, and I do not know whether he was compelled to pay a fine. I should like to see the papers in these cases, not only for myself, but for the information of a great many people of Quebec, especially in order to see what particular ground existed for returning the goods in the case of Mr. Levi, and not returning them in the case of Mr. Vallerand. Mr. Vallerand is a most respectable merchant in the city of Quebec, and I understand the whole trouble arose owing to a mistake, and a very excusable mistake, made by a clerk. On the other hand, Mr. Levi was a stranger who came into the country having a large quantity of precious stones, I am told, of the value of \$10,000 or \$12,000, in his trunk. They were seized, but were returned after a short time. Why they were returned, it is impossible to judge, but I should like to see the papers in order to see the reasons assigned.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to the papers in connection with both seizures being laid before the House. In the case of Mr. Vallerand the seizure arose from the fact of there having been an enclosure in a package not mentioned in the invoice, and if the hon. gentleman will refer to the law he will find that in such a case the goods are absolutely forfeited and that no discretion is left to the department. Mr. Vallerand was treated in precisely the same manner as all other importers, quite as respectable as he is, are treated. I have no doubt as to the respectability of that gentleman; but in all cases of that kind where the law is positive the importers are treated alike. As to the seizure of diamonds from Mr. Levi, when the papers are laid before the House, the hon. gentleman will see that where the Minister of the department had discretion in dealing with the case, the decision was of an equitable character. He not only had to pay the duty, but penalties were imposed in addition. I do not desire to go into the facts, because the hon. gentleman will be much better satisfied when he reads all the papers and the decision of the department which contains the reasons for the conclusion arrived at.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec Centre). I do not dispute that the law is as stated by the Minister of Customs; but, if the law is such, it is a very bad law and should be amended as soon as possible. Here we have the cases of two men; in one a seizure occurred from a package, and a very unimportant package, being enclosed in another package and omitted from an invoice, all of which was done in good faith; in the other case it was that of a man who had no invoice, but who concealed goods in his trunk, which goods proved to be of very large value, I am informed not less than \$10,000 or \$12,000 at least. Those precious stones were seized but returned. He was a stranger, and visited Quebec with those stones in his trunk evidently for the pur-

pose of selling them to the trade. I repeat that I do not say the interpretation of the laws laid down by the Minister is incorrect, but I say that it is evidently a very bad law and should be altered.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not admit that the clause is a bad one. It is more moderate now than it was when the hon. gentleman's friends were in power, and when they consolidated the law. I did modify it once. I do not think, in the interests of honest trade, it should be modified again; but it would have been just as well if the hon. gentleman had waited until he had obtained the papers before he expressed the opinion he has given in regard to the diamond seizure. One would be led to the conclusion from his remarks that the two cases were analagous. The diamonds were not brought in as the hon. gentleman has said. I will not now discuss the question, but will simply say that the information he has received is not strictly accurate.

Motion agreed to.

TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE COLONIES.

Mr. MARSHALL moved :

That the establishment of mutually favorable trade relations between Great Britain and her colonies would benefit the agricultural, mining, lumbering and other industries of the latter and would strengthen the Empire by building up its dependencies, and that the Government should ask the other Colonial Governments to join in approaching the Imperial Government with a view to obtaining such an agreement.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, in moving a resolution for the first time in this House, and having taken part in none of the debates or proceedings heretofore, I do not intend to occupy your time for more than a few minutes on this occasion, as I should like to hear hon. members on both sides of this House express their views on this, what I consider a very important question. My object in moving this resolution at this Session is, because I think the time has come when the attention of this House should be drawn to the advisability of extending our trade relations between Great Britain and Canada, whereby the natural products of our country should have preference in the British market to those of foreign nations or other countries other than her colonies. During the recent debate on unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States in this House, it was admitted on all sides that we should seek the British market for our natural products, and that fact has already been established, because there has not been an hon. member on the opposite side of the House, or on this side either, who has not forcibly laid that principle before the House, and spoken in support of it. They have all admitted that the British market is the market which rules the prices of our surplus products and not only of this country but also of the United States, and all the world. Sir, I have been asked by hon. members since making this notice of motion when I intended bringing my Imperial Federation resolution forward. Now, Sir, I want to say for the information of hon. members that I do not belong to the Imperial Federation League myself, nor does my resolution. This subject has been prominently in my mind for some time past, long before I had the honor of occupying a seat in this House, and perhaps more naturally so because being intimately and practically connected with the class of people who would be more directly benefited by such trade relations than any other class of people in Canada, and upon whom I consider, and I think this House considers, by their voices in the past, that upon them depends the welfare and prosperity of this country of ours. That is the farming and agricultural classes, and it is in their interests that I have been prompted to move in the matter, for when they are benefitted or prosperous the country naturally must be also. But, Sir, as a Canadian, I do not propose to go to the mother country hat-in-hand, as the

saying is, to ask a favor of her specially for Canada. I hope while in this House or out of it I will always in my humble way uphold the dignity of Canada. I do not propose to ask England to do anything that would be an injury to herself or her people. What I ask for is a policy of trade relations by which mutual advantages would be secured in the exchange of our natural and manufactured products, and I do not propose, of course, to seek any advantages from England without giving her something in return. The object of the resolution is that we shall have more extended trade relations between Canada and Great Britain, whereby some agreement may be arrived at mutually beneficial to both countries, and secure extended trade relations with our sister colonies. When I propose that Great Britain and Canada, as well as all the colonies, should be more closely connected, I do not expect that Great Britain will concede a special favor to us, nor do I ask it. But I do think that if the mother country makes a concession on behalf of the colonies that they will give her something in return. We must remember that such a policy for the Empire would give our people a market with a population of over 320,000,000 instead of having a market of 60,000,000, as proposed by unrestricted reciprocity with the United States—the people with whom we have principally to compete in the British market. It may be said in answer to this proposition that it is all very well to make a suggestion of this kind, but that England, after adopting her free trade policy for the benefit of her people, will not go back to her old barbarism, or as some people say, of protection, or adopt a protective policy in favor of her colonies. That may be said, but England's relations with her colonies have been very much changed since free trade was first agitated and adopted as the policy of Great Britain. The free trade policy was first agitated in 1838, or about fifty years ago, and let me ask hon. gentlemen what the position of the North American colonies at that time was and what it is now? Take, for instance, our own country. At that time it was almost unknown to England except as a country of forest and snow, and we are in a position to-day that if our great wheat fields of the North-West and Manitoba were under cultivation they alone would supply the British markets with wheat. I should like very much that the Government of the country would take whatever steps may be necessary to bring about such a trade policy, as I do not intend to let this matter rest until some such result has been arrived at. The fact is, that if a protective wall were built around the British Empire she could live independently of the world with the aid of her colonies alone.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, before you declare the motion carried I desire to say a few words in support of it. The motion is very similar in purpose to the one I had the honor of placing upon the Order paper and which I am afraid there will be no opportunity of moving during the present Session. I have given notice that I would move :

"That it would be in the best interests of the Dominion that such changes should be sought for in the trade relations between the United Kingdom and Canada as would give to Canada advantages in the markets of the Mother Country not allowed to Foreign States, Canada being willing for such privileges to discriminate in her markets in favor of Great Britain and Ireland, due regard being had to the policy adopted in 1879 for the purpose of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion, and to the financial necessities of the Dominion."

The motion which my hon. friend has just proposed is one upon somewhat the same lines. At all events it cannot be said that the motion which I have just read is not germane to the general purpose of that resolution. I undertook, Sir, at a public meeting that was held in the city of Toronto, to bring this subject before the House this Session, and I am very glad that I have this opportunity of doing so.

Not that I at all assume that the House is prepared to come to any decision on it this Session, but it is proper, I think, that the matter should be considered, and the arguments—as I believe, the irresistible arguments—in favor of this policy should be known, should be weighed, should be considered. I do not—I may as well disclaim at the outset—I do not at all admit that what we know as the National Policy has been a failure. I do not at all desire to join the band—which is sufficiently large in my view, and perhaps a little too large, on the other side—of those who are always proclaiming, and seem to take a delight in doing so, that the people of this country are in a worse condition than the people of other lands. On the contrary, Sir, I believe that on investigation, the condition of our people will compare favorably with that of any other people who are known to us, or any other people we are brought in contact with; and I think, Sir, it will be found that the policy which we adopted here, and which the country has twice since ratified by a very large vote, has been on the whole beneficial, and that whatever we may be now said to be laboring under is not at all attributable to the policy of protection, or the policy known as the National Policy, but to causes over which we in this Parliament have no more control than the people of Great Britain or the people of the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Flies on the wheel.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman reminds us of remark of the financial critic of the Opposition. I do not know that it is particularly apposite to the point I am making, but, at all events, it is always well to remember that that was the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Whether they have forgotten or would like to forget that policy, and adopt more active measures for the promotion of the interests of the country, it is for them and not for me to say. Now, let me deal with one large class of people in this country—the largest class—the farmers and the farming community. We hear a good deal about the manufacturing industries of the country, and I think we do not, perhaps, hear any more of them than the great importance of those industries demands. I think we all, or the most of us, at all events, are of opinion that if Canada is ever to attain to that position in the councils of the world that we believe she is entitled to, it cannot be by the promotion and fostering of one industry alone, but that the best results are to be obtained by the promotion and fostering of various industries, and the affording of opportunities to the sons of toil and the people in different branches of life. Therefore I do not at all desire to say that the manufacturing industries of this country, and those engaged in them, are not entitled to every consideration. But we cannot and ought not to lose sight of the fact that the largest proportion of the laboring classes and the toiling millions in this country are engaged in tilling the soil; and those people are entitled to have at the hands of this Parliament full consideration of their wants and aspirations, and all that this Parliament can do to afford them the best market for their produce. It is because I think, Sir, that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is exactly in the wrong direction—because I believe the policy which has been announced here on the other side of the House, and so persistently fought for during a large portion of the Session, would not be giving to the farmers of this country that which they demand, a better market, that I ventured to put the notice on the paper to which I have referred, and that I venture here to make some observations in support of that notice. When we are asked to throw open the market of sixty or sixty-five millions of people, and when we are told in general terms that that would be a great boon to the four or five million people in this country, we ought naturally to enquire—and we should be unworthy of our position here if we did not carry our investigation at least that far—what is the market for

Mr. McCARTHY.

our farmers which is sought to be obtained by that policy? Why, Sir, we are competitors in the great market of the world. Our surplus products go to the English market, as do the surplus products, to a very much larger extent, of the people on the other side of the line. They are producers of corn as we are producers of corn; they are producers of cattle as we are; and if we look to the trade returns, of which we have ample store, and which are open to us all, we shall find that the great market for both countries, as for the whole of this continent, is the British market; and if by any means we can obtain in the British market a more favorable return for our products than is permitted to other countries, that certainly would be a wiser policy than, as has several times been said, to send our coals to Newcastle, to send our products to mix with the mass of the products of the United States, where we could not expect to get a better price. Now, let us see whether these few observations, which are merely introductory to what I intend further on to draw the attention of the House to, are not borne out by the statistics which are open to us. Is the Canadian farmer, according to the knowledge we have—and unfortunately that knowledge is confined mainly, if not entirely, to the statistics in the Province of Ontario—any better off to-day than the farmer of the United States? Whether you look at the quantity he produces or at the price he realises, I venture to say that no hon. gentleman can consult the statistics of the United States without being perfectly and clearly satisfied that the farmer of Ontario at all events—and I do not know why the same remark should not apply to other parts of the Dominion—is better off, both as to the quantity he produces and the price he realises, than is the farmer in the United States. Now, Sir, I desire to prove—and I have the statistics here which I think will enable me to prove to the satisfaction of all who desire to realise the true position—that that is the position of the farmers of Canada at this moment. Whether you take, Sir, wheat, or barley, or oats, or rye, or corn even, or hay, or potatoes—taking each and all of these articles, I find that the following may be said to be the net results: In the great article of production in the Province from which I come, an article which in the near future we all hope is to be produced in the great North-West in still greater and ever increasing quantities, it will be found that the average production per acre, as well as the price realised, are in favor of the Ontario farmer, and I believe to the same extent in favor of the farmers in those portions of the Dominion in which those cereals are grown. Now, I have taken the returns of fall wheat for two years; but an examination for a series of years will lead to the same result and perhaps one more favorable to the Canadian farmer. Take fall wheat for the years 1885 and 1886, and I find the net result has been as follows: The average price has been 77½ cents per bushel in the Province of Ontario, and the average product has been 22.4 bushels per acre. During the same period in the United States, the average price was 72.9 instead of 77 cents, and the product 11.4 as compared with 22.4. The net return, therefore, so far as that part of that product is concerned, shows that the yield per acre in the Province of Ontario has been 9.17 in favor of the Canadian as compared with the American farmer. That result alone, if it is borne out by reference to the other figures which I propose to give, ought not to dishearten us, but ought to rather encourage us, and to show that we are not, as my hon. friends opposite so often preach, going to ruin. Take barley, the price of barley during these two years in Ontario averaged—hon. gentlemen will understand that the average includes the barley not quite sufficiently good for export or for use by brewers and also that which is fit for export and fit for use by our domestic manufacturers—53.2 cents and the average product 27.1. On the other side of the line the average price was 56

cents, but the average product was only 22; and the difference, again in favor of the Ontario farmer, is \$2.11 per acre. So in oats, the difference is \$3.70 per acre, the quantity grown in Ontario being an average of 36 bushels per acre compared with 26.55 bushels on the other side of the line; and the price in Ontario being 31.7 as against 25.33 on the other side of the line. Therefore, both in quantity and in price, the average is in favor of the home farmer. In rye, the product is not very large in either country; but such as it is, the quantity with us is 16.2 bushels per acre as compared with 12 on the other side, or 25 per cent. more in our favor, and the price with us is 53.7 cents while that on the other side is 57.9 cents, showing upon the whole a result favorable to us to the extent of \$1.80 per acre compared with the other side. I cannot make any comparison with regard to peas, because they do not appear to be grown to any considerable extent on the other side. I do not find them in the report of the Commissioner of Agriculture, but the result appears to be reasonably satisfactory, so far as our farmers are concerned, \$12.28 per acre. Take in corn, of course our product is not very large. It is confined, so far as I know, to that part of Ontario which is in the neighborhood of the Detroit river, but our product is 66½ bushels per acre to 24 on the other side; and the price 27 cents on our side against 24 on the other side, the result being favorable to our farmers to the extent of \$10 per acre. Now, hay is grown on both sides; and although the Americans import hay from us and pay the duty, their importation is but for local purposes. Taking the general result, I find that the price during these two years in Ontario averaged \$9.77 a ton and on the other side averaged \$8.71 a ton, showing a difference in favor of the Canadians of \$1.06 per ton; and the product was 1.39 in Canada compared with 1.02 on the other side, the net result being \$3.13 in favor of the Canadian side. Take potatoes, this is the original home of the potatoes.

Mr. CASEY. No, that is in Ireland.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, that is a mistake of my hon. friend. The home of the potato is here, and it shows this result: The price during the two years was 42 cents in Ontario, and on the other side, 41.7 per bushel. And the average product here 123 bushels to the acre compared with 77 bushels on the other side, the difference in value in our favor being the enormous sum per acre of \$24.40. So, whatever article you take that we grow and compare it with a similar article on the other side of the line, the conclusion is inevitable that the value to the farmer of his labor is greater on this side than it is on the other. It may well be said that I am comparing one particular province, perhaps the richest part of the Dominion, with the whole of the United States, and that the comparison in that respect is not fair. I understand perfectly well that my argument is open to that objection, and the objection is so obvious that it has occurred to my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) as well as the others. But surely those hon. gentlemen will not say it is an unfair comparison to compare Ontario with Michigan or with the State of New York. I invite a comparison between these two neighboring States and Ontario, and I maintain it will be found, although not so largely in our favor as the total result by the figures I have already given would indicate, that the result is in favor of the Canadian farmer. Take, for instance, wheat, the value in Ontario as I have already said per acre is \$20. In Michigan it is \$16.17, and in the State of New York \$14.76. Rye, \$8.96 in Ontario, \$6.67 in Michigan, \$7.37 in New York. Oats \$11.7 in Ontario, \$9.91 in Michigan, \$10.05 in New York. Barley \$15.27 in Ontario, \$13.98 in Michigan, \$15.62 in New York. Potatoes \$54.27 in Ontario, \$29.58 in Michigan, \$25.20 in New York. Hay \$14.42 in Ontario, \$12.85 in Michigan, \$13.39 in

New York, Corn \$17.86 in Ontario, \$11.00 in Michigan, \$17. in New York. In fact, there is not a single article for the year 1885, of which the value to the farmer was not greater in the Province of Ontario than it was in the neighboring States, according to the returns of Michigan and New York. I think that this is a satisfactory reason why I should not stand here representing an agricultural constituency, and pretend to think or to urge that our farmers are going to ruin as compared with those who occupy the same position on the other side of the line. I think it is also a reason why I should not accept the policy which has been enunciated on the other side of the House, and in regard to which we are told that they have nailed their colors to the mast, which they are prepared to stand and fall by; and it affords an argument why I shall be found voting, as I trust I ever shall be found voting, against that policy. But I admit, while that is so, that if this House by any policy can improve the condition of the farmer, it is the bounden duty of this House to do so. I think, therefore, that, while I am not opposed in any sense or form to the policy that I have hitherto supported, while I am prepared to accept that policy with all its consequences, at the same time if it can be shown to us that we have yet another means which is quite consistent with that policy which we have adopted, and consistent with the protection which we have given to our infant manufactures, by which we can benefit our farmers, we are bound to adopt that means; we owe everything to the great producing people of this country, and we are bound to give effect to such a policy. Therefore it is that I have ventured to propound the policy which I have mentioned, and which is expounded very largely, if not even more widely, in the resolution which is now before the Chair. Undoubtedly, while the comparison, so far, is in favor of the Canadian farmer with the American farmer, while it is still more largely in his favor as compared with the English farmer, who, according to statistics, is on the high road to ruin, still we cannot forget or ignore the fact that the price of the cereals, which are the chief articles of export from this country, has been for some years past, and appears still to be, getting lower and lower, so that the farmer does not get now for his product, although he gets more than his neighbor, as much as he did obtain some years ago, and particularly in the product of wheat. On the contrary, that article has been falling in the market so enormously that I will just mention one set of figures as showing the result of that falling off, which must strike us as being of great significance. The export from the United States of wheat and wheat flour alone in 1837, as compared with what it was five years before, has increased to an enormous extent, I think to the extent of over \$5,000,000 costs. The cost to the English consumer is no less than £5,000,000 sterling less than it was five years ago. They have purchased from the American farmer wheat and wheat flour to the extent of \$5,000,000 cost more than they did at the period which I have mentioned at a cost of £5,000,000 sterling less. Nothing can more illustrate the down grade which this great article of production on this continent has been taken in late years than that. Therefore it behoves us to take into consideration the question whether we might not restore to the farmer the market he has lost in consequence of the enormous competition on the other side of the line.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McCARTHY. Before entering on the next branch of the subject, I desire to disclaim all hostility to the great American Republic. The motion which I have mentioned, and the views I propose to state, are not grounded at all upon any desire to create feelings of hostility between this

country and the neighboring Republic; but I believe that we ought to do here what they appear always to have done there, to make our trade relations with reference to our interests and the interests of the people we represent, without regard to the interests of that neighboring nation. I think we will best fulfil our duty if we endeavor, no matter what the subject may be in connection with trade, to put it in the best possible shape for the people of Canada, without having too much regard to the Acts, the policy, the possibilities, the expectations which we may have from a conciliatory policy on the part of the people on the other side of the line. Perhaps in the past we have all been looking too much to Washington. Certainly we have been expecting more than we have ever obtained from them, and I think we are strong enough and able enough, and I think we will do better, to deal with great trade questions solely in regard to the wishes and wants of our own people, without regard to the policy which is pursued on the other side of the line. Now, we cannot, of course, discuss this question without making some reference to the alternative proposition which has been made this session, and although I have no right, and I do not propose at all to transgress the rule, to make any reference in particular to the discussion which took place on that subject, nevertheless, the two policies are virtually antagonistic. Unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, which it is admitted, involves the rearrangement of our tariff, not to suit our own wants, not to suit our own interest, but in order to prevent goods being imported through Canada, and thereby reaching the neighboring Republic. That seems to be practically and honestly conceded. Then it appears to me that after all, call it what you will, unrestricted reciprocity is but commercial union thinly veiled; because, whether we are to make, by a joint arrangement, our tariff, which, in point of fact, would be having our tariff made for us by the people on the other side; or whether we are to make our tariff according to their wishes, and to bind ourselves to retain that tariff for a certain definite number of years, as in the event of a reciprocity treaty; whether we are to collect our revenue into one fund and distribute it *per capita*, or in any other way that may be agreed upon, or to collect the revenue coming into this country and to allow them to collect their revenue—all these, in the long run, amount to one and the same thing; and, as I say, I believe it is commercial union thinly veiled. Now that involves, Sir, as an immediate consequence, the disruption of the trade relations which exist between this and the mother country. It would cause us to say to the people of Great Britain: True it is, you have given us an open market; we have for years sent you our goods on free and equal terms, but the country to the south of us, which has denied us an open market, which has imposed a high rate of tariff upon our goods, which has done all that tariff regulations could do in order to impede our trade and to build themselves up at our expense,—because of that very policy, we are now prepared to take them to our bosom and to turn our backs upon the old mother land. Now, not merely is that so, but it is a fact that cannot be denied, that the great bulk of our trade has been, and is, and is still more largely likely to be with Great Britain, than with the United States,—I speak more particularly of that portion of our products which the farmers have to export, the export of agriculture in the broadest sense of that term. Let me just go over, very briefly, a few figures upon that subject. For the last five years I find that our exports to Great Britain—I do not take five years because it brings out any special result; I believe the same result will be found for any other period that may be selected—but I will take the five years from 1883 to 1887, and I find the amount of our agricultural products exported to the mother country amounted to \$114,457,541 odd, or an average of nearly \$23,000,000 for the five years. During the

Mr. McCARTHY.

same period our exports of the same products to the United States amounted to the sum of \$78,302,984, or an average of of something over \$15,500,000 per annum. I do not wish to trouble the House with the exact figures; the general result is quite sufficient for the purpose of my argument. Now, then, the total of these exports of agricultural products for that period came to the large sum of \$192,000,000; or in the ratio of 23 to Great Britain, and 15½ to the United States. When we examine, for that period, the proportions we must be more convinced that our trade is growing with one country while it is falling off with the other—if not falling off, it is certainly not increasing. In 1883, the ratio was 22½ to 18½; in 1884, 20 to 18½; in 1885, 23·4 to 15; in 1886, 22½ to 15½; in the last year of which we have returns, 25·7 to 15·2, the largest export of any year, and the largest proportion to Great Britain. Now, it would be a policy of madness, as it appears to me, if we, at this stage, should say to the people of Great Britain, who are the great purchasers of our goods, we propose to increase our tariff in such a way that not only goods cannot come in here intended for the United States, but that the large imports which we are now taking from you, must be very greatly diminished, because the result of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, would be that, to a large extent, these goods would be purchased from the neighboring Republic. That course, I say, is not unattended with danger in a commercial sense; that course would be followed, I believe, very promptly, by scheduling Canada, and preventing us from doing that which we have hitherto done—try to export cattle alive to the mother country. No greater blow could be struck at the prosperity of the farmer, in my humble judgment, if that growing industry—because it is a growing industry, one which has attained enormous proportions within recent years—nothing could give us so fatal a stab as that the English people should place Canada on the schedule, and put us in the same position, in that regard, as the United States. We all know the trouble that our High Commissioner, the present Minister of Finance, had in England not many years ago, to prevent that untoward result. We all know the jealousy of the hard-run English and Irish farmer against importations of cattle from a colony like Canada, that does not give any advantages whatever to Britain in her markets; but if we were to raise our tariff, no one can pretend with any show of reason that the English people would not be perfectly justified in scheduling us, and treating us, in that sense, as a hostile people, so far as tariff relations are concerned. Not only would that be so, but if we do not deal with them, if we do not purchase from them, we cannot ship our goods to them with advantage. The very ships that now go there to carry our wheat, come back laden with their goods. But destroy our trade with them, and we would see repeated the complaint made in respect to the Maritime Province vessels that go to Boston without any return cargo. That itself would tend to drive our grain and our produce away from the ports of Montreal and Halifax, where we have been spending money and doing all we can, with the highest patriotic efforts, in order to build up those ports and these sea-ways, for it would be driving our goods away towards the ports of the United States. So, whatever way it is looked at, it appears to me it is a policy that must be attended with the greatest disadvantages to this country. Now, what is our position in the English market? It is said we have got all we can possibly get there; we have got absolute free trade, full and free right to take our goods in there. We get that just as all other countries in the world get it, not because we are a colony, not because we are a British possession, but because it is the policy of that country to receive goods on those terms from all parts of the world, so that they may buy in the cheapest market, even although they may not be able,

possibly, to sell in the dearest, and if that is true, if that be the unalterable policy of that country, then there might be some justification for the argument used on the other side of the House; although, Sir, it does appear to me that if nations are to deal in the same way that people deal with one another, it is a strange way of showing our gratitude for all that has been done for this country in the past, by the open market that has been given to us, to take the first opportunity of building up a country to the south of us which has denied us that market in every possible way. Why, Sir, to me it is most astonishing that the free traders in this House, those who have preached free trade so long in this country, should propose this as the culmination of their policy, that the country which has denied us free trade, which has built itself up by protection, is to reap a reward from this country, which my hon. friends opposite have all along contended should have adopted free trade. I fancy that gentlemen on the other side of the line, the great statesmen who inaugurated the policy of protection, would if they lived to see this day have reason indeed to be proud of their policy and of its results. They would be able to say: Here is part of the British Empire, a part of that great country which has nailed its colors to the mast, so far as free trade is concerned, and we are a country which has adopted the opposite policy of protection. That policy of protection, of building up our own manufactures, making and creating a market for our home industries, has been attended with such marvellous results that Canada is knocking at our door, desirous of obtaining the great advantages of the protective country, and is willing to give terms to the United States that she denies to Great Britain. I do not think it is possible, in any event, that so disastrous a policy as that is likely to prevail. But I am prepared to establish that we have a market in England for everything we produce, that no matter what may happen that market is open to us, and I think I shall be able to satisfy this House that there is good ground to believe and strong ground to hope that there is a party in England which favors the giving of advantages in the English market to the colonies, and that this opinion will before very long prevail. Hon. gentlemen may say that it is an impossibility. Hon. gentlemen may say: What evidence have you of such a result? In the first place, let me point out what the result would be. I have given the figures of our exports of farm produce to England for the past five years. I ask this House, is there any member in it prepared to vote against the proposition that will give to us a preference in the English market of 10 per cent. or any other percentage, no matter how small, upon the agricultural products of this country? Is any person prepared to say that that would not be a policy advantageous to the people of Canada? I see my hon. friend who is distinguished of course as a free trader (Mr. Gillmor) laughs at the very notion that the English people would do such a suicidal act, in his judgment; but, if he will pardon me, I will come back to that point afterwards, and I will simply say now that there is a strong probability, I will venture to say there is more than a strong probability, that as regards breadstuffs Great Britain will be obliged to come to that point. I am at present dealing with the question whether it would be advantageous for us, if there is such a party there, if there is a party in England prepared to offer to the colonies—and this is England's greatest colony—advantages in her market which they would not afford to foreigners, a percentage obtained by placing a duty against foreign products, thereby giving a substantial advantage in her markets to Canada as well as to other parts of the Empire? I want to know if there is any person prepared to say that that policy would not be an advantage to the people of this country? Why, take these very \$25,000,000. Ten per cent. on that would be an advantage to our farmers of \$2,500,000 more in addition to \$25,000,000 already received. It would mean

a very considerable sum per bushel to every farmer who produces any portion of the produce exported from this country; and whatever may be said about the other part of the question, I do not think any hon. gentleman will deny that that at all events would be an advantage which we ought to be prepared to accept.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) What about the manufacturers?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will give an answer to the hon. gentleman, although I propose to deal with that branch of the question a little later. I admit, and my resolution suggests it, and it is a point that has not been lost sight of by gentlemen who favor the policy, that manufacturers must be to a certain extent protected, and to a certain extent they must surrender in favor of the great farming population the extreme protection they possess at this moment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will deal with that point in a few moments when I come to discuss that branch of the subject. We need not doubt that there is a market in England for all our products. When I say so I am aware that hon. members know perfectly well that England to-day is importing from the United States 60 per cent. of her breadstuffs, 15 per cent. coming from India and but a very small proportion indeed from the remaining part of the Empire. There is no question but that there is an ample field for all we can raise, or hope to raise, in this country for the next thirty years in the English market. The same remark applies to horned cattle, to cheese, to everything we have to export, even to barley, which we send to the other side of the line; there is not an article that our farmers have to export and which the country has to dispose of for which there is not an ample market in England, and that market can be obtained by excluding, in the differential manner I have mentioned, the exports of foreign countries. Who is in favor of this policy on the other side? I have been at some pains to follow the discussion, and the thought, in this particular and most interesting branch of politics to Canadians, because whatever else may be said of it I think we all must agree that if there is any large party in England willing to adopt that policy we should stretch out the right hand of fellowship to that party, and do all that is possible to support and strengthen it. In 1879 the subject of fair trade, as it was known, was first broached, and the first discussion took place in the press and on platforms, and in 1881 an organisation was formed. I will read the principles, or what we would call the platform of that organisation, showing as it does that, from the earliest time, the fair traders were in favor of giving advantages to Canada and the other colonies of the Empire in the markets of Great Britain. The first article of the platform was with respect to the formation of commercial treaties. It was suggested and urged at that time, and perhaps not improperly so, that some of the commercial treaties Great Britain had made would prevent her giving better terms to her own dependencies than she was prepared to give to other countries with which she had made commercial treaties. The first article of the platform was in opposition to that policy, and for the discontinuance of it in the future. The second article of the platform was this:

"Imports of raw materials for home industries free from every quarter in order that we may compete successfully in the sales of our manufactures."

The third article was that import duties should be placed upon the manufacturers of foreign states refusing to receive our manufactures into their markets free or on a fair exchange, and article four, the one with which we were more immediately concerned, is as follows:—

"A moderate duty to be levied on articles of food from foreign countries, the same being admitted free from all parts of our Empire, in order:

"1. To develop the resources of our own Empire, and to determine the flow of British capital, skill, and industry, henceforth into our own dominions, instead of into protective foreign states where it becomes a force commercially hostile to us.

"2. Thus to transfer the great fruit growing industries which we employ from protective foreign nations, where tariff restrictions contract our export trade and diminish its value, to our own colonies and dependencies; where, even now, without such preferential treatment, our labor products are in increasing demand, and are taken per head of the populations, in far greater proportion than those foreign states to which our food custom is now chiefly given."

That was the policy laid down by an organisation known as the Fair Trade League. That league is still in existence, and before I am done I shall be able to show hon. gentlemen that the principles of the league have been adopted by the party that now rules in Great Britain. But there are some words to which, with the consent of the House, I venture to draw attention, written by one of the distinguished members of that league—a gentleman who occupied so high a position that he was afterwards appointed one of the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade—Mr. W. Farrar Ecroyd, of Bradford. He wrote on this subject, and his letters were afterwards circulated in pamphlet form, and to those letters I appeal for a full statement of the case. So full and so convincing is the statement that I venture to say no man can read them without feeling satisfied that the day of the triumph of the policy which he is in favor cannot be very long delayed. He divided the position of England into three periods and he said:

"1. A period of almost unbounded prosperity, during which the nations from whom we purchased our supplies of food and raw materials, not having the means as yet of manufacturing for themselves, must, of necessity, take our productions in exchange. During this period, any protective duties they might levy would not affect us, and would only enhance the cost for themselves.

"2. Transition. During which these nations, gradually increasing their own manufactures under the shelter of protective duties, should become more and more independent of ours; yet during which the increased prosperity of our home trade and the growth of markets in semi-civilised lands should suffice to maintain our prosperity.

"3. A period of contradiction and difficulty, when—being obliged to import half the food of a dense and delicately organised population—we should find the nations excluding by hostile tariffs those products of our industry which are all we have to offer in exchange in the long run."

Now, look at the trade returns, and see if this gentleman's statement of the position is not accurate? How has the course of trade been in England? Why, Sir, the exports from 1871 to 1885 to foreign countries, mainly, although not altogether, protective countries, have decreased from £171,000,000 to £135,000,000. The exports from England to the United States, notwithstanding the enormous increase of the population of that great country, have decreased from £34,000,000 in 1871 to £21,000,000, or nearly £22,000,000 in 1885. The exports to Germany during the same period have decreased from £27,000,000 to £16,000,000. The writer pointedly asks, and the argument is irresistible, and I venture to say it is unanswerable: If such is the result of protection in those countries—and I could have added France to the number—that we cannot trade with them, that they built up by their protective policy industries in their own land, so that they ceased to buy from us, what will happen in England if Japan, China, Turkey and other countries, where there is no protective policy should adopt the same system and establish the same industries in their midst? That is the view that is presented by this gentleman, who is not merely a free trader but who is also a manufacturer. It is impossible to have regard for what we know is going on in the world without seeing that the United States with its 65,000,000 of people is now practically doing nearly all its own manufacturing.

Mr. MULOCK. How much did they export last year from Great Britain?

Mr. McCARTHY.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not give last year, but in 1885 it was twenty odd millions.

Mr. MULOCK. Pounds sterling?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. Compare that with £34,000,000 in 1871, and compare the population in 1871 with the population in 1885, and see how enormous the decrease *per capita* has been. Now that is not all. That is not the only force that is at work. The agricultural industry in England is absolutely in a state of bankruptcy, and I do not think that language is too strong to describe it; I do not think it is too much to say that, when I point out the enormous loss the agriculturists have been sustaining, and I take the authority of Sir James Caird. In that gentleman's evidence before the Commission on the Depression of Trade, he puts the annual loss of the farming community at no less than the enormous sum of forty-two millions and odd pounds sterling. Then look at the enormous quantity of land in England that yearly passes out of cultivation. Take grain growing as an illustration of that, and let me give you the figures. From 1870 to 1886, in 16 years, the difference in the quantity of land in Great Britain which formerly was used for the cultivation of grain had fallen from 11,803,000 acres to 9,851,000 acres, or nearly 2,000,000 acres, a decrease of 16 per cent. It is shown by statistics also that although the population is largely increasing the number of people engaged in agricultural pursuits is very largely diminishing. Those people either emigrate or go to the towns and what is the result? Let us take the manufacturer. He is denied his home market to the farmer, who was his largest customer, and the former purchaser, who is in beggary instead of being in affluence, can buy no more. The agricultural laborers are driven from the country to compete with the artisan and the mechanic in the town, and so the manufacturer and artisan and the mechanic have this two-fold reason for supporting the policy which I am speaking of. First, the increase of his home and local market, and secondly, a desire that the competition from the countryman should be withdrawn to his more natural pursuits of agriculture. Those economic forces, appear to me, must before very long prevail. But I am not driven merely to rely upon that argument, although I think very great importance is to be attached to it. Whatever politicians may hold, we know they pass away, but the arguments and reasons which induce great changes of public opinion remain, and I say these causes inevitably tend to England doing something in order to get a market for herself, instead of importing enormously from protective countries which every year take less and less from England in exchange. Now, let me draw attention to the report—the minority report it is true, but still a report of very able men: upon this subject on the Commission of enquiry into the Depression of Trade, and the reasons they give and the remedies they propose for it. The gentlemen whose minority report I propose to read an extract or two from, are Lord Dunraven, Mr. W. Farrar Ecroyd, Mr. P. Albert Muntz and Mr. Nevile Hubbock, men of distinction in the various walks of life. Let us see what they recommend. They say:

"For though we may be unable to alter the protectionist policy of other nations, we can do much to free ourselves from its injurious effects. The more we can draw our supplies of imported food from countries which will largely and under moderate tariff rates, accept the products of our industries in exchange, the fuller and the steadier will be the employment of our population.

"Our command of the fiscal arrangements of India has saved the industry of Lancashire from the calamity which must have overwhelmed it, had the great Empire come under the control of a commercial policy like that of Russia and the United States. And the growth of our colonies, with their very large consumption per head of British manufactures, has helped on our industries to endure with less suffering the stifling pressure of foreign tariffs.

"But these aids, though welcome, are insufficient. It is a striking fact that during the past twenty years 67 per cent. of our emigrants have gone to the United States and only 27½ per cent. to our own colo-

nies. The more extreme protectionist policy of the United States, so far from repelling the emigrants has operated as an effectual bribe to both capital and labor, by holding out the inducements of higher prices and higher wages.

"It would be an act of suicidal folly on our part to attempt to counterwork these influences by a like system of enormous import duties, designed to raise the price of commodities for the advantage of home producers. We have a far better and more effectual remedy at command. A slightly preferential treatment of the food products of India and the colonies over those of foreign nations, would if adopted as a permanent system, gradually but certainly direct the flow of food-growing capital and labor more towards our own dependencies and less towards the United States than heretofore."

Mr. CASEY. What is the book you are reading from?

Mr. McCARTHY. The report of the Commission on the Depression of Trade.

"When it is noted that in the year 1884 the Australian colonies, with only 3,100,000 inhabitants, purchased £13,895,853 worth of our manufactures, whilst the United States with about 55,000,000 inhabitants, purchased only £24,424,636 worth, it will be apparent how great would be the effect of a policy which should lead to the more rapid peopling of the Australian colonies, in giving fuller employment to our working classes at home, and thus increasing the healthful activity of the home trade, as well as the import of raw materials for our various industries to operate upon.

"We believe that specific duties, equal to about 10 per cent. on a low range of values, imposed upon the import from foreign countries of those articles of food which India and the colonies are well able to produce, would sufficiently effect this purpose. Their adoption would, of course, involve the abolition of the heavy duties on tea, coffee, cocoa and dried fruits which are now levied on Indian and colonial equally with foreign produce. It would widen the basis of our revenue, and render us less dependent upon the sustained productiveness of the income tax and the duties upon intoxicating liquors. And, what is even more important, it could not fail to draw closer all portions of the Empire in the bond of mutual interests, and thus pave the way towards a more effective union for great common objects."

Here in this formal document is the proposition to put 10 per cent. duty on all breadstuffs imported from foreign countries; and, Sir, it is the recognised policy, the clear and well-understood policy of the party of which these gentlemen were the representatives that that duty, or some equivalent duty, should be placed on breadstuffs in order to attain the ends which they seek to accomplish, and of the means they themselves propose. Now, Sir, let us understand what that would be to us. Let us take it in a simple form and work it out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman say what party has declared that as its policy?

Mr. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will tell him before I take my seat, but I thought the hon. gentleman having such a wide knowledge of financial matters would not require to come to me for information on that subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because I know that it has been disavowed by the leaders of both parties in England.

Mr. McCARTHY. However, I will give the hon. gentleman the information, and add to his stock of knowledge. Let us see what the effect of that policy would be on the consumer, because I am reasoning the question from his standpoint. It needs no argument to show that it would be of advantage to us; what I want to show is, that it is a policy which must recommend itself in the near future to the English people, and what I want this House to do, if not to-night, at some near day, is to let the party who are advocating it know that we are in accord with them, and ready to do whatever we can to induce the Canadian people to join hands with them. Now, I have worked out, as an illustration, the effect of this policy on the food supply of England, which is, perhaps, after all the most unpopular way in which it can be presented to a British audience. Much has been heard there in days gone by of the large loaf and the small loaf; but when we know that during the years of England's greatest prosperity the price of wheat was 5s. to 5s. a quarter, and that to-day—or on February 8,

by the last returns I could obtain—it was 30s. 4d. a quarter, I think hon. gentlemen must see that a small specific or *ad valorem* duty on wheat would not press heavily on the resources of the working classes of Great Britain. If they could prosper with wheat at 50s. a quarter, I fail to know in what way their circumstances have changed so as to prevent them paying 36s. or 38s., which, perhaps, a small duty on wheat would compel them to pay, but would be more than returned to them in the increased prosperity of their own farmers, the revival of their industries, and the enlarged commerce of their colonies. England's consumption of breadstuffs amounts to 231,000,000 bushels of wheat and flour. Of that quantity Great Britain herself produced something in the neighborhood of 79,000,000 bushels, while from the British Possessions 36,000,000 bushels were imported; in other words, Great Britain and her colonies produce about 50 per cent. of her food supply. Now, put upon that, if you please, a specific duty of a shilling a bushel, and what is the immediate result? That would bring in a revenue from foreign wheat of nearly £3,000,000. The revenue obtained from foreign wheat would supply the place of the revenue now obtained from the duties on tea, coffee chicory and the like, and dried fruits. They would be merely receiving that revenue from one article of food that largely enters into the consumption of the people, while they could relieve the people of the duty on the article of tea, which I suppose also enters very largely into general consumption. But, Sir, that is not all that it would do. It would raise the price for us of the wheat we send, and would also raise the price to the English farmer of the wheat he grows. How much it would do that is not, perhaps, a matter on which we shall be able to agree; but I put it—and I do not suppose it will be deemed too much—at 9d. a bushel, three-fourths of the duty. Suppose it would be a shilling, my argument would still be sound; but call it 9d., and what is the result? The result is that you would have an increased cost to the consumer altogether of £9,000,000, which would be the difference in the price of wheat between 30s. 4d. and 36s. 4d. a quarter, which would be still much lower than was the price in the best days of England's prosperity. To us it would mean a difference of 25 cents a bushel; to the English farmer a difference of a shilling or at least 9d. a bushel, as the case may be; to the British consumer it would mean half of that spread over the whole of the breadstuffs, because he would be relieved of the tax on tea, which he could afford to apply on the increased cost of his grain. Now, I was pleased to find that this illustration was backed up by a gentleman to whom I have already referred, Mr. W. Farrar Ercroyd, who puts it in this way:

"To effect our purpose it would, I think, be needful to impose specific duties on foreign food products, equal to about 10 per cent. on a low range of values, and to maintain them steadfastly until our own dependencies should be able to supply our wants; save only, that in the event of a bad harvest and high prices, the duty on corn, not being maintained for revenue purposes, could easily be suspended for a year. I will not encumber my letter with a long array of figures, but after a careful study of our average imports of food products from foreign countries, I find that a duty of 10 per cent. on them would amount to about £14,500,000. From this must be deducted £4,500,000 which would be remitted by reducing to 10 per cent. the existing duties on foreign tea, coffee, cocoa, dried fruits, &c., and by admitting these articles duty free from English dependencies. To the balance of £9,000,000, I add £1,600,000, to cover the charges and profits of distributors on the increased cost; this brings the sum to £9,600,000. We have next to consider the effect of the duties in raising the price of some of these articles which are also grown at home; this is a complicated question, because it is not easy to estimate the proportion of loss which would fall upon the foreign grower, just as Bradford mill owners and workmen too well know that they now endure a portion of the burden of these foreign tariffs which press upon their goods and render their toil and trade so unprofitable. I take the amount, however, at £7,500,000 after much research,—thus bringing the total up to £17,100,000; of which sum it is evident that £3,000,000 being new revenue, would at once enable us to lighten the existing burden of taxation to an equal amount. This would leave £9,700,000 as the net additional cost to consumers; of which £7,500,000 would go to relieve our depressed and harassed agriculturists of the remaining £1,800,000 to increase the in-

terests and profits of wholesale and retail distributors, should competition permit them to charge it to us. Now our present population is about 35,000,000, or 7,000,000 families at 5 persons each, amongst whom to divide the added cost of £9,100,000. This would give 26s. per annum, or 6d. per week as the charge on each family; surely a very moderate price to pay for benefits so great and enduring as those which have been described."

I think I have shown so far that this matter is gaining ground in England; and now I will answer the question and point out the party that has adopted, as a party, to-day the fair trade policy, which was laid down in 1881 and has been fought for ever since, and which was adopted by a large minority of the report on the depression of trade. We find at the meeting of the great Conservative party in Oxford last November, attended by representatives from all parts of England, that a resolution in favor of fair trade was adopted by the enormous majority of 1,000 to 11. The great party of England, because it is the great party of England to-day—leaving Ireland out of the question—the Conservative party, has a majority of about 90 representatives, so far as Great Britain alone is concerned. It is the great party of England, and upon this question of protection, I venture to say the Irish representatives would not be found opposed to the majority of English representatives. There is no country in the world where protection to the farming industry is more required than it is in the Green Isle; and on that policy, when the day comes for a new party, when the day comes for a new policy and for new issues, I venture to say that the Irish representatives will be found at the back of the majority of English representatives on this great question. Here is the resolution which I beg to read for the information more especially of the hon. member for South Oxford.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I have read it a dozen times and know it is disallowed by Lord Salisbury, it is no use to read it again.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will deal with Lord Salisbury's position presently.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt you will.

Mr. McCARTHY. The resolution is as follows :—

"Resolved that the continued depression in trade and agriculture renders speedy reform in the policy of the United Kingdom as regards foreign imports and the influx of indigent foreigners a matter of vital necessity to the people of Great Britain and Ireland."

That platform, only last November, was, at what we would call a convention, a convention of the whole Conservative party of England, adopted by the enormous majority of 1,000 to 11; and that policy is now the accepted policy of the Conservative party of England. I want to know whether that is not encouragement for us to adopt a corresponding resolution in this House; I want to know whether any representative here of any agricultural constituency can go back to his constituents and say: The great party in Great Britain offers to us differential terms in their market, and that party has accepted this policy as their platform, but we have refused in the Canadian House of Commons to take advantage of the offer they have made. I do not think there is one member from an agricultural constituency or from any other constituency in this House who can refuse to, at all events, hear what the results of that offer may be. Now, as to Lord Salisbury, he came down to Oxford. He was not present at the meeting, but he was received by that convention and addressed them; and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is perfectly right in saying that Lord Salisbury did not, by word, say anything in favor of this resolution. On the contrary, Lord Salisbury, with a good deal of circumlocution, gave it the go-by. He intimated that in times past his party and the Liberal Unionists had held different views. He intimated that these two parties were now united for a specific object, and that their purpose gained, their interests

Mr. McCARTHY.

could again differ; but for the present—and a practical statesman is concerned for the present,—he, the leader of the Government, composed not merely of Conservatives but of Conservatives and Liberal Unionists—a government formed for the express purpose of preventing the policy of separation, as propounded by Mr. Gladstone, being adopted—had, as his first duty to his party and policy, to see that no disturbing influence or question should be allowed to interfere with that union until the great end and aim of the union between the Conservatives and the Liberal Unionists was attained. Well, I can understand that. I can understand that it would have been suicidal on the part of the leader of the present Government to have introduced a bone of contention into his present policy. Remember that he has the support of Mr. John Bright in his present policy. Remember that Mr. Bright always has been a great free trader and will remain a free trader to the end of his term. Remember that Mr. Bright could not support a government, even perhaps to prevent the separation or division of the Empire, contrary to his opinion on free trade. But the men of this generation, the men who compose the party, the men who wield the strength of the party, because, after all, even the hon. gentleman, a kind of sub leader on the other side, I venture to say, does not direct all the policy of his party, for the great body of gentlemen who sit behind him have something to say in the formation of that policy, and so I believe have we on this side—the men I say, who form the body of the great Conservative party of England—have something to say in the formation of its policy, and when these men, when the great Conservative party of England have adopted as their policy this policy of fair trade, it must in the near future prevail.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They had a vote on that in the House of Commons.

Mr. McCARTHY. No doubt, but that party were just as much bound to sustain the Government in their present policy as is Lord Salisbury. But the policy of fair trade has been announced, and I am merely giving the course of events which have led to that conclusion and which is convincing that the policy must be successful. Either England, as a great manufacturing country, must fall from her great estate, either England, as a great manufacturing country, must cease to hold her own in competition with foreign countries, or she must adopt some policy of the kind I have intimated, of drawing her supplies of breadstuffs from her own people and creating an intercolonial trade, so to speak, by gathering in all her colonies and dependencies, just as we have gathered in all the colonies and dependencies from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Is there anything to fear from the adoption of this policy? I dare say there are amongst us gentlemen who may feel that, if we adopt any such policy as this, we will raise feelings of hostility, that is to say, that we will be embarrassed in our trade relations with the United States. For my part, I utterly disbelieve in the possibility of the United States doing more than the United States has already done to injure us in trade matters, or, in other words, to advance her own interests. Her policy has been consistent. It has been said, perhaps not correctly, that it was Mr. Seward's policy, after the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, to drive us into annexation, to compel us by hostile tariffs to sue for annexation. If any such idea entered into the mind of any United States statesman, I think the results since that date must have shown the difficulties with which they had to deal. Take our products which they import. Take for instance our barley. There is a duty of 10 cents a bushel on that. If they were to make it 15 cents, does anyone suppose that we would send one bushel less to the United States?

Mr. MULOCK. Who pays the duty?

Mr. McCARTHY. The American brewer buys our barley because he must have it, because, great as that country is as an agricultural country, it cannot produce the barley which he requires in order to make his beer, and the American brewer, as he bought our barley in times gone by, so he buys it now, and pays that duty in order to obtain our barley. I throw out a hint to some of the moneyed men on the other side of the House. They could make a corner in barley if they were to buy up all our barley, and they could make the American brewer pay whatever they liked to ask for it. England is a great importer of barley. She imports a large quantity of barley from Russia. Why should she not import from Canada? Will anyone say that our barley is not as good as the barley from Russia? I may be told that the barley which is produced in England is better for the manufacture of their heavy beer than any barley which we produce here. That may be so, but does anyone suppose that the barley which they obtain from Russia is better than ours?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). She gets it cheaper.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not so cheap. Look at the trade returns, and you will see that the declared value of Russian wheat in England is 77 cents per bushel. Of course that includes freight, that is the price delivered in England, but that is not so remarkably cheap. I say that, if we had a preferential market there, if 10 per cent. were to be put on Russian barley, we would have a market there for Canadian barley. I think I may say that the reason why we have not a market in England for our barley is that the Americans are always prepared to go one better than the English offer; and, of course, when they go one better, it is to our interest to send our barley there; and everyone who knows anything about brewing knows that whether the price is 10 cents or 15 cents different is only a small matter. Then I will come to another article, that of horses. They tax our horses pretty heavily. The tax I know has been lowered, but has it been lowered to suit Canada or to protect the American farmer? What is our position? Out of \$37,000,000 of exports to the United States, about \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000 went in free of duty. If the present changes proposed by the Mills' tariff are adopted, it is expected that another \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000 will go into the United States free of duty. But we are not getting that reduction because we asked for it, or to please us. All parties in the United States find that they have a larger revenue than is required, that they are absorbing a larger revenue from the country into their exchequer than they know what to do with, and it has to be reduced; and, while one party proposes to lighten the taxes on the necessities of life, the other party proposes to reduce the taxes on whiskey and tobacco, so as to keep up the tariff wall against all the world; but, with all the care they exercise, with all their devotion to their own country and its interests, they have never suggested what, in madness, has been suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite, to take off the protection which is given to the farmers. They may take the duty off lumber, but not off horses.

Mr. CHARLTON. What about wool?

Mr. McCARTHY. Wool is an exception. They do not take the duty off barley or cattle. They keep up this protection for the farmer, and the farmer much needs it, because there is no certainty that this tariff of theirs would introduce reciprocal relations with this side of the line, and the farmers need what protection they have, as I demonstrated by the figures which I quoted this afternoon. I do not think that any portion of the Canadian people will agree to allow any man to say that they fear that the adoption of any policy which is wise and beneficial will be hostile to the United States. They have dealt with us as they saw fit, they have raised and lowered their tariff, as they saw fit, and I do

not think anyone will say that the Canadian people are not able to alter their own tariff and make advantageous relations with any country in the world without consulting the American Senate or the people of the United States. Then there is the other consideration which must not be lost sight of, that we would find ourselves by-and-bye left out in the cold. If it is a possibility, and I am not putting it further than that—I look upon it as a certainty and not only a possibility—if it is a possibility that a Fair Trade party should come into power in England, how would they treat Canada with this tariff which we have to-day, or how would they treat us if the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite propose to force upon the House and the country were adopted? Can we expect that, if they adopted Fair Trade they would treat us in the same way as if we had always been ready to open our markets to them and to deal with them, or would they not naturally deal with us in a manner which would under the circumstances be perfectly proper and right from their standpoint? I cannot put this better than in the words of the president of the Federation League, Mr. Cunliffe Lister, who says:

"In conclusion, let me point out that it is this commercial federation of the Empire which furnishes the key note of the present position, compared with the protection of old days which looked to the United Kingdom being self-contained, self-subsisting and self-supporting. This latter position is so absolutely impossible to-day that we are bound to extend our borders and to treat the Empire as one; and if it be urged that some of our possessions cannot for revenue purposes, and will not, dispense with import duties, even against British products, our reply is simple. In such case, our hands are free to establish the differential system in lieu of absolutely free imports. In such case, our Empire would be still united in commercial bonds, and there is probably no British colony in existence that would not, in return for a preferential market on our shores only too gladly give us a preferential market on theirs. Should there be any so blind as not to be willing to do so, then such colony or possession should become *ipso facto* for tariff purposes a foreign state."

Now, there we have the alternative presented to us. On the one hand, the advantages are to give us free trade with the United States, and to build up a tariff against England. Has it any advantages? you know its dangers. But, we know, by that means, that not the slightest benefit can be obtained, so far as advancing the price of our agricultural products is concerned. We know, on the other hand, that there is a possibility—and I hope yet to live to see the day when my statement will be corroborated—of getting advantages in the great market of the world, where all our goods ultimately have to go. If they go to the States, we will displace there goods that go to England; if American goods are allowed into this country they merely displace so much more for the ultimate destination of all. We make the market ourselves. An invitation is offered to us, not by the Government, it is true, but by a party which is now, I venture to say, the large party. I want also to point out how much Ireland is interested in a policy of this kind. We all know, who have paid any attention to this subject, that from Ireland a large number of cattle is sold yearly to the English market; but I was surprised to learn that in the year 1886, from Ireland, were shipped to England, Scotland and Wales no less than 717,389 cattle, 734,213 sheep, and 421,285 swine. Now, compare that with our export, which we know is large. I have not the values, only the numbers. Our export of cattle was 91,000 as against 717,000; our export of sheep was 359,000 as against 734,000; we do not appear to have exported swine at all to the British market. Now, what country is more interested than Ireland? What argument compelled the Government last year to pass a measure in relief of the tenant? It was an argument demonstrated by the Commission that sat in Ireland, namely, that owing to the competition from this side of the Atlantic, the value to the Irish farmer of all that he raised, all that he had to sell, had enormously depreciated. What country, therefore, is more interested in this policy than Ireland? What country, therefore, should this fair trade policy look to for support more than Ireland?

Now, when the question is settled, the question which, no doubt, will be settled during this Parliament, which appears to be in a fair way of settlement even now, when the question is settled as to what the Irish are to have in the nature of Home Rule, or County Government, or whatever it may be, then the new issue must be this all-important question, important to every man in Great Britain and Ireland, the all-important question as to the position of the farmer, and not merely the farmer but the manufacturer of that country. Sir, I will close my observations by reading an extract from Mr. Chamberlain's speech, Mr. Chamberlain, of the great free trade City of Birmingham Mr. Chamberlain, of a younger generation than Cobden and Bright, and still hitherto believed to be impregnated to the fullest extent with free trade doctrine; speaking the other night—where, Sir? in the Devonshire Club, a Liberal club; in the chair, Lord Granville, a Gladstonian Liberal, surrounded by members of the Liberal party, he held out his hands in terms of kindness, in terms which one formerly would not have expected from Mr. Chamberlain. Dealing with this question of commercial union, he said:

"The difficulty in the case of the commercial union is, no doubt, much greater. It is no use to expect that our colonies will abandon their customs duties as their chief and principle source of revenue. It is hardly to be hoped that the protected interests fostered by their system will willingly surrender the privileges which they now enjoy. All they can do is to wait until proposals are made to us to consider those proposals when they come with fairness and impartiality and to accept them if they do not involve the sacrifice of any important principle or interest vital to our population.

Coming from Mr. Chamberlain, under the auspices of Lord Granville, in the Devonshire Club, I say these are words that speak, perhaps, louder than the report of the Commission with regard to the depreciation of trade, which speak, perhaps, as loudly as the voice of the great Conservative party in their meeting last November, in Oxford; and they warn us not to turn our backs, not to despise the policy which is offered to us by so great a statesman, so eminent a public man, and by so large a party in the country where our chief market must always be. Therefore it is that I have risen with great pleasure to make these observations in support of the resolution which my friend from East Middlesex (Mr. Marshall) has moved, and also to some extent, and, perhaps, more particularly, in support of the propositions contained in my own. I would close by saying this with regard to the manufacturer: The manufacturer, as he stands to-day, has, to a great extent, successfully built up industries in this country. I believe for my part that our manufacturers can well say that if we are to be protected against foreigners, if we are to have that market, we can well afford that England should have certain differential preferences in our market. We cannot expect that all the advantages are to be on one side; we cannot expect to discriminate against her in our market, to be placed by England, as it were, upon the ground floor, and at the same time deny to the English manufacturer all that the English manufacturer wants, that is, the sale of his articles in our country so as to pay for the food he gets from us. We cannot refuse to say to England: We now import from the United States \$45,000,000 worth, we will do what we can to give that \$45,000,000 to the English manufacturer; we will do what we can in that way; and I do not believe, Sir, that with a reduction of 5 or 7 per cent. even on manufactured articles, from our protection as it stands to-day, he would be able to hold his own if the American manufacturer was excluded from our market. Therefore, I say that the policy which I advocate is a fair policy. We ask, on the one hand, for preferences in the English market, and we say we are prepared to give them certain preferences in ours, we are willing to enter into commercial union. This matter has been foreseen. With many countries, their terms would be better than ours; with a country such as Australia they would probably be entitled

Mr. McCARTHY.

to all the advantages with us. As I read a moment ago from Mr. Cunliffe Lister's observations, there will be, perhaps, such a bargain as, under the circumstances, would not be unreasonable. That however is a matter of detail, which I need not dwell upon now. I am obliged, Sir, to the House for the patient hearing they have given to my somewhat lengthy remarks. The subject, in my humble judgment, is of the greatest importance, or else I would not have been found occupying the time of the House to this extent. I believe it is fraught with great importance to this country, and believing that, I feel it is my duty to say what I have said on this subject.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad that my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Marshall) has brought this question to the attention of the House. I know that he has done so from a real desire to benefit the interest of that class to which he belongs, and to which I also claim to belong, the farmers of Canada. I have been long aware that the hon. gentleman had some such plan to bring before the House, and I am glad that he has now put it in shape, and brought up a discussion upon it. I cannot say that I stand before you as a supporter, in the fullest extent, of everything that has been advanced by himself, and especially by his seconder, in discussing this matter, but I am sufficiently of a free trader, sufficiently in favor of reciprocity with whoever is willing to be reciprocal with us, to entertain favorably any reasonable proposition for reciprocity with any country, and more especially with that country from which we claim political descent. I have voted already this Session in favor of reciprocity with the United States. I do not think that is inconsistent with the position of being willing to enter into reciprocal trade relations with Great Britain as well. I do not accept this proposition instead of the other; in fact, I wish to be understood distinctly as saying that if it must be a choice between the two I believe Canadian interests will be most promoted by having free trade with the United States rather than any arrangement that is likely to be obtained with Great Britain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CASEY. Hon. gentlemen may say "no." If they can show us any reasonable possibility of obtaining fair arrangements with England, arrangements quite as favorable as those we can reasonably expect to obtain from the United States, then they may say "no." However, I am not contrasting the two propositions or rejecting the one in favor of the other; I see no reason why we should not discuss with the Imperial Government the question of improved trade relations between Great Britain and the colonies generally. The resolution merely suggests that such arrangements would be beneficial to all interested in Canada, and would strengthen the Empire by building up her colonies, and that we should discuss that question with the Home Government. So far there is very little objection to be taken to the motion, and I am glad he has brought it before the House with a view to eliciting opinion by way of discussion, I do not suppose it is intended to press the motion to a division, at least I hope not, for I do not think a vote should be taken on such an important question the first time it comes up in the House for discussion. I do not think ten members have considered the matter sufficiently to be able to vote intelligently upon it and place themselves on record. I am glad, however, that an opportunity is afforded to discuss it. This question should be discussed in a purely non-partisan spirit, I do not see why any question of party is connected with it, and for that reason I was rather sorry, not so much at any actual words used but at the general tone of the speech of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The earlier part of his speech was evidently prepared for delivery on a former occasion, when, perhaps, the hon. gentleman had not an opportunity of delivering it. It was a speech intended for

the reciprocity debate, and I do not think it has improved by keeping. Some things do not improve by age, and speeches are among the number. The earlier part of the speech was devoted not to advocating reciprocity with England but to showing that reciprocity with the United States was not advantageous, and it is to that part of his speech I desire to make special reference. The hon. member, no doubt, spoke some sound and stirring truths. He said that most of the people of Canada were farmers and that their interests should be considered, and that they should have the best market available, and he went on later to state that the manufacturers must give up to the farmers some of the extreme protection they now enjoy. It is because I believe that the manufacturers should give up some of the extreme protection they now enjoy that I voted in favor of reciprocity with the United States and am now willing to consider the question of reciprocity with England. For the same ostensible reason for which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) claims we should have reciprocity with England, I claim we should have reciprocity with the United States because the farming interests should prevail. We have had class legislation since 1879, nearly all favoring that portion of the population which comes under the generic name of manufacturers; but in legislating in favor of the farmers who constitute a majority of the people I hold that they should be considered more than any other class. It is their turn now, and I hope that the farmers have a sufficient bond of union, sufficient *esprit de corps*, sufficient self-restraint and knowledge of their own interests to see that their interests are protected. We should not have a class war, but if one class pushes their interest at the expense of the preponderating and overwhelming class, the farmers, they must expect ultimately to be forced to the wall. It would be unfortunate if such a war should occur, it would not be the fault of the farmers, but would have been brought about by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite; and unless some one of these propositions is adopted and reciprocity is had with a convenient market such a result may occur, and the manufacturers must look out for themselves. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) referred to the policy of the United States in protecting the farmers and said that neither party in the States would be so mad as to talk of giving up protection to the farmers, and he went on to show that a similar condition prevailed in Canada. Did the hon. gentleman forget that his leader, the representative of Canada at Washington, clothed with all the authority of a plenipotentiary and backed by the Canadian Government, asked the American commissioners to agree to remove the duties on agricultural and natural products on both sides of the line? I do not think such a proposition was improper, but I also think it should not be confined to that line of products alone. I believe in reciprocity all around. I think the farmer has a right not only to enter the American markets with his produce, but that he should be able to buy his manufactured articles in the American market if he can obtain them cheaper. Reciprocity all round is the only motto that can be adopted. The hon. gentleman continued, with his thorough knowledge of agricultural questions, to discuss the comparative profits of American and Canadian farmers, and he declared that the United States market was no use to us because they produced the same articles we did. This is an old argument used during the reciprocity debate, but it requires, perhaps, an answer afresh. Although the United States export a great many products, we are able to sell them many. The hon. gentleman has proved to his own satisfaction, as a lawyer, that our farmers cannot obtain in the United States as high prices for their products as they can at home; but the fact remains that, notwithstanding the protection, our farmers send produce across the line. In New York and its vicinity there are over two millions of people, forming one of the largest centres of

population in the world. There is there a large market for choice cattle, choice sheep, choice horses, and everything that is good; a market almost, if not quite as high in price, as the market of England, and a market infinitely more convenient for Canadian farmers to send their stock to. I have been myself told by feeders and buyers of cattle in my own neighborhood, that they would much rather deal in the New York market, even at a smaller price, than with the Liverpool market, for the reason that they can know from day to day how the market stands. They can buy a carload of cattle and ship them across the line, knowing about the price that they will get for them, whereas if they send them to England, there is a long delay, there is a great uncertainty whether they will get there, and a tremendous uncertainty as to what the price will be if they do get there. For that reason alone the United States markets would be a great convenience to the Ontario farmers. I say "United States," because I have an objection to using the word "American," and I shall say United States whenever I have an occasion to refer to that people, because I believe that we have the bigger, if not throughout the better, part of America ourselves. The hon. gentleman went on to refer to the prices of products in the States and here. He said that the price of wheat was higher in Canada than in the United States, and that the farmer was more prosperous, because he not only raised more bushels per acre but he obtained a higher price. I have no doubt of the correctness of one of those statements, that, on an average, the Ontario farmers do produce more bushels per acre than the average farmer in the United States; but I must also point out the utter unfairness of any comparison between Ontario, the best Province of old Canada—and the most fertile part of Canada too, except the very favored portions of the prairie in the North-West—being compared with the average of the United States, including the worn out lands of New England, including other lands which may not perhaps be worn out but which never were good, and including the rocky farms of the State of New York, for even in New York there are a great many rocky farms. It is absurd, utterly misleading, and unfair in discussing a question of this kind on the motion made by the hon. gentleman who seems to show such a knowledge of agricultural matters, and I would almost say it was lawyer-like to make such a comparison. If he wishes to make a comparison between Canada and the United States he should have secured the statistics for all Canada, and if they are not available it is simply impossible to make any comparison between Canada and the States. He referred to the comparison between Ontario and New York, but he did not give us a comparative statement of bushels and prices as between Ontario and the State of New York or the State of Michigan.

Mr. HESSON. Yes, he did.

Mr. CASEY. No, he did not. I was here, and the hon. gentleman simply said that the total returns per acre were so much in Ontario, so much in Michigan, and so much in New York. He did not tell us how it was arrived at, and he did not tell us that 20 bushels per acre were worth considerably more in the State of New York than in the Province of Ontario. He did not tell us that they were worth more in Michigan than in the western part of Ontario. Of course I have not given so much time and attention to the matter as the hon. gentleman, nor have I gone so fully into the records. I just picked up this afternoon, since I came into the House, a copy of the *Empire*, and it gives the contrast between the prices of wheat in Ontario and the State of New York and in Michigan. I find the result to be as follows:—I find that in Toronto on Saturday, as reported in the *Empire* to day, "Red Winter" wheat of the very best kind was worth 90 cents a bushel; "No. 2 Fall," 86 cents

a bushel, and the prices in the Toronto market ran all the way down to 76 cents. Let us compare that with the price in the State of New York. Let us take the price in Buffalo, which is just about as far from tide water by way of New York as Toronto is by way of Montreal. In Buffalo "No. 1 Red Winter" was the same price as in Toronto; "No. 1 Hard" was 96½ cents a bushel, and there was no price quoted in Toronto for "No. 1 Hard," and there did not seem to be a market for it; "No. 2 Red Michigan," corresponding to "No. 2 Fall Wheat," sold in Toronto at 86 cents, was sold in Buffalo at 94½.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let the hon. gentleman look and he will find that "No. 1 Hard" is quoted in the Toronto market in to-day's *Empire* at 93½ and 94.

Mr. CASEY. It is possible I overlooked that. It was 96 cents in Buffalo, that is three cents more than in Toronto and all the other grades run about the same way. "No. 2 Fall" wheat was 8 cents higher in Buffalo than in Toronto, and "No. 1 Hard," on the word of my hon. friend, was 3 cents higher in Buffalo, and "No. 1 White" was 3 or 4 cents higher in Buffalo than in Toronto. In London on the same day the highest quotation for wheat was 84 cents a bushel. Detroit is the nearest corresponding point to London, and in Detroit on Friday the highest quotation was 88½ cents. The highest quotation in Detroit, which is 100 miles west of London, was 4½ cents higher than the highest quotation in London. I take the quotation from the *London Free Press*. I do not know exactly what kind the wheat was but that is the highest quotation that I can find for wheat in the London market. Now let us take barley. The highest price for barley in Toronto was 68 cents a bushel, and in Oswego, across the lake, it was 80 cents for the best Canadian barley. The same grade of barley that was selling at a low rate in Toronto was sold at 12 cents a bushel more in Oswego—that is the difference between the two sides of the lake—and yet the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says it would not pay us to go into that market. If prices are lower in the States than in Canada, as they would wish to make us believe, how is it that the people of the United States do not send their wheat in here. It is perfectly absurd and nonsensical to make such a statement as that to an audience of farmers. The hon. gentleman would not say it in a country school-house, because he would know that everyone who heard him was aware of the fact that grain is dearer on the other side of the line than it is here. He would not presume to make that statement to farmers, but he thinks, possibly, so many members of this House are not farmers that it will go down here. He will find he is greatly mistaken. Such a statement will go down neither here nor in the country, because it is absurd on the face of it. If grain was cheaper in the States than it is here they would overrun our market with grain.

Mr. TAYLOR. Quote oats.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) will have his opportunity afterwards, and I shall have to make this speech myself I think. The hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) dwelt a great deal on average prices. That was another misleading portion of his speech. I should like to know what he means by average prices. He says he quoted the average prices in Ontario from the report of Mr. Blue, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. I do not know how Mr. Blue arrived at an average price for a whole Province— at how many points he took the market rates; but even if you took the rates on a particular day at every market town in Ontario, you could not arrive at an average market price unless you knew the quantity of wheat sold at each of these places. As a matter of fact, the great bulk of the fall wheat of Ontario, at all events, is sold at

Mr. CASEY.

markets west of Toronto, where the price of wheat is low, and runs, as it does at London at the present time, at from 80 to 84 cents a bushel. If you took this price and averaged it with the prices in eastern Ontario, you would get an unfair result, because the bulk of the wheat sold in Ontario is sold at the low rates instead of at the high rates, and you must know the quantity sold at all places in the Province before you can get the average price. I do not know whether Mr. Blue made up the average price, or whether the hon. gentleman took Mr. Blue's figures and made up the average price himself; but I know that no average price can be anything but misleading. The same is true of his figures of the average price in the United States, which he says was 85 cents. We find, in to-day's paper, that on Saturday last wheat sold in Buffalo at 90 cents, and in Detroit at 88 cents. I do not know how the average price in the States is made up unless the prices at Chicago, Minneapolis, and other western points, where wheat is still lower in price, are taken into account. The hon. member gave us a great many statistics of our trade with Great Britain to show how important and great it was as compared with our trade with the United States. I should be as glad as the hon. gentleman to see our trade with Great Britain increase; I should be more so, I think, because the hon. gentleman has been supporting a policy which led to a decrease in our trade with Great Britain. He tried to draw on our credulity by urging that if we entered into reciprocity with the United States, it would lead to the scheduling of Canadian cattle, so that they would have to be killed on landing at Liverpool as are American cattle. I admit that if we entered into reciprocity in live animals, it might possibly have that effect, not from revenge against Canada, but because our cattle would be exposed to the same risks as the American cattle. But that might be avoided by quarantine or in some other way. But suppose our cattle were scheduled, the Americans seem to make a good deal from selling their cattle in England as things are, and if we had both the English market and the American market I do not think we should care much whether our cattle were scheduled or not. But what pleased me very much in the hon. gentleman's speech was the way in which he dilated on England's prosperity under free trade. The statistics he quoted were such as to convince almost everybody that free trade has been a good thing for England. I shall leave it to the hon. member himself to draw the conclusion which is applicable to Canada. After that, he went on to prove to his own satisfaction that, although free trade had been such a success in England, the largest party in England, the Conservative party, were at the present time committed to the policy of what he calls fair trade—discrimination in favor of the colonies—because a certain Conservative meeting at Oxford had adopted that policy. The hon. member knew, and admitted that he knew, that Lord Salisbury, the leader of the Conservative party and the leader of the Government, had utterly repudiated that policy, and had said that it was impossible to carry it out. I should not object to see England adopt that policy, as I think it would benefit us in this country; but it is not fair to lead us to believe that the Conservative party are in favor of that policy, when the leader of that party has repudiated it. It may come in the future, but no party in England is at present committed to it. Now, I regret, although the House will probably not regret, that the condition of my throat is such that I am unable to continue this discussion any further. I shall conclude by repeating that I am glad that this question has been brought up by the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Marshall), and that the prospects are that there will be a very full and free discussion of the question. I hope some good will come out of it, by informing both the people of Canada and the people of England on this important question.

Mr. FISHER. Before this motion is carried, I should like to say a few words on it. Like my hon. friend who has just sat down, I am very glad that this question has been brought before this House. For some time back we have had discussions of this question in various parts of the country—discussions, however, of a more or less informal character, and carried on by those not having the full responsibility which attends a member of Parliament on the floor of this House. I am glad, indeed, that my hon. friend from East Middlesex (Mr. Marshall) has brought it before us to-night, so that some illusions which have been thrown around it may be cleared away, and that the people of this country may have something on which they can go in their examination into the subject. When the hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was addressing the House a little while ago, in a somewhat lengthy, but not at all too lengthy speech, considering the importance of the subject and the prominent position he holds in this House and the country, I was a little surprised at some of the words he gave utterance to, and some of the ideas he put forth. In that speech the hon. gentleman announced some very good doctrines indeed, good free trade doctrine, I may call it, which I was surprised to hear coming from that hon. gentleman. Sir, we do not often hear such principles coming from the lips of leading gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. Pity it is that that hon. gentleman did not years ago, in the party to which he belongs, utter the words he has uttered to-night. Pity it is that when that party in 1878 appealed to the people of Canada on the question of protection and free trade, he did not give forth the truths which he has given forth to-night. The hon. gentleman spoke of Great Britain as our mother country, and said we would be much more right if we followed the example of that country and drew ourselves closer to her instead of trying to form a connection with the United States. But, Sir, in 1878, when the party to which that hon. gentleman belongs appealed to the people of this country, did they hold up the mother country as an example to be followed by Canada? Did they point to her policy as one that we should adopt? Nothing of the kind. They then pointed to the country to the south of us, and appealed to the people of Canada to follow the example of the United States, because we lived under the same conditions, and to adopt a protective policy as the true policy for this country. At that time Canada made a great mistake, and threw away the chance she will never be able to regain. Had Canada then pronounced in favor of a revenue tariff, and distinctly and clearly against a protective policy, we would have to-day a prosperous condition of affairs, which words fail me to depict, instead of the deplorable condition of affairs that now exist. At that time, our neighbors to the south, by means of the injudicious policy they were pursuing in regard to their commerce on the sea, had practically destroyed their carrying trade and their shipping. If we had gone exactly in the opposite direction, instead of following their example, at a very respectful distance, as we have only been able to do; if we had announced that we would make Canada a cheap country to live in, by following on this, the best portion of the continent, the free trade policy of England, we would have attracted to our country the enormous immigration that has gone to the United States. If, at that time, instead of following the United States and doing our best to destroy our commercial marine, we had made it easy to the people of this country to build ships and to navigate those ships, we would not have gone backwards as we have, since the inauguration of the National Policy, and our commercial marine would not only be doing our own carrying trade, but be doing the whole carrying trade of this continent, and be a strong competitor with the commercial marine of the mother country in the carrying trade of the world. If instead of a high tariff we had adopted a low revenue tariff, capital would have been invited to our

shores and found investment here in enterprises which it would not be necessary to foster by increased protection year after year. That capital would have been invested in manufacturing industries able to stand on their own bottom, and not continually requiring increased protection, and we would not be witnesses of that antagonism which to-day exists between those manufacturing industries and the other industries of the country. We would not have the antagonism that now exists between those who are producers of natural products and consumers of manufactured products, and our manufacturing industries. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), spoke at length this afternoon on the question of reciprocity between us and the United States, and in that connection made most contradictory and extraordinary statements. I will not detain the House by going over those statements in detail, but there are one or two points which have not been touched by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) and to which I think attention should be drawn. In the first place the hon. gentleman spoke of the United States as being our competitors in natural products instead of having our market for those products. It is true that in two or three leading articles they are our rivals. They rival us in the production of beef, and cheese, and butter. Nevertheless it is true, and perfectly reasonable to say, that in the United States our farmers have a very large market for their products. The eastern portion of the United States has to bring its food from a very great distance within the United States, and that food it could more easily import from Canada were the duties removed. Having made an investigation into this subject, and coming as I do from a locality where this Atlantic seaboard market of the United States is especially valuable, I can say that the duty which the farmers of the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces have to pay on their products shipped to the United States, just counterbalances the freight which the eastern portions of the United States have to pay on the products they import from the west. If we send hay, horses, cattle, or oats, or potatoes from the Province of Quebec or the Maritime Provinces to New England, to New York, and Philadelphia, we not only have to compete with the portions of the United States which are equally distant from those markets, but we also have to compete with the whole area whose freight rates are greater than ours, but whose freight rates are less than ours and the duties combined. The result is that in the instances I have mentioned, especially horses and hay, we have to compete with the whole area of the United States all the way to the Pacific seaboard. Take a cargo of horses: the freight rate from the Province of Quebec to Boston or New York is very small indeed, but the duty is so high that, combined with the freight, it enables the Americans to purchase horses on the Pacific coast which will compete with ours. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), speaking of the product of hay, acknowledged that local causes enabled our people to pay the duty and ship their hay to the New England markets. He thus refuted himself out of his own mouth. More than that, the hon. gentleman knows right well that we do, to-day, export an enormous amount of natural products to the United States. Now, if, as is contended by the hon. gentleman, our farmers get higher prices here for their products than do the farmers of the United States there, how is it that we are able to send our food products over to the United States, pay the duty, and compete with the American farmer? It would be manifestly absurd to say that we could do this, if the facts were as described by the hon. member for North Simcoe. I suppose some hon. gentlemen will say that they do not pay the duty. Well, I will refer them to the speech of the Finance Minister himself, who said that we did pay the duty. It is true that the result of that was to draw forth a vigorous protest from the Government organ in

Montreal, the *Montreal Gazette*, which, while stating that the hon. gentleman had made a splendid speech in regard to every other matter, said he had made a serious mistake in saying that we paid the duty on anything that we sent into the United States. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) also said that the United States Government would not dare to take off the protection which their farmers have, as against Canadian farmers, in regard to food production. At the same time, he alluded to the fact that we got a higher price here for our food products than they do. What an absurd juxtaposition that is! If they can produce food more cheaply and get a less price, why do they need protection against us? He also said a few words in reference to barley, and he said that England got barley from Russia cheaper than we could send it to England. Why is that? Simply because our producers find that they can get a better price in the United States than they can get anywhere else. The other day I heard a statement on this question from a man who is an authority, a man who, I believe, is the largest dealer in barley in the Province of Ontario, and he stated that he could not afford to send barley to England because the English barley was so much cheaper than our barley could be sent over there for. The reason for all this is that the United States people are willing to pay a larger price than any English maltsters would. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that the Russians sold their barley in England at a cheaper rate, but the reason for that is that the Russian people have no other market for their barley than England. They have to send it there, and they are obliged to take the price which the English maltsters would give; but in regard to our barley, we have a market at our own door. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) alluded also to what is known as the Mills' Tariff in the United States, and he said that, when that was adopted, no doubt we would be enabled to send a large number of our productions into the United States free of duty or nearly so, but he brought into close juxtaposition with that the proposition to discriminate against the United States in favor of Great Britain. I think that our experience in regard to the United States of late has been that, if we were to discriminate against them in favor of any one, the mother country or anyone else, the result would be retaliatory legislation, not only against us, but probably against the British Empire altogether. I will only allude to one other fact, which is, perhaps, a piece of by-play—that is, that the hon. gentleman referred to our most important export, and spoke of cereals in that connection, and said our breadstuffs were the greatest exports of Canada and the foundation of our prosperity. I think he cannot have consulted the Trade and Navigation Returns, or cannot be familiar with the actual condition of affairs, or he would know that, in Ontario itself, breadstuffs play a secondary part in exports to the export of animals and their products. We, in Canada, occupy a prominent position in the world in regard to our exports of animals and their products, and I believe we have the very best means for the production of animals, and that we have shown, especially in Ontario. We have the best appliances, and we have the best means in the world to produce the best cheese. We have been able to produce a larger proportion, in regard to our population, than any country in the world, and we stand at the head in regard to the production of animals and their products, sent from this continent to England. In this connection also, the hon. gentleman spoke of what he called our proposition to allow American animals to come into this country free, and suggested that our animals would run the great danger of being scheduled in England because of that free interchange. I was surprised that that hon. gentleman, who is known as a great legal light, should have made such a statement as that. I remember when some other hon. gentleman who, per-

Mr. FISHER.

haps, was more rash in his statements than the hon. gentleman, made an allusion to this matter in the same sense, I was surprised to find the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) forget, apparently, that there is a statutory offer on the Statute-book of this country—an offer which has been there for a long time, an offer which hon. gentlemen opposite have boasted of, and have thrown in our teeth for years back, an offer which the leader of these hon. gentlemen proposed to withdraw. But, in his proposition to withdraw it, does he propose to take out of that list animals and their products? On the contrary, in the very first line of the resolution which the Finance Minister proposes, for which I have no doubt the hon. member for North Simcoe will vote next week, and all those hon. gentlemen will vote who have been talking about the danger that we may have our animals scheduled in England, he says:

“That section 9 of the said Act be repealed—”

That is the section which says that the Governor General in Council may by Order in Council allow these articles to come in free from the United States,—

“and the following substituted therefor: Any or all of the following things, that is to say, animals of all kinds.”

That is the very first thing you come to, and yet the hon. gentleman says that we have introduced a danger to the export trade of cattle to England, when he knew that the Government of which he is a supporter, ever since 1879, have made the same proposition to the United States, and that to-day when they are proposing to reconstruct their offer and to make changes in reference to that proposition, they still offer what, according to the hon. gentleman, amounts to ruining the Canadian export trade in cattle. This is of a piece with the other arguments of the hon. gentleman, with the changes and the difficulties which those hon. gentlemen find themselves in, when, as usual, they try to trim, to hunt with the hounds and to run with the hare. I have something more to say in regard to this question, which is, perhaps, more germane to the proposition before the House, because reciprocity with the United States has been dealt with, and voted upon, and the hon. gentlemen who voted against it took their lives in their hands, and many of them, when they go before the people, will find that they will have to retire into private life. There is, however, another question, and that is the question of an extension of our commercial relations with the Empire. The hon. member in introducing this resolution,—and I congratulate him on the manner in which, as a young member, he did it—stated that he did not wish England to give us a preference without giving her something in return. He did not very definitely say what he was prepared to give in return; but the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was a little more clear, although not as specific as I would like him to have been; but to a certain extent he did tell us what he was prepared to give in return. He indicated what he was willing to give, by quoting from English sources, from certain people in England called fair traders to show what they expected us to give them in return. Now, I was a little surprised to hear the hon. member for Simcoe so completely give himself and his friends away—to use a slang expression—when he announced that the farming community in this country needed to have their condition improved, and that it ought to be improved by some means which would be consistent with the manufacturing interests. That is all right. That part of his speech was quite consistent with the action which he and his friends have hitherto taken, and quite consistent with the amendment which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries moved to the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford the other day. The hon. member for Simcoe went on a little while afterwards to say that the

farming community of this country was the largest in number, that they were practically the toiling masses of this country, and that they must be considered. Brave words, Mr. Speaker, and I will be glad if the hon. gentleman opposite and his friends would act upon them, and in framing legislation would remember that, as a matter of fact, the farming class are not only the foundation and basis of our community, but in numbers they are actually four-fifths of the whole population, and the capital invested in agriculture is seven and a-half or eight times as great as is the capital invested in the manufacturing industries of this country. But, Sir, he said that the manufacturer probably would have to suffer a little. I understood him to mean that the farmers would have to be carefully considered, even though it should be necessary for the manufacturers to suffer a little. Sir, that is very disloyal. These hon. gentlemen, a few weeks ago, were telling us, when we made such a proposition, that we were disloyal to the best interests of our country, that we were proposing to destroy this country, to interfere with the vested rights, as they called them, of the manufacturers, which had been built up by our protective tariff. But to-day, according to the hon. member for Simcoe, they are ready to hurt the manufacturers a little for the sake of the farmers. Sir, I am a little surprised to hear that from the hon. member for Simcoe and his friends, because a little while ago they were declaring most emphatically that not one jot of our protective tariff, so far as it relates to manufacturers, must be disturbed, and they declared then, and they declare now, they are quite ready to take away from the farming community of this country their protection, and to sacrifice the interests of the farming classes, in so far as the abandonment of protection will sacrifice them. I do not believe it will. Sir, I am quite prepared to believe that the farming community can exist without protection. As a matter of fact, the protection which was extended to the farming community since 1878, has been an entire delusion. Surely if the principle which hon. gentlemen opposite denounce that protection must be upheld in the interests of a class, then they ought to uphold the principle of protection to the farmers just as much as to manufacturers and other interests. But, no, they are quite ready to sacrifice all the protection they have given to farmers. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Simcoe went on to quote from English sources, to describe the great progress that the fair trade movement in England has been making. I quite agree with the hon. member that there are in England to-day a goodly number of fair traders. There are always in England a large number of individuals who are always ready to take up anything new and discuss it, hold conventions on it, form leagues and associations for the advancement of any ideas they have. We can name, perhaps, a hundred leagues which are to-day in existence for the promulgation of one principle or another. It is true, Sir, that attempts have been made by the Conservative party in England to make this a party question, but, as was acknowledged by the hon. member himself, they have not so far succeeded; and the leaders of the Conservative party have again and again refused point blank to take up this question and make it a plank in their platform. Sir, they are wise in their day and generation, for they know perfectly well that those principles of free trade which Bright and Cobden taught in England some years ago, those principles upon which the great free trade campaign was conducted to a successful issue, are so well established in England that there is no possibility whatever of the electors of England being brought to reject them. The hon. member quoted some words from several fair traders, and I have here some quotations of perhaps later authorities than some he has given. Last November a great fair trade meeting was held in England, and at that meeting the platform and principles of the league were

fairly announced. The great English dailies the next day had editorials on it and accepted the meeting as the exponent of the principles of the fair traders in England, and alluded to them as the official announcement of what the fair traders wanted to do. At that meeting Mr. Cunliffe Lister, who was mentioned by the hon. member for Simcoe, and whom I believe to be one of the leading lights in this fair trade movement, and whose dictum upon the question is accepted as authority, said upon that occasion:

"Fair traders advocate to-day, as they did six years ago and as they have done ever since, duties on foreign manufactures, combined with duties on all foreign imports of food, but stipulating always for the free import of raw materials needed for home industry."

Now, the *Times* newspaper is generally considered to be the most perfect exponent of public opinion in England; it is a newspaper which, in all circumstances, desires to express what it believes to be the prevailing sentiments of the English people. And what does the *Times* say?

"So far as words are concerned this is clear enough. When we come to things it becomes somewhat obscure, and what is more the policy, such as it is propounded by Mr. C. Lister, was expressly repudiated by one of the speakers at the conference. Mr. Dixon Hartland declared he could not be a party to taxing corn. There is thus still a rift within the lute. Fair traders are not entirely agreed as to whether they will advocate a duty on corn or not."

And here comes, I think, the most pithy statement of the question in England which I have ever heard:

"The manufacturers would like to put a duty on manufactures, but the agriculturist will not let him. The agriculturist would like to put a duty on corn, but the manufacturer will not let him. When these two parties are agreed we shall begin to believe in the strength of the Fair Trade League."

I should like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the time has come for the two parties to be agreed. This was the result of that great meeting. There is a little addendum to this in an editorial in the *Times*, which the hon. gentleman might take to heart, and which expresses pretty clearly the opinion the majority of the people of England have on this movement:

"We are now told that fair traders are protectionists pure and simple with a sort of platonic predilection for what they are pleased to call 'Commercial Federation of the Empire.' 'They would' as Mr. C. Lister said yesterday, 'put a duty on everything foreign except raw material, placing, however, our colonies and dependencies in the position of having free entry here if they gave us free entry in return.'"

Are hon. gentlemen ready to give English manufacturers free entry here in return?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FISHER. Hon. gentlemen say "no." If hon. gentlemen are willing to discriminate against England then they may be quite sure that England will discriminate against the colonies. So long as we impose duties on British manufactures, British manufacturers will not allow us to impose a duty on the food of their laborers. Moreover, it does not follow that if we allow British manufactures to come in free, England would admit our products free and discriminate against those of other nations. I attended the British Association meetings in Montreal, which were attended by a large number of the best intellects of Britain. I attended the economic section, and a discussion arose relating to the commercial relations of the Empire, when the question of Canadian intercourse with England came up a gentleman proposed Imperial federation or Imperial free trade, with discriminating duties against foreign countries. There were present a large number of representatives of British manufacturers, and there was one universal chorus of horror at the idea that they could be tempted, under any circumstances or conditions, to impose a duty on corn coming into England. The figures quoted by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) show that the importations of foreign corn were enormous, and to-day the British colonies do not produce, or, at all events, ship anything like to meet the surplus required

by England from foreign markets. The hon. gentleman said that the duty to be imposed on foreign corn would be sufficient to give a very large return in the English markets. If so, what benefit would it be to us? It would not displace foreign corn, we would still have to compete with it. One of the two things would happen: either it would not increase our corn production and consequently would not displace foreign corn, or if it did so displace it, the duty would not give the income expected to be obtained from the duty on foreign corn. Mr. Cunliffe Lister says:

"Let us have free trade within the Empire, or as near it as may be possible, and no longer should we be dependent on the foreigner who refuses to deal with us."

The *Times* says:

"By all means we reply, but how are we to get free trade within the Empire? It is not true to say the foreigner refuses to deal with us, and certainly if any foreigner does refuse to deal with us, we cannot be in any way dependent on him. But so far as it is true that foreigners refuse to deal with us, it is equally true that many of our own colonies refuse to deal with us. If fair traders really can tell us how we can better persuade the colonies to adopt free trade than by showing that we ourselves believe in free trade, they have certainly so far succeeded in keeping a very important piece of information to themselves."

Therefore, although the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is advocating commercial Imperial confederation or free trade in the Empire, it must be remembered that if there is an obstacle to free trade in the Empire it has been brought about more by hon. gentlemen opposite than by any other individuals in the Empire, because Canada, in this respect, has gone beyond any other of the colonies and placed a stumbling block, which it is impossible to overcome, to any movement for free trade within the Empire. I will read another short extract to show what is the opinion of England on this question, and it is not going too far to say that this is a fair representation of that opinion. After discussing the old question of free trade or protection, the writer goes on to say:

"As for the other branch of their policy—namely, the commercial federation of the Empire—it seems to us to be a proposition applicable rather to Jupiter or Saturn than to the actual world in which we live."

This is a deliberate statement taken from the first editorial article in the *London Times* dealing with the question, and after the full exposition of it by the leader of the fair trade movement at the meeting to which I have alluded. The same article goes on to say:

"It might be possible, if the colonies were at one with each other and with the mother country, to establish a customs union which would secure free commercial interchange between the different parts of the Empire combined with hostile tariffs against foreign nations. Whether it would be expedient or not is another question, into which at present it is quite unnecessary to enter. But the colonies are not at one with each other, nor with the mother country. Victoria and New South Wales cannot agree with each other. Canada seems at present to be moving rather in the direction of commercial union with the United States than in that of commercial union with the United Kingdom."

There is another part of the hon. gentleman's speech to which I cannot refrain from alluding very briefly. He gave a very lugubrious account of the present depression in England. I was certainly surprised that the hon. gentleman, who is rather an important person and whose words carry weight, should have followed the policy which he has so roundly condemned in hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite have taunted us with decrying our country and have accused us of being unpatriotic, because we have said that Canada was not so prosperous as she should be; but the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was quite ready to rise and state that the mother country is to-day suffering from commercial depression and is practically on the highway to ruin. I am not going to accuse the hon. gentleman of want of patriotism. If those are the facts relating to England we should know them, just as we should know the exact state of affairs respecting our own country. I do not attack a man's patriotism if he points out the

Mr. FISHER.

remedy for a deplorable state of affairs, if such should exist. But if the hon. gentleman's accusation in regard to hon. members on this side of the House is true, then I must say he is as unpatriotic as we are. What are the facts? He says England to-day is depressed. I came across a report in a paper, which the hon. gentleman will acknowledge to be a good protectionist organ, the *Montreal Star*, and that organ says in alluding, not to anything of its own but to a report which the hon. gentleman will be content to accept as authority. Here is what the *Montreal Star* said about Mr. Giffen's report to the British Board of Trade. Mr. Giffen is well known all over the British Empire as a gentleman who is in no sense a partisan but who is essentially and before everything else a statistician, a man who deals with figures, examines those figures, and gives the result:

"Mr. Giffen's report to the British Board of Trade shows that Great Britain maintains its relative superiority with regard to foreign trade. In the open markets of the world the old country still distances all competitors. To some countries, such as India and Australia, it sends by far the greater part of what they import from foreign countries. Great Britain sends to Egypt 47 per cent. of all that it imports, France and Germany send 14 per cent. each, and the United States 1 per cent. To the Argentine republic, Uruguay and Chili, it sends from 28 to 39 per cent. of all they import, France sends 17 per cent., Germany from 8 to 19 per cent., and the United States 7 per cent. As much as 28 per cent. of all that China imports is sent by Great Britain, while Germany and France send next to nothing and the United States only 4 per cent. The Japanese get 43 per cent. of all their foreign goods from Great Britain, 9 per cent. from the United States, 7 per cent. from Germany and 5 per cent. from France. The preponderance of Great Britain is conspicuous in every country except Canada."

And mind you, Sir, that is after ten years of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, which was intended to foster a trade between us and Great Britain and to discriminate in favor of Great Britain.

"There the contiguity of the United States gives it an immense advantage. But as regards European countries, what Canada imports from the whole of them does not amount to much more than one-sixth of what she imports from the mother country. Germany about whose rivalry in foreign trade with Great Britain so much has been said, does not, according to Mr. Giffen, send to British North America more than 1.7 of its imports. Mr. Giffen's general conclusion is that 'Germany has not been gaining in common markets of late years at the expense of English trade. Its gains have been in special directions. Our predominance in the great common markets remains substantially what it was ten years ago.'"

This is only one evidence. I have here another quotation which is taken from the *Times* of last November, and in allusion to that same meeting which the Fair Trade League had held in London:

"The whole basis of their argument is the allegation that our trade is declining. The allegation is not true. 'In point of fact,' says our correspondent, 'English manufacturers and English industry in general, whatever may be the case with one or two branches only, are now developed to a greater degree than ever they were before, and our exports to foreign countries are also greater than they ever were before.'"

This does not look as if England were going back in the commercial race of the world. As a matter of fact to a certain extent it has apparently been slightly retrograding in consequence of the lower values of goods, but if you take the amount of goods exported, England has held her prominent position more than she ever did before. To-day she does most of the carrying trade of the world, and has a greater command of the markets open to competition than she ever had in any period of her history before. Those things show pretty clearly that England does not need to take up this policy which is proposed to her. Her old free trade doctrine is carrying her to prosperity and keeping her in a sound condition. It shows more than that: that the efforts which have been made to depreciate this free trade success, and the efforts which have been made to point out what is called the depression, in consequence of free trade, are clearly inaccurate and misleading in fact. It is also a warning to us in this country. At one time it would have been better for us if we had taken the example of the mother country, and if we had followed the good advice given by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCar-

thy), instead of, as was unfortunately the case in 1878, following the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, who for the purpose of carrying the country at that time, chose to take the example of his neighbors to the south and chose to take that example which his followers have told him he was wrong to have done. We would have been in a far more prosperous position to-day, and we would not have been obliged to consider either the United States or the British Empire, in our internal economy or our internal legislation, if we had followed the policy laid down by Mr. Mackenzie. The great reason why it is necessary for Canada to regulate her commercial policy by the commercial policy of England and the States, is because our progress has been balked in consequence of the policy of protection which the hon. gentlemen opposite have insisted on this country adopting. I do not see how it is possible that this proposition can be practically carried into effect. I read with great interest some words of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in Toronto a little while ago and those words I fully endorse. I thought that when the hon. gentleman uttered those words, he was going to come to a different conclusion from what he did, for certainly his first conclusion does not appear to me to agree with his support of this motion. The hon. gentleman said :

“ He did not think the practical Canadian people were prepared to endorse any scheme which did not hold out any hope, any prospect of being adopted on practical lines and being capable of practical solution.”

He was then advocating a policy which he has not yet shown in the slightest degree, to be practical. He comes before us and he supports the motion of the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Marshall), but he has not shown us the practical solution of these difficulties which he has acknowledged were to be found in the discussions at the Free Trade League meeting in England. Instead of trying to forward a policy which would be practical he has attempted what I believe to be a dream, and a dream which never can be realised. It is a fact that the Empire to-day is composed of very widely scattered portions; it is a fact that they are building up new states in far distant portions of the Empire, and I believe if there is going to be any possibility of holding that Empire together it will be by giving each portion of it the fullest latitude and jurisdiction to deal with its own affairs as it thinks best for its own welfare. Thus and thus only will you be able to keep the Empire together. If we try, by any paper plan, to bring the bonds closer and try to draw the string more tight between the outlying portions of the Empire the result will be, as it has been, unfortunately, in this Dominion, a rather straining of relations between the different portions of the Empire a tendency to arouse irritation between the different portions and eventually to break up the Empire into a large number of possibly antagonistic states. The efforts of the leader of this House to centralise in this Dominion have been unfortunate. His efforts to make a legislative union, though he cannot adopt a legislative union in theory, are very unfortunate. We, as Canadians, can give a warning to the whole Empire that they shall not carry out the same mistake as we did and that they shall not be landed in the same difficulties as we have been. It is not from any lack of patriotism that I thus prefer that this resolution should not pass, or that this question be dealt with on the lines laid down by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I yield to no one in my patriotism. I hold, as everyone in this country holds, that the Queen is the head of our country and our Government, just as much as she is of the English people, the Irish people and the Australian people. But, Sir, I do not acknowledge any allegiance whatever to the Parliament of England. We, in this country, are a portion of the British Empire, having free institutions, ruling ourselves in a Parliament that is supreme in this country; and

we believe that the more that is done, and acknowledged, and insisted upon, the better chance there is that we shall remain good friends with the rest of the British Empire and with the mother country herself. I trust that it will be a long time before we have any other head to our Government than the Queen of England; I trust that we shall long remain a portion of the British Empire; but, Sir, I do not believe that, to occupy that ground, it is necessary that we should be subject to the Parliament of Great Britain or be ruled except by our own people, and in accordance with the views of our own people as expressed on this floor. Sir, the patriotism I glory in is the patriotism which leads me to do what I consider best in the interests of the people of Canada, and I believe I shall be doing that by favoring such measures as will tend to extend and increase the trade of our people. The hon. member for Simcoe gave utterance to some good and sound advice on this question. He said he believed we must discuss it purely from a Canadian standpoint, and I have been trying to do so; but we know that hon. gentlemen opposite, in discussing the question of reciprocity with the United States, prominently brought forward what they call the interests of the Empire. I have heard and seen in the press utterances of some hon. gentlemen from which I would be led to believe that they did not care at all for the interests of Canada, but were sent here especially to look after the interests of the Empire. It may be well for men who come here from the mother country to think of those interests; but I have to look back through too many generations to consider any interests but those of the country in which I have been born and brought up, that is Canada. In taking that position we follow the example of the mother country. In England, have we heard one word of what would be for the advantage of Canada from Imperial federation? Not one. Have we known any man there to call on the English people to accept that doctrine for the benefit of the colonies? Not one. It has been urged on the English people by its advocates, because they said it would be for the benefit of the manufacturing and agricultural classes of England; and one reason why England has been governed so well is that her statesmen have always been true to the English principle that it was their duty to look after the interests of the English people and nothing else. In the Associated Chambers of Commerce in London, in February last, a question similar to this was brought up, and I will just read to you this description in the *Daily News* of what occurred on that occasion :

“ A motion in favor of such changes in the fiscal arrangements existing between Great Britain, her colonies and dependencies as would increase the trade of the British Empire, was opposed by Mr. Mundella, M.P.—”

Hon. gentlemen are all familiar enough with his name to know that he is a pretty high authority on commercial questions in England; and what did he say?

“ He pointed out that the colonies could not supply us with all our needs. The United States were at the present moment the greatest market for our manufactures; and was it not possible that if we acted in the way suggested by the resolution, the United States would subject us to differential treatment? What would become of us then? We imported silks and tea from China, and were we going to put an increased duty on those articles? It would be cutting our own throats. The suggestion was especially ill-timed, when the United States were in the middle of a controversy regarding free trade. President Cleveland had undoubtedly taken a step in the direction of free trade, and if, or when, it was adopted, and America was made one of the cheapest instead of one of the dearest countries in the world, great advantage would accrue, not only to herself but to the English colonies.”

What was the result of that discussion in that purely commercial body, which is representative of the whole United Kingdom? “ The motion was lost by an overwhelming majority.” No, Sir; the people in the mother land look on this question purely and simply from their own standpoint, considering whether it is going to benefit them, and not in any sense whether it is going to benefit us. Then the

question of differential duties was mooted there, Mr. Muddella did not look to Canada; he looked to the United States, and his fear was that the United States might put on retaliatory duties and injure English trade. Hon. gentlemen know that although we are a portion of the British Empire, and although our flag is the flag of the British Empire, our trade is intimately connected with that of the United States. Sir, by looking after the true interests of Canada, we shall, I believe, best conserve our relations with England and the most outlying portions of the British Empire. I must hope that this motion be not persisted in, or, at all events, that it be not carried.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). As the hour is late, and we have listened to several speeches this evening on this very interesting subject, which has been so ably brought before the House, I do not propose to occupy the attention of hon. gentlemen at any great length. Indeed, the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have rendered it unnecessary, at this stage of the debate, for those who are in favor of the principle of the motion, and the resolution on the motion paper to which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) referred, to elaborate the case. The hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who have successively taken their seat, one apparently from an avowed sympathy with the motion, and the other for reasons best known to himself, have avoided the main question before the House. The hon. gentleman who last spoke took up considerable time in discussing the question of trade relations with the United States, and alluded at considerable length to the question of Imperial federation. Neither of these questions is before the House on the present occasion. The question before the House has nothing to do with the question of Imperial federation. It is true, many of the leagues in Canada, and Canada alone, have favored some question of this kind; but neither the league in Canada nor the league in England has subscribed to the principles in this resolution. Therefore I do not understand why, when this question is important enough, broad enough, and big enough to engage our consideration, such questions as Imperial federation and other questions which have been discussed outside of the House, and are in no way connected with this important trade question, should be brought before the House. I was somewhat sorry, in listening to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat—who poses in this House as a temperance man, and who lectures his brethren sometimes as to what they should do on that subject—to hear him dwell so long on the growth and export of barley in Canada. The main use for barley is for malting purposes, and surely my hon. friend has not receded from the strong position on the temperance question which he has so long occupied. My hon. friend discussed one other point only, and, perhaps, not the most important point, mentioned by the hon. member for North Simcoe, and that was the practicability of this resolution or of the scheme embodied in it. He took issue on that point with the hon. gentleman, who was sanguine that the day was coming when it would be practicable to go to the English Government with such a policy as this, and to endeavor to make trade arrangements for the Empire—not between Canada and the mother country, but between the mother country and all the different colonies of the Empire. I did not understand either the mover of the resolution, or the hon. member for North Simcoe, or the resolution itself, to go so far as to ask that this Government should at once approach the Government of the mother country with this policy. I understood the hon. member for North Simcoe to take an entirely different position in the debate. I understood him to forcibly allude to the different facts occurring every day in England, in order to show that the current of public opinion there was in favor of a trade policy for the British Empire, as distinct from the policy of England with

Mr. FISHER.

the rest of the world. In support of that position, the hon. gentleman was able to urge strong reasons. He was able to point to the unmistakable utterances of a powerful party in England to-day—he was able to point to the utterances of the leaders of that party, and the body of men who constitute it, when they met in solemn conclave at Oxford, in favor of that view. But the trade returns and the consular reports appertaining to the British Empire furnish far wider reasons in support of the position taken by the advocates of this resolution. These reports and returns show unmistakably that, so far from the policy of free trade in the mother country carrying out the views and the opinions of the framers of that policy, who have stood by it for so many years—so far from these gentlemen being able to convince the world that free trade is the proper policy, steadily, day by day, all the nations of the world, all the countries that are the commercial rivals of Great Britain, are going more and more to the other extreme.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). These gentlemen have found the colonies of the Empire forced to adopt a protective policy, and they have found that the foothold of England, once unchallenged in the different markets of the world, foreign as well as colonial, is steadily becoming weaker.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). In a moment I will give the hon. gentleman my authority for making the statement. The statistics to which I have alluded, and to which the House will permit me briefly to refer, fully bear it out. Comparing the position which England holds in the foreign markets to-day with that she held formerly, we find that to the colonies, in 1872, England exported \$320,500,000 worth of goods, while in 1886 she exported to them \$350,000,000 worth, showing a steady increase; and if you take her returns of exports to foreign countries, which formerly were her monopoly, you will find the proportion has decreased. In the last fifty years the imports by Great Britain from the colonies increased from \$75,000,000 to \$405,000,000, and her exports to the colonies increased to about the same extent, from \$75,000,000 to \$375,000,000. Those are important figures, and hon. gentlemen will see their force. They will see by them that this colonial question never entered the minds of English statesmen at the time they adopted their free trade policy, the value of the colonial trade then being as nothing compared with the value of the other trade. No one will seriously controvert that position, and it furnishes an important and powerful reason for the change that is coming over English public opinion. We find, for instance, Sir Robert Stout, the premier of New Zealand, in a very interesting article in the *Nineteenth Century*, written last year, citing as evidence in support of the position I took a short time ago, and which hon. gentlemen opposite challenged, the important fact that in New South Wales, American contractors were able to obtain the contract for building the largest iron bridge ever built there, at a figure \$135,000 below the lowest tender from Great Britain herself. Hon. gentlemen will see from this one sample, that in her own colony and in that iron industry which, with the coal industry, at one time gave England the monopoly of the markets of the world, England can be outbid by a foreign competitor. In face of this evidence, hon. gentlemen ought to hesitate before contradicting the assertion that Great Britain has not in the foreign markets to-day the position she hitherto held. Why do hon. gentlemen opposite try to minimise the undoubtedly grand results that would follow from increased trade between the mother country and her colonies. No man from the Maritime Provinces, I venture to say, would for a moment declare that he would be in favor of frustrating a movement which has in view the increase in commerce not only

between the mother country and the Maritime Provinces but between the different colonies of the British Empire and the Maritime Provinces. We have expended, without demur, in times past, large sums of public money in the endeavor to create a trade between the West Indies and Canada, and hon. gentlemen opposite have always held that the money spent in this view was well spent, and that to open up new channels of trade was an object that should be encouraged. We find these potent facts: that, in the West Indies today, our competitor is not merely the mother country, but we find there, as in the English markets themselves, that the American States are our competitors. They actually buy from us about 700,000 lbs. of dried fish to send to the West Indies. Their trade relations are so complete with that portion of the British Empire, that they do not only their own trade but a part of ours with them. Of course, you can encourage that trade by subsidising steamers, but it, nevertheless, is true that you can encourage and foster it in the way proposed by the resolution now before the House. Not only do the United States send our productions there, but they also send them to Africa, to the extent of \$5,000,000 annually; to Australasia, to the extent of \$10,500,000 annually; and to Great Britain and Ireland, where they meet us as gigantic competitors, they send \$447,000,000 worth of goods annually. The last gentleman who addressed the House, as a practical farmer, as one who is familiar with the trade between the mother country and the Dominion of Canada, mentioned, *en passant*, three articles in which we had a large trade with the mother country—cheese, butter, and I did not catch the other article which he mentioned. Even under present circumstances, I find competing with us in the markets of the old world that country to the south of us which Mr. Gladstone referred to recently as making progress by leaps and bounds, and he predicted that it was possible that it would distance even Great Britain in the near future. We find that, in regard to cheese, we send more to Great Britain than the United States do. But there are a host of things in regard to which they interfere with us. Looking at the trade returns, I find—though I have not had time to look the question up as I would wish to do—and taking the consular reports of the United States and the official documents published in Washington in 1885—the following results:—

	Great Britain Imported.	From United States.	From Canada.
Cattle.....	\$46,661,210	\$17,686,815	\$4,650,595
Sheep and lambs....	12,591,091	157,775	919,495
Bacon and hams....	50,181,630	39,502,605	746,178
Beef.....	14,471,985	13,371,490	4,391
Butter, &c.....	58,869,665	2,811,580	1,423,016
Cheese.....	24,452,000	13,478,520	7,777,675
Fish.....	11,509,830	2,826,540	1,500,000
Wood and timber...	83,876,419	{ (about) 6,000,000 }	13,142,663

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman is simply confirming what I said, that our chief export to England was animals and their products, and that we exported a larger amount in proportion to our population than the United States did.

Mr. TUPPER (Picton). If I misunderstood the hon. gentleman that is another thing, but I do not think he mentioned the article of fish or the article of lumber. At any rate, if the hon. gentleman will look through the trade returns, and I hesitate to weary the House by giving the proof of this at this hour, he will see that we send a considerable number of other articles in the same way. We are sending an appreciable quantity of manufactures, we are sending something of nearly every article, and the whole point is that you cannot judge of the trade which we could do by that which we do at present. Large as our trade has been in the past, you are not to judge what it may be in the future, or to test the merits of this resolution simply by what it has been in the past; but, if we have

been able to do something, in spite of the strong and powerful competitors we have on the south, what can we do if we receive the preference in the different colonial markets? No one will dare to say that our advantages will not be great in that regard. I will not refer to the matter of canned goods and fruit which we export, which are becoming large items of our trade, and which, under any circumstances, we hope to increase year by year. But, in reference to all these matters, the slightest change in the tariff, the smallest amount that could be obtained from the British Government under an arrangement with the different colonies, would start all these industries in the most extraordinary and beneficial manner to Canada. The hon. gentleman spoke of the English merchants having no reason to fear competition in foreign markets, and said that our whole supposition was fallacious, without a careful consideration of the action which England would be sure to take in this matter. If you look over the blue-books published in England as well as those published in the United States, you will see that not only are the manufacturers of the neighboring republic meeting the English manufacturers in colonial markets, but also the German manufacturers to an alarming extent. I could quote from the reports of English and German as well as American consuls, to show that the Germans and Americans are driving the English from the position they once held; but I may summarise these reports by one small quotation from Sir Thomas Brassey's work on "Foreign work and English wages," in which he says:

"Excluded from the principal manufacturing countries by a protectionist policy, it is to the colonies and to the half civilised countries that we must look for new openings for the expansion of our trade."

When English public opinion is looking towards the growing commercial trade between England and the colonies, it is wise for us not to formulate any policy here; the time has not come for that. To make any definite expression of our views now would be unwise, but we should, by an expression of the opinion of Parliament, in an unmistakable manner, show public men in the old country who may help this matter, what our sympathies are, and that we hope the day will come when this will be carried out. I hope that some day the representative men of the Australasian confederation will go to London and meet the representatives of the other co-federated colonies, and arrange a system which will be beneficial to all the colonies, as well as to the mother country itself. In this, there is no attack upon self-government or upon commercial autonomy. It is not necessary to invoke any sentiment in regard to this matter, but there is simply a trade proposition before the House; and I understood the mover of the resolution and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to give no uncertain voice on this question, that this is no time for action, but that it is desirable to tell the distinguished men in Great Britain, men like Mr. Chamberlain—who has given the benefit of his great ability to this subject—that we are ready to meet them, and that there is nothing in the National Policy antagonistic to this matter or to the benefit of the farmers of that country. It is not proposed, as I understand it—and if it is proposed I am against it tooth and nail—to interfere with the vested interests of the country. It is proposed, on the other hand, to give them far more protection than they now have. Whatever other hon. gentlemen have to say upon the question, I, for one, would not go for lowering the duties which are necessary for a fair protection of the manufacturing industries of this country, to the extent of one single farthing. But I think an arrangement can be made; I think we can raise the duties on other goods when the time comes. But, certainly, if there is an unanimous desire throughout the colonies and Great Britain—I mean by unanimous desire, such a one as will induce political action

—I am satisfied that when the time comes, an arrangement can be easily and willingly made by this country to carry out the objects which the mover of this resolution has in view. I promised the House not to deal with the position of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), as far as the question of reciprocity is concerned. It was quite natural that the hon. member for North Simcoe should explain his views as far as they affected the question of commercial union; and I quite admit that my hon. friends opposite who, a year or two ago, might consistently have joined hands with us, as the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) wished to do to-night, in legislating as far as we could towards a consummation of such a policy, are, to a large extent, debarred from it. They wish to throw in their fortunes with the United States, our competitors in nearly all the articles of trade between Great Britain and ourselves. We, on the other hand, who support the substance of the resolution, and the proposition of the hon. member for North Simcoe, desire closer trade relations with the mother country and the colonies which constitute the British Empire.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It does seem to me rather extraordinary that a motion of such importance as this should have been discussed the whole evening without any member of the Government giving to the House the slightest indication of what the views of the Government are upon this question. We are told by the seconder of this motion that it is one of paramount importance, that it is one effecting not merely the future well being of Canada, but one of the utmost consequence to the whole Empire; and yet, after such declaration as that, made by a gentleman who occupies a very prominent place on the front benches of the Ministerial side, not a member of Government, up to this moment, has given to the House the slightest indication of what their views may be upon the subject. Sir, there can be no doubt whatever that this measure is one, if it were adopted, of a revolutionary character. If we are to believe what hon. gentlemen opposite contended on another important proposition that was under the consideration of the House at an earlier period of the Session, we should come to the conclusion that the proposition now before the House would lead to the absolute destruction of everything like self-government in this country. Sir, those hon. gentlemen informed us again and again that anything like absolute free trade between Canada and the United States must ultimately lead to the wiping out of our political institutions, and there can be no doubt whatever that if they were to abandon the policy upon which the Government entered some years ago, and adopt the views expressed in this resolution, an equally great calamity would befall this country. We would have our autonomy wiped out, and we would be absorbed into the government of the United Kingdom. Sir, if there is danger on the one hand, there would be still greater danger on other; and if hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches entertain those views which the exponents of the Government put forward upon another proposition, we can come to but one conclusion with regard to their views as to what would be the political effect of this proposition. Now, an hon. gentleman has made a proposition which would lead to a complete change in the fiscal policy of this country. Are the Government prepared to recommend to this House that change? The Government asked us again and again, what were we to do if we wiped out the 7½ millions that we now derive from the imposition of taxes upon our trade with the United States? I ask them this question: What, under this proposition, are they to do if they wipe out 10 or 12 millions of customs duties which they receive by taxes upon our trade with the United Kingdom? There can be no doubt whatever that if the proposition of the hon. gentleman who moved this motion is carried out—I lay aside the commentary that was read upon

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou)

the proposition by the hon. gentleman who seconded it—there must be an abandonment of those taxes which the Government have imposed on articles produced in the United Kingdom which have hitherto been consumed in this country. Why, Sir, hon. gentlemen do not suppose for one moment that the people of the United Kingdom would, if they were making such an arrangement as is proposed, permit the articles of Canada to come in absolutely free of taxes into the market of the United Kingdom, while those of the United Kingdom coming into Canada would be subject to a very heavy taxation. What do the Government propose, then? We find this proposition moved by one supporter of the Government, seconded by another, and supported in a speech by another gentleman who we are told, is looking with longing eyes, and not without hope to the Treasury benches. Sir, I think it is rather extraordinary, under these circumstances, that the Government should have, up to this moment, failed to indicate to the House what their views are upon the question. Are they in favor of abandoning their National Policy, and of accepting a policy of the federation of the Empire, for that is precisely what this proposition means. The hon. gentleman who seconded the motion told us that this was not quite so explicit as the proposition which he had submitted but that it was really a proposition with the same object and aim in view. And so the hon. gentleman has submitted to the House a proposition which we are led to believe has the support of the Government, proposing to wipe out \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 of customs duty, and establish absolute free trade between Canada and the United Kingdom. Now, the First Minister is in his place, and I put to him the question: If he could not see his way to carry on the Government of this country in abandoning the \$7,000,000 of taxes that we get upon trade with the United States, how is he prepared to carry on the Government of the country and to abandon the \$12,000,000 of taxes that we receive from trade with the United Kingdom? Does the First Minister propose to accept this proposition? Does he attach to it the importance that is attached to it by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who have spoken? Does he subscribe to the doctrine that fair trade is in the air, and that the policy of fair trade at this moment constitutes the policy of the Conservative party in the United Kingdom, that Lord Salisbury is a supporter of that policy in disguise, without the courage of his convictions, and that all those who support him entertain the same views? I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the United Kingdom, their representatives, at all events, have rather a strange way of exhibiting their devotion to this principle. If I remember rightly, but a few weeks ago a vote was taken in the House of Commons upon the subject, and there were 4 supporters to 304 opponents. That, I think, was the way the vote stood. Those hon. gentlemen are proposing to us a proposition that, however favorably it may be received by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches and those behind them, certainly has not been very favorably received by the representatives of the people of the United Kingdom. We are dealing here with questions of practical politics, and I suppose the Government are not prepared to abandon what they call the National Policy unless they see some hope of this new policy being adopted, and the action of the Parliament of the United Kingdom on the question does not indicate a very great disposition to carry it out at a very early day. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in discussing this question not long since in Toronto told us that the theory of a Federal Government was propounded by Lord Durham in 1837, and it was not until 1864 that serious steps were taken with a view to consummating the policy of union which Lord Durham in his report had indicated. And so, the hon. gentleman says, we should not be discouraged. But it is rather an extraordinary proposition to submit to this Parliament,

that we should at this moment disregard our present interests and present necessities and should look to the condition of things thirty or forty years hence, and undertake to exercise a policy of self-denial and act upon lines that are only to lead to conclusion long after we have not only ceased to be members of this House but inhabitants of the world. There is a great deal of force in the observations addressed some years ago to the people by the Rev. Sydney Smith. He said: Gentlemen, so long as you are members of the congregation and occupants of the pews you have the right to decide what shall be done in the parish church, but after you have become occupants of the graveyard, after you have ceased to be here and others have taken your places, you ought to leave them the same privilege of judging what is best in their own interests as you claim for yourself while living. So long as you are masters of the ship you may say that the ship shall sail east or west, but when you have resigned your position and it is placed in charge of other persons, it is for them to say in what direction it shall sail and upon what voyage it shall enter. And so I say that those who occupy the places we now occupy thirty or forty years hence will be the best judges as to what policy shall be adopted in their day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of what ought to be adopted now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not the hon. gentleman's proposition. The hon. gentleman pointed out that Lord Durham in 1837 decided in favor of a union and it was not until 1864 that serious steps were taken to carry it out; but now we have a speech in favor of the principle of federation of the Empire at some period in the remote future, and that some one will then be in favor of giving effect to the policy at this time enunciated. I am not in favor of any such policy. I believe any step in that direction would diminish our power of self-government, it would increase our responsibilities, it would impose serious burdens from which, at the present time, we are relieved, and I am not disposed to sacrifice our present opportunity for practical improvement and our present lines of public policy that are in the interests of the people, in favor of some fancied scheme upon which it is necessary to consult another party which has a paramount interest in the question, especially when there is not the slightest indication of any disposition on their part to adopt the policy we are now marking out for them. The people of the United Kingdom number 37,000,000, and the hon. gentleman proposes that we shall mark out here a policy for those 37,000,000 and tell them what is the best course to adopt at this moment, not with any hope of its being now adopted, but, in order that we may convert them to our views and at some period induce them to accept what he and some other hon. gentlemen believe to be an excellent policy. The hon. gentleman also told the House that the people of Ontario were more prosperous than are the people of the United States to-day. That was a very extraordinary announcement for the hon. gentleman to make. One would suppose it was a statement of which he had been ignorant. It seems to be new to the hon. gentleman, quite as new as the calculation of an eclipse would be to an Indian. But this statement was as true ten years ago as it is to-day. There was a greater difference in 1877 between the relative prosperity of the people of Ontario and of the United States, as a whole, than to-day; and yet the hon. gentleman did not hesitate to declare that the whole country was going to ruin at that time. The present First Minister moved a resolution declaring that the people of this country were leaving it, that people could not get employment, and that if he was returned to power all this would come to an end. It did not come to an end. The people are leaving the country in greater numbers than before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say "Oh, yes;" and statistics show it to be true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is no doubt whatever of the fact.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, every doubt of it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There are at least four times as many people leaving the country every year as there were in 1878. What did the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) tell us to night? The hon. gentleman said that the country is depressed, that trade is depressed, that the condition of the farmers, although better than the condition of the farmers in the United States, was far from satisfactory.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, he did say so; I took down his words.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, he did not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say he did, and the question will be decided by *Hansard* when the speech of the gentleman appears. The First Minister knows that the hon. gentleman went on and said what the price of wheat is to-day, that it was 77½ cents a bushel. Now, the First Minister promised the people that it would never be less than a dollar. He further promised the people that the price of barley should never be less than it was in the United States.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have had better prices.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for North Simcoe, to-night, has said that the farming population was in a depressed condition, but that it was brought about by matters over which the Government could exercise no control. I say we were told the National Policy was intended to prevent that state of things. We were called "flies on the wheel." Why did hon. gentlemen call us by that name? Hon. gentlemen, when in Opposition, promised to stop the emigration of the people and secure for every man good wages for a fair day's work and constant employment, and at the same time fair prices for our agricultural products. Yet what is the statement made by the member for North Simcoe, in support of the resolution to-night? It is that such is not the condition of things, that the agricultural population are in a depressed condition, in an unsatisfactory condition, and that it is necessary to bring about a better state of things than exists. How does the hon. gentleman, and the mover of the resolution, propose to do it? He says: Let us enter into commercial relations with the United Kingdom and other British colonies; let us enter into a compact by which there shall be absolute free trade between the various portions of the British Empire and high tariff against all the rest of the world. That is the proposition of the mover. But does the supporter of that resolution take the same ground? Oh, no; he tells us a different story. He says: That is too high a price to pay for such an arrangement as this, we would not like to have absolute free trade, we have got to consider the condition of the manufacturers to some extent, and the manufacturers have got to make concessions to the farmers. Now, assume at the present time that the manufacturer gets 60 per cent., and he must be content with 53, for the hon. gentleman says: Let us take off 6 or 7 per cent, so as to give the English manufacturer a little advantage in the Canadian market, and for giving him that little advantage the British people will give us absolute free trade and exclude the rest of the world from trading with them. Hon. gentlemen know that this is an absurd proposition. If the English Government and the people of England can be persuaded to act on the principle of free trade, and to tax the rest of the world and establish free trade between England and

Canada and the colonies, it can only be on the principle of absolute free trade between the different portions of the Empire as free as that which exists between the different Provinces of this Dominion. But the hon. gentleman who leads the House will not support such a proposition, and the hon. gentleman who seconded this proposition dare not express his approval of such a proposition as that. The hon. gentleman is in favor of the federation of the Empire under which our autonomy would be sacrificed, he is in favor of a federation of the Empire that would compel us to fight the battles of England against Russia in Central Asia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh !

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hon. gentlemen think this is nonsense. I believe that such a view is nonsense, but nevertheless, it is held by quite a number of his supporters. Here is a gallant general who sits on this side of the House, but who belongs to that side, who assured the people of this city the other evening that Canada absolutely was spoiling for war, in which she would feel all the consequences and mischiefs of war, and under which she would feel the necessity of relying upon the right arm of England for her support, and then from the feelings of gratitude that would be so far carried on that she would be compelled to fight the Zulus in Africa and the Russians in Afghanistan. I notice that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) did not quite fairly state the commercial relations and the trade of England with the United States. He represented the trade of England as declining, that her manufacturers were losing the markets of the world, and that all this was being brought about because other countries had adopted a protective policy. He referred to the fact that the trade of England with the United States was declining. Where is the evidence of that? The hon. gentleman took a year that happened to favor his comparison, but let him take another year. The exports of England to the United States in 1878 were £14,500,000 and in 1886 £26,824,000 sterling; nearly double what they were in 1878. Why did not the hon. gentleman take some other year in which the comparison would not be quite so favorable to his argument?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He took 1885.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And I take 1886 when the trade is nearly £6,000,000 more than in 1885. Why did the hon. gentleman take 1885 and not 1886, for I apprehend he had the statistics before him? Then, when he comes to tell us about the report of the Commission of Enquiry into the depressed state of trade in England why did he read the report of the minority? The hon. gentleman did that, and he did not tell the House that it was a report of the minority.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, he did.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I accept that statement. I did not hear him say so. At all events the whole drift of his speech was supported simply by a selection of evidence that suited the line of argument which he had adopted, and carefully ignoring whatever might tend to establish a different proposition. Then, Sir, if the hon. gentleman had thought as he does that free trade with England, with protection against all the rest of the world is such an advantage, why did he support the statutory offer? The hon. gentleman who leads the Government did not take the same view. The hon. gentleman proposes to establish free trade with the United States upon certain conditions. He never made such a proposition to England and in fact he declared in 1878 that we wanted a policy of retaliation to bring the United States to terms—that we wanted freer trade relations. What did the hon. gentleman do when he succeeded to power? Did he confine his increased taxation to the punishment of the

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

people of the United States? Why, Sir, he applied the punishment to England as well. Does the hon. gentleman think it was a great advantage to this country to buy cheaply as well as to sell dearly? Why is it that he has adopted towards England which puts no tax on our exports the same policy that he does toward the United States where he said retaliation was necessary? The hon. gentleman has not taken the same view as to the importance of free trade with England that he has with regard to free trade with the United States, and yet the hon. gentleman's supporters here to-night state that they are prepared to adopt the other policy. Is the hon. gentleman who leads the Government prepared to adopt this policy? I am satisfied that the right hon. gentleman will not venture to ask the House to support this proposition. I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman will not ask the House to agree to reciprocal free trade between England and Canada. I am rather inclined to think—unless the hon. gentleman's views have undergone another revolution—that he will hardly be found here to support the views of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) on the subject of Imperial Federation. I think that the hon. gentleman has both in England and in this country declared himself against such a proposition; and unless he has had new light—and I have not heard that he has announced views different from those he formerly expressed—I fancy he will not support the proposition of the hon. member who moved this motion or of the hon. member who seconded it. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) told us that the English are driven out of the market of the world by the German competitors. If the hon. gentleman would undertake to read the reports of English consuls, and they are quite accessible, he will find that that is not the case, and so far as it is the case in certain localities it is due to other and different causes. The reports of the English consuls at Rio Janiero, La Plata and other parts of South America, show that the Germans have sent into the various republics of South America commercial travellers who are thoroughly conversant with the Spanish and Portuguese languages and he tells the English manufacturers that unless they send out men who are good linguists they cannot expect to sell goods with the same facilities that the Germans do. What are commercial men in England saying just now? We must establish schools and colleges for men intending to engage in commercial pursuits in all parts of the world where the modern languages will be taught to them? What is the report of the English consul from the capital of Japan? It is that the French and German commercial men there are thoroughly acquainted with the Japanese language. And they have sent their commercial agents all over Japan, while the English have sent men there who can scarcely speak a word of Japanese, and who have to confine themselves to the capital, and he says that unless they adopt the aggressive policy of the Germans and the French they cannot make the same progress in establishing a market for their goods in that country. He says their goods are better and cheaper—there is no doubt about that; but they have not men so well qualified to act on the part of those manufacturing and commercial houses as the French and German houses have. There is not one of the English consuls—and I believe I have read the reports of every one of them throughout the world—who assigns as a reason that the English are inferior as manufacturers and are failing in the race. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman told us that our barley was a necessity to the people of the United States, and that as long as we chose to grow the article, the Americans will have it, no matter what the duty is. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. In 1875, the Americans raised but a very few million bushels of barley. To-day they raise more than five times the quantity they raised twenty years ago; and as every one acquainted with agricultural populations knows, the people in large districts become habituated to run in a certain

routine; they grow certain products, and unless something occurs to induce them to change the order of rotation of crops, and to introduce some new crop, no change will take place; but when the people of the United States began largely to consume malt liquors, and a demand arose for barley, the article began to command a high price, and the Americans began to grow it largely. So that neither on the American side of the line nor on the Canadian side does barley bring as high a price as it did ten years ago, and the Government have found themselves wholly unable to seriously affect the price of that article. Now, I am not going to delay the House by entering into a discussion of this question at any length, because the Government has no more serious idea than we have of accepting the principle laid down in the gentleman's motion. They know better than to accept any such proposition, and that being the case I do not think it is necessary to discuss the subject further.

Gen. LAURIE. I desire to make a personal explanation. If I were an older member of this House, I might have been prepared for the way in which this matter was referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). It appears to me that he rather took the line of drawing a red herring across the track, to carry this discussion to Imperial federation. I do not think Imperial federation is concerned. But with reference to the remark that I am stated to have made, that the people of Canada were spoiling for a war, and that they should be taken to fight the battles of England in Central Asia among the Afghans, or in Africa among the Zulus, I think that is exactly the opposite of what I stated. What I stated was that it was giving a false impression of Imperial federation to say that that was the view of its promoters; but I stated at the same time—and I am satisfied that in this I shall carry the House with me—that there was a strong feeling in Canada in favor of taking part in England's wars when she was in danger. But I certainly pointed out to the meeting I was addressing that it was not a true idea of Imperial federation that our people should be taken against their will to fight the battles of the Empire abroad.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not stand between the House for any length of time and any hon. gentleman who may wish to address it on this subject, but I wish to make a few remarks upon it. Before doing so, however, you will permit me to correct the history of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). He declared that the party of the right hon. gentleman characterised himself and his friends as "flies on the wheel." Why, Sir, they never did anything of the kind. That phrase originated with the hon. member for South Oxford.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; there is the original proprietor of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. DAVIN. I am perfectly correct, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for South Oxford was explaining political economy, and he declared that statesmen were only "flies on the wheel."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is wholly wrong; I did nothing of the kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is quite right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was first used by the First Minister at Halifax. He rightly compared himself to a fly on a wheel.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He used it at Halifax in 1864.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, the flies are not of so much importance; but I distinctly remember the hon. member for South Oxford making a speech, in which he did not credit the Prime Minister or anyone else with making the state-

ment, but declared that statesmen had as much influence in promoting prosperity as "flies on the wheel."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Withdraw.

Mr. DAVIN. I cannot withdraw, because I remember it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, all I can say is that it is a very vinous and after-dinner memory. I have told you distinctly that you are wrong.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I do not think it is at all unparliamentary to say that my memory of a matter like that is one that can be relied on; and my memory, after dinner or before dinner, is probably about as good as that of the hon. member for South Oxford. But, of course, if he is deeply hurt at the suggestion that he could describe himself and his friends as "flies on the wheel," I will, out of consideration for himself and the flies, withdraw the statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no hesitation in saying that the hon. member for South Oxford said so, and I heard him say so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I have no hesitation in saying that the statement just made is utterly without foundation; and if I knew any stronger expression that would not be unparliamentary, I would use it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite ready to use strong unparliamentary language, but he did state so, and if he says he did not, he says what is not true.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not, and the hon. gentleman in saying that I did knows that he is stating a falsehood.

Mr. DAVIN. I will not refer to that, but I will say that I never in all my life felt confident in my memory, and found that I had cause to repent relying on it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But you have withdrawn.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not withdraw. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) is, I see, trying the new role of a humorist; he generally appears in a different role. I will not pay any attention to the hon. gentleman in this role, but will proceed to discuss the question before the House. It is greatly to be regretted that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) should have introduced Imperial federation into this question. This has nothing to do with Imperial federation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh, yes, it has.

Mr. DAVIN. This is the proposal that the Government shall make certain propositions to England; and I venture to say there is not a man on either side of the House who will dare to controvert the statement that if we can get England to discriminate in our favor, it will be of the greatest advantage to us. It does not follow that we need in any way interfere with the protection we have given our manufacturers; it does not follow that our infant industries should, in any way, be imperilled, but we can make proposals to England that will be at once advantageous to England and to us, without in any way imperilling the existence of these industries.

At hon. MEMBER. What are they?

Mr. DAVIN. It is of great value to have introduced this subject here and to have introduced it in England, because England has had very little interest in her colonies, and in Canada up to a very recent period. It is exceedingly

difficult to bring home to a large population, such as that of England, the affairs and the claims of a country separated from her by the "great floods and barriers of creation," to use the language of Edmund Burke. I can see here an illustration of how difficult it is to do that, in the difficulty we have of bringing home to members from the east the exact condition of affairs in the North-West, which is nearer to us than we are to England. But as surely as it is of the greatest importance to Canada that our eastern members and politicians should thoroughly understand the North-West, it is of the greatest importance to England and to the Empire that the people of England should thoroughly understand the claim of her colonies and the advantages that the colonies hold out to her. The other day I was reading the speech of an eminent naval man, who pointed out that England could not, apart from her colonies, defend her mercantile marine. He pointed out that, under the new conditions of naval warfare, England, deprived of her colonies, could not protect her mercantile marine; therefore, apart from any such consideration as that referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell, namely that we might have to be involved in wars and fight battles, which is a mere attempt to discredit a question on which it has no practical bearing, because nobody who takes a sensible view of this question proposes anything of the kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Ask the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) ?

Mr. DAVIN. If we can show the English Government that her colonies are of the greatest advantage to her, then, from our point of view, when we come to what the hon. member for Simcoe, in his closely-reasoned and most instructive speech, called the great market of the world, we see what an advantage is presented by that market to Canada. The hon. member for Bothwell talked as if this proposal was for free trade with England, and the hon. member for Elgin, acting on a similar supposition, said: let us have reciprocity all round. We would then have to go in for direct taxation and free trade with all the world, and the result would be that our manufacturers would despair, and the exodus, which weighs so heavily on the hearts of hon. gentlemen opposite, would be swollen to an enormous extent. There is no proposition here for free trade with England.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is it ?

Mr. DAVIN. There is the proposition that England shall give us an advantage in consideration of our giving her an advantage, as compared with other countries.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is it ?

Mr. DAVIN. Can we not discriminate? Can we not put up a discriminating duty against other countries in favor of England? Is not that possible? Mr. Gladstone was accustomed to say there are three customs. We may remain as we are, or we may adopt the benighted policy which hon. gentlemen opposite advocate, or we may support the suggestion of the mover of this motion and try whether we shall not get advantages in the English market, by discriminating on some articles, say on breadstuffs, in favor of Canada, while we would put a duty on manufactured articles coming from other countries to the extent of 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. over those imposed on the imports of foreign countries.

Mr. LISTER. That is a "dandy" policy.

Mr. DAVIN. I have never studied slang, and I do not know the meaning of "dandy." The only idea I have of "dandy" is as applied to the individual, and I dare say the hon. gentleman fulfils that part well.

Mr. LISTER. No, you are the man.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. DAVIN. This question has been most properly brought before the House to-night, but some of the hon. gentlemen opposite have sought to raise issues that should not have been raised. The hon. member for Bothwell complained that no member of the Government had spoken on this question. If this motion should be carried, no one can doubt that the Government will make proposal to the other colonies and to England, and that a step will be taken towards an understanding of what may be done in this direction. At this late hour I do not propose to say anything further except this, that any one who visits England—and I visited England eight or nine months ago—will find the greatest possible change in the sentiments of the people there; he will find they have made the greatest progress in understanding the colonies and that the fetish of free trade no longer holds dominion over their minds; he will find they are beginning to understand the advantage of taking a different course from that which they took under the inspiration of Manchester and under a complete misconception of the teaching of Adam Smith. I will also give the hon. gentleman a fact that came to my knowledge when I was travelling on the continent. I found that large quantities of ready-made clothes were being sent over to England from Belgium, sent to England where men are supposed to have such an advantage in manufacturing wearing apparel. Can anyone doubt that it would be an advantage to England to preserve that market for her own sons? Then, Sir, I know Coventry. I remember, when I was a boy, driving over to Coventry, before Mr. Gladstone's policy ruined their manufactures, and it was a thriving and a thickly populated town. After I left the university I visited it again, and I found it like a city of the dead, the manufactories closed, and the industries destroyed. By adopting a wiser policy, by adopting fair trade, as my hon. and learned friend has said to-day, and as is set forth in this resolution, England would benefit her own trade, would keep her own markets for her own sons, would practically promote her industries which are now dormant or dead, and would obtain advantages for herself and extend advantages to us.

Mr. McNEILL. As this is a very important question, a question the magnitude and importance of which can scarcely be exaggerated, and as hon. gentlemen opposite have not discussed it at all, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. LAURIER. It is, perhaps, just as well to adopt the motion of my hon. friend, as, unfortunately, the Government do not appear to be prepared to give an opinion on this important question this evening, and, when it comes up again, if it does come up again this Session, we may expect to have the benefit of their views on the subject.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Orders in Council, &c., connected with the resignation of Antoine Audette, Esquire, Postmaster of North Stukely, and with the appointment of his successor.—(Mr. Langelier, Quebec Centre.)

Correspondence between the Corporation of the City of Quebec, or any of its officers, and the Department of Militia, or any of the officers of the same, respecting the supplying, from the waterworks of the said city, of water to the cartridge factory and the drill hall.—(Mr. Langelier, Quebec Centre.)

Copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council, papers and documents respecting the seizure of diamonds and other precious stones effected at Quebec on one David Levi, and the cancelling of the said seizure.—(Mr. Langelier, Quebec Centre.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Department of Railways and Messrs. A. Pion & Co., of Quebec, in relation to a claim for goods damaged on the Intercolonial Railway.—(Mr. Langelier, Quebec Centre.)

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:10 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 1st May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 118) to amend the Weights and Measures Act, as respects the contents of packages of salt. He said: I propose to amend the present Act by providing that every barrel of salt sold or offered for sale in Canada shall weigh 280 lbs.; the weight to be marked on the barrel. When imported in barrels such barrels should have the name of the importer marked thereon, and when packed in Canada the name of the packer shall be on the barrel. It is not proposed to interfere with salt imported in bulk or in sacks, but when small bags of salt are packed in barrels, such barrels shall have the gross weight marked on them.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to call the attention of the House to a gross breach of its privilege. Last night, it will be in the recollection of the House that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) made a speech in which he used this phrase: "You said we were flies on the wheel." I happened to speak later on, and I said that I should like to correct the history of the hon. member for Bothwell. I said that the phrase "flies on the wheel" was not flung across the House at those hon. gentlemen. I said that the phrase "flies on the wheel" was—

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I must say that he cannot make a question of privilege of what passed last night in another debate in which he took part. If he wishes to make a personal explanation, and will keep himself within the limits I have on a previous occasion indicated to the House, that is another thing.

Mr. TAYLOR. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I will put the question. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt that motion?

Mr. DAVIN. I said that the phrase "flies on the wheel" had been used by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Thereupon the hon. member, with that courtesy which distinguishes him, said it was not so.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is still breaking one of the Rules of the House. He is referring to a past debate of this Session.

Mr. HAGGART. If I understand rightly, the hon. member is bringing this up as a breach of privilege, the charge which was flung across the House to him last night, and I think he is perfectly in order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. HAGGART. It was stated that the hon. member had not made a true statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. This incident could have been brought up last night as a question of order, when the veracity of

the hon. member was called into question, but it cannot be taken up as a question of privilege.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If Mr. Speaker would so far kindly consent, it would please me exceedingly that the hon. gentleman should make his statement on the condition that I should have the right of reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be much better to have this dealt with when the debate is resumed, and I do not think it would further the business of the House to refer to that debate again.

Mr. DAVIN. In Manley's case, reported in the Commons Journals on the 10th November, 1620, the conduct of Manley was brought up as a matter of privilege, as I bring this matter up, and in Sheppard's case it was also brought up and was also a case of using language which it was not proper to use.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What year was that?

Mr. DAVIN. I think that was in 1622. Sheppard, for using language not nearly as strong as that of the hon. gentleman, was brought to the Bar of the House on his knees. However, if you decide that I should not go on now, I will not go on at present, but I can give notice, because, in the case of Sir Robert Peel and of Sir Edward Watkin, that course was adopted, so I will give notice in the regular way, and will bring the matter up.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. DAVIN. The Speaker rules that I cannot go on.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Speak to the motion for adjournment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper: "That Mr. Speaker leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means," and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment.

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not follow the example of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) I shall not preface my remarks by stating that the observations that he made to the House were intolerable rubbish. The speech which he delivered is before the House and before the country, and the the House and the country will judge of that speech as they have judged of all the speeches which the hon. gentleman has delivered in this House, speeches which have never yet found a response in the hearts of the people of this country, to sustain him and approve of them. Sir, he excited our sympathies for the people of this country by telling us that he had addressed a hundred thousand of the electors of Ontario. The infliction of those speeches upon the people of Ontario excites our warmest sympathies, except in one respect, that they have resulted in giving to the Government a majority from that Province. He went down to speak to the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, in 1878, and his speeches there resulted in a majority against him and the Government of which he was a member. He has spoken, he says, to one hundred thousand people. One can fancy that speech redelivered and redelivered. I was reminded, Sir, of an American statesman, Mr. Stevenson, who made a humorous speech complaining that President Hayes had not appointed him collector of New Orleans; for, he said, on behalf of the

republican party, he had made 127 speeches, or rather he had delivered one speech 127 times. So, Sir, I presume that the hon. member for South Oxford has repeated the same speech to a hundred thousand voters of Ontario. There is a similarity in all his speeches upon public questions and in all his resolutions every year. They seem to grow a little every year, but as a repetition of what we had last year and a little added. It reminds me of the old legend of "The House that Jack built," the revelations increasing in length a little from every repetition. He has discussed almost every possible question throughout the country. Sometimes we find him dealing with a protective tariff, and the robberies committed by protection; sometimes we find him discussing the gender of political parties. In 1884 we found him at Toronto advocating the independence of Canada, and in 1887 we find him here on the floor of Parliament, and on the hustings, advocating annexation to the United States. It is true, Sir, that the hon. gentleman, in all the speeches he has made in this House, does not openly use the word annexation; but yet the arguments he has used, the assertions that he is making, are in advocacy of annexation to the United States. He startled the House this Session by informing us that he had been reading his Bible, that he had learned from Solomon that it is "In vain to spread the net in the sight of the bird." And so, Mr. Speaker, he covers up the net of annexation, and he talks about reciprocity, but the net is there all the same. He tells us that sentiment follows interest, and he declared that ever since the Loyalists settled in Canada, there has been no year in which it was not the interest of the people of this country to associate themselves and to unite with the people of the United States. He tells us that we owe no debt to England except the debt of forgiveness for the wrongs she has committed against us. And so, Sir, under the guise of unrestricted reciprocity, he throws in sentences and expressions every little while to affect the minds of the people in favor of annexation, which is more dangerous than open discussion of the question, and an open declaration of his views and intentions upon the subject. Sir, he has learned from Solomon that it is in vain to spread the net in the sight of the bird, and he covers it up, but the danger is only the greater:

"The deadliest snakes are those which, twined 'mongst flowers,
Blend their bright coloring with the varied blossoms,
Their fierce eyes glittering like a spangled dewdrop
In all so like what nature has most harmless,
That sportive innocence which dreads no danger is poisoned unawares."

The net was spread, but hidden, and the serpent twined among the flowers and blended its coloring with the blossoms, exhaling its poison all the time. He has been good enough to define his position for our benefit. He took special care to define it for the benefit of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. He declares that his position upon trade questions is to discriminate against England, to turn his back upon the mother country in all commercial transactions, and to favor the United States; and he tells the hon. Finance Minister that if the people of the United States knew that we were determined to discriminate against England, they would hold up both hands for unrestricted reciprocity with us. That he defines as his position, that is his fixed policy, the policy of himself and his party, which he is prepared, he says, to fight out upon every hustings, and in every farm yard in the country. Sir, the hon. gentleman called attention to the fact that my hon. friend the Finance Minister was unable to discover a way to provide for the ordinary wants of the administration of the country. He, however, professed to have all the knowledge necessary, that it was simply a matter of statesmanship, that he had that ability, that patriotism, and that wisdom which were necessary to solve that great problem. Mr. Speaker, it was amusing to see the way in which he directed the attention of his

Mr. McLELAN.

party and the members around him, to note the fact—and he called upon the press of the country to note the fact—that my hon. friend was unable to grapple with this problem, but that he, the hon. member for South Oxford, had the wisdom, the statesmanship and the patriotism requisite to grapple with that question. Let me read what he said:

"I call on my hon. friends to take special note of it, I call on the people of Canada to take special note of it, that the hon. gentleman, by his own words, admits that he and his party are unable to solve or grapple with this problem. I well believe it. There is no doubt whatever that to grapple successfully with the great enterprise to which we have set our hands, requires the greatest prudence and the greatest economy. There is no doubt it requires a knowledge of the first principles on which honest taxation should be based, it requires the greatest wisdom for the welfare of Canada, not for retaining place by grants to combines and trusts and monopolies; it requires the greatest statesmanship and patriotism."

And then he says: I, the member for South Oxford, possess all this wisdom and statesmanship, but I am going to button it up in my pocket and will not let the Finance Minister know anything about it for fear he will steal some of the plums. The wisdom comes to him late and it comes to him suddenly. Why, not only did he announce to us that he had been studying Solomon, but he made a pious ejaculation and wished to heaven we could go back to 1874. With this new-found statesmanship and this new wisdom that has come to him I suppose he wanted to go back to 1874, and from that date to 1879, in order to remedy the errors he had committed and to wipe from our public records the blot which he had placed upon those records by his administration of public affairs during those years. I am not surprised that he should want to go back, that he should pray to heaven that he might be permitted to go back to 1874 and exercise that wisdom and statesmanship for the want of which every industry in this country languished and died, for the want of which he declared himself, as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was about to prove, to have been unable to grapple with public affairs and was but a "fly on the wheel." I understood the hon. gentleman last night denied the paternity of the fly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. McLELAN. The leader of the Government said it was a wasp. We have had proof that there have been a good many bees in the hon. gentleman's bonnet, and this Session there has been a bee of enormous growth that wants to fly unrestricted. Now, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman denies that, permit me to take the figure of a ship used by the Minister of Finance and to say that during that period the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) never touched the tiller, that he allowed the ship to drift helpless upon the tide wherever she might go, that during five years, for the want of that statesmanship, that wisdom and that sagacity which he now claims, he never touched a helm, he never trimmed a sail to catch a favoring breeze, but he left the ship of state drifting helpless, aimless and uncertain as the poet's rudderless ship:

"Asleep in an ocean fog."

Now, however, the hon. gentleman desires to go back to 1874 in order that he may exercise wisdom and statesmanship, that he may make a better record for his party and for his country than there remains for his administration. He claims now that he has all the statesmanship and wisdom necessary to grapple with this problem which was presented by the Minister of Finance, namely: How are you to govern the country without direct taxation? The Minister of Finance referred the hon. gentleman to his statements in 1874 during the time he was Finance Minister, to the declaration that he then made that he was unable to raise any more revenue without imposing direct taxation. The hon. gentleman then denied that he

ever made such a statement. We have here his speeches for two separate years; they are nicely got up, gilt edged, but the policy did not turn out to be of that character. What did the hon. gentleman say when he was Finance Minister, although he now denies it. He said:

"An increase of duty is inevitable, and arises from circumstances over which this Government has no control. I do not think that any greater increase of the tariff than we now suggest would be wise. I think we have gone to the limit beyond which it would be impossible to pass without resorting to direct taxation. It may be that those very expenditures may indirectly help our revenue; but I desire to say to the House that, although I think the country can bear the entire burden we have imposed upon it without any great inconvenience, I do not think that much more taxation could be safely resorted to; nor do I think we should be called upon to consider the question of raising any great amount by direct taxation."

Now the hon. member puts aside the question of direct taxation and stands before this House and declares that he is quite able to solve the problem of sweeping away the entire revenues we derive from our imports from the United States, and nearly all those from our imports from Great Britain, and carry on the administration of the country and provide a revenue without direct taxation. I should like to refer the hon. gentleman to some observations made by his late leader, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) at Malvern, when the question of the reduction of revenue was under discussion. What did his leader say?

"Now, what are our sources of taxation? Direct taxation is at this time out of the question. The reasons I need not discuss. The advantages and disadvantages I need not balance. We are dealing with practical conditions, and no one suggests direct taxation as practicable. There remain in the existing sources, the duties of customs and excise. From the liquor duties we cannot expect further relief. By common consent these are kept as high as the danger of illicit invasion will allow; some think higher. The progress of the Temperance movement will, we all hope, diminish this source of revenue, and when the advocates of total prohibition succeeds those duties will disappear; at any rate the excise will then be 'all smoke.' There remain the duties of customs on other commodities, and the conditions demonstrate the impossibility of diminishing to any large extent this fund. We have no longer a surplus to dispose of; we have a deficit to overcome; and, that done, we have a tremendous yearly charge to overtake. 'Oh, but,' say some Tories, 'you can yet do this and make a free trade or non-political tariff.' The statement is dishonest and absurd."

I want to call the hon. gentleman's special attention to this:

"The statement is dishonest and absurd."

I should like to know whether, if the hon. member for West Durham had been present, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), knowing that that hon. gentleman made the statement that it would be dishonest and absurd, would have risen in the House and said he was quite able to solve this problem and quite able to provide revenues for the country without resorting to direct taxation. One word more upon this point. I have referred to a speech delivered last year by the hon. gentleman, and I find he took a little different course at that time to that which he is taking this Session, for he said that the charges on the revenue are so great that you must always raise a large sum from customs and excise in order to meet them. He goes over the different items: for interest and charges of management, \$10,000,000; sinking fund, at \$6,000,000; subsidies, \$4,182,000; and if you include the Indians, \$25,278,000. Now, Sir, he admits that here are the fixed charges which must be met. Allowing that from excise and miscellaneous sources, we receive enough to meet the controllable expenses of the country, let me tell the hon. gentleman that our entire revenue, exclusive of Great Britain and the United States, from customs, was \$5,851,000. Having free intercourse and no duty from the United States, this would without doubt drop \$5,000,000. The hon. member has told us, in a previous discussion, that although we had entire free trade with the United States, we ought to purchase from England as largely in proportion to our population as the United States does. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) put the amount at \$150,000,000 of purchases from Great Britain. I do not believe

that we would purchase anything near so large an amount, but assuming that we did, that would be \$12,500,000 worth purchased from Great Britain, and it would give us a revenue of two and a half million dollars, or a total of seven and a half million dollars from those sources to meet the \$25,000,000 that the hon. gentleman says are a fixed charge upon us. This would leave a large difference between our revenue and the fixed charges to be otherwise provided for. Allowing that from excise and from the general revenue of the country there would be a surplus of \$2,700,000, there would still be \$15,000,000 that would have to be met, and the hon. gentleman would have a difficult task before him to make this up. I know that the hon. gentleman, if he takes time to consider this subject will come to this conclusion, and if he gives weight to the assertion made by his late leader, that it is dishonest to say otherwise, he will admit that we must raise \$15,000,000 by direct taxation from the people of this country, if the hon. gentleman's proposed scheme is carried into operation. I have been referring to the assertion which was made by his late leader, that any attempt to convince the people of this country that it was impossible to reduce the duties of the country without direct taxation, was dishonest and absurd. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when reference was made to Mr. Blake, challenged us, or rather he contrasted our treatment of the member for West Durham and the member for East York now, with that of old times. Sir, when those hon. gentlemen were here in health, there were always men on this side to measure swords with them but when they became unfit, or rather when they retired from the conflict, we observe the decencies of life which should prevail between one member of this House and another. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) does not follow the example that we set him, and he is not careful of the good name of his late leader. Why, Sir, when the Finance Minister referred to what Mr. Blake had said at Malvern Hill, and that that hon. gentleman stated he had accepted the National Policy—when the Minister of Finance stated that Mr. Blake had given the manufacturers of this country and the farmers of this country to believe, that there would be no disturbance in the policy of protection, except upon the single article of corn meal for the Lower Provinces, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that he knew when Mr. Blake was making this speech what Mr. Blake meant, insinuating that Mr. Blake was deceiving the people of the country on that occasion, deceiving his hearers, deceiving the manufacturers and deceiving the people at large. It ill comes from the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to reflect upon the good name of the hon. the late leader of the Opposition; an hon. gentleman to whom he owes everything, an hon. gentleman who has done more for him than any other man in this country, and to whom he owes his seat in this House. When the hon. gentleman was unable to find a constituency, when driven out of Lennox and again defeated in Wellington, his late leader found him a place in Huron, and when the period had elapsed, and when the people of Huron were giving him intimation that he would have to move on, as a policeman would intimate to a loiterer on a street corner that he has to move on, then Mr. Blake came to his assistance, and implored the party, supplicated the party, begged of the party to provide him a safe seat, and to give one of the "hives" to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I do not know, Sir, whether there is to be another intimation to the hon. member for South Oxford to move on, or whether this is a finally, final safe seat for him. Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to one or two of the assertions made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). That which deserves most attention just now is a charge made against

my hon. friend of having cooked the Public Accounts, so that, in the statement which he delivered to this House, he might show a surplus for the year 1887. The hon. gentleman charged, as a crime against the Minister of Finance, that he had transferred to revenue account the receipts from Dominion lands, whereas, previously, they had been credited to capital account. Why, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows that, under his own administration, he always credited those receipts to revenue account.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And charged likewise.

Mr. McLELAN. And charged likewise; and so do we credit and charge likewise. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Public Accounts, and study them, he will see that whereas he charged only \$80,000 or \$90,000 of receipts from Dominion lands, we have this year charged \$190,000 odd. But he knows that he always took credit for the receipts from Dominion lands, small as they were, and that they were always so treated down to 1881, both by himself and by Sir Leonard Tilley; and after 1881, when we had got this policy in full swing, Sir Leonard Tilley had such large surpluses, amounting to two, three, four, five, six and seven millions a year, that it was unimportant whether these charges were made to the credit of income or capital account. Now, Sir, in 1886, when I had the honor of standing before the House as Finance Minister, dealing with the Public Accounts, I said:

"It will be noticed that I have included in that amount, the receipts from Dominion lands. During the five years that hon. gentlemen opposite held the Government, all the receipts from Dominion lands were taken and counted as part of the revenue, and my hon. friend and predecessor, Sir Leonard Tilley, followed the same course up to 1881, placing these as part of the receipts from consolidated revenue account. From 1881 to 1885, Sir Leonard seems to have placed them to capital account. I suppose the reason will be found in the fact that he had a large surplus each year during that period, and it was immaterial whether they should be placed to capital or to revenue account. But, Sir, I think the House will agree with me that as we have made large expenditures in the North-West in opening up the country by railway, and incurred a large debt for that purpose, as we have made a large expenditure in surveys, in the North-West Mounted Police, in the Indian treaties, incurring large liabilities, it is but right that whatever revenue or return we should have from the lands in the North-West, should be placed to revenue account to meet the interest that we are paying on the expenditures and the sinking fund that we are providing in order to pay off that indebtedness. I think the House will agree with me that we should do that instead of increasing the taxation of the country. Should we receive from the lands in the North-West a larger sum in any one year than would meet the sinking fund we have to provide towards the payment of our indebtedness there, and the interest upon our indebtedness for that expenditure; then it might very well be placed to capital account, but until that point is reached, I think we are justified in placing it as hon. gentlemen opposite did, and as Sir Leonard Tilley did till 1881, to revenue account, and I have therefore proposed for the present and future to deal with it in that manner, calling it and using it as so much revenue, instead of increasing the taxation in order to meet our wants."

That was the proposition that I made to the House and that was agreed to by the House; and although the hon. gentleman was present, and although he knows the custom that had been pursued by himself and Sir Leonard Tilley, yet he now comes down and says that because these are credited to income, there has been a cooking of the accounts. Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman what would be a cooking of the accounts. If Parliament makes a particular grant to be charged to capital or income, and that is sanctioned by Parliament, it would be a cooking of the account to transfer it, contrary to the orders of Parliament, to some other account; and the House will remember that when the hon. gentleman came into office in 1874, and a large sum had been passed by the preceding Parliament to capital account for the purpose, I think, of changing the gauge of the railway, the hon. gentleman, in order to diminish the surplus that Sir Leonard Tilley left behind him, charged this amount, which Parliament had declared should be charged to capital, to income, in order to reduce the surplus. That, Sir, is what may be called cooking the accounts, doing that which Parliament declared should

Mr. McLELAN.

not be done. Now, the hon. gentleman two or three times in his speech, and in all the speeches he has delivered to this House this Session, and I may say in almost any speech of any length which he delivered to this House in any Session, makes the charge against the Government that they have driven many people out of this country. Why, Sir, one is almost amazed at the assertion of the hon. gentleman, when we look back to the period during which he administered the Government of this country, and at the condition of the country during those five years, and when he has under his hand the proof that the people of this country went out during that period of depression by hundreds of thousands, and sought homes, and made a permanent settlement in the adjoining country. I have only to refer the hon. gentleman for an answer to all his assertions that we have driven people out of this country, to the statement made by his late leader in this House, on March 24, 1884. Mr. Blake, speaking of the loss that the Province of Quebec had incurred, said:

"The immigration of French Canadians to the eastern States has, no doubt, assumed alarming proportions, in two respects—first, in the extent of the departure, and secondly, in the character of the exodus. It is proved by the very thorough examination that took place in the year 1882, under the instruction of the Legislature of Massachusetts into the question, that it has only been within the last ten or fifteen years that this immigration has assumed such large proportions in that part of the country. It was only within a much shorter period, five or six years before 1882, that it began to assume the character of a permanent settlement in the country to which these people went."

And if the hon. gentleman will take five or six years from 1882, he will get back to 1876 and 1877, when the hon. gentleman administered the affairs of this country without the remarkable wisdom and statesmanship which he now claims to possess. Now, the hon. gentleman spoke of the meeting of French Canadians in the United States at Lowell. One of the resolutions passed at that gathering of French Canadians recites as follows:—

"Whereas, since the French Canadians have come to this section, they have reached a population of 400,000 in New England, and whereas a large number have become proprietors, paying large taxes, and whereas for the most part the young men propose to make their homes here; Resolved, that we protest against that portion of the report which says that we are a horde of industrial invaders. And whereas we have to live five years in the country before we can become citizens of this glorious republic, and the French Canadians have been here in large numbers but five or six years."

That would bring them to 1876-7, when they reached a population of 400,000, and determined to become permanent residents of the United States, having been driven out of Canada by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. There is other evidence before that Commission of the Legislature to show that the French Canadians went to the States for employment, and that finding employment there, and having no hope of ever being employed in their own country, while hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, they determined to remain in their adopted home. The hon. gentleman has said that we are losing our very best men, the men that statesmen desire to retain in a country. Well, the hon. gentleman has here the proof that 480,000 went out in 1876 and 1877, under his administration, seeking labor in the United States, which his policy denied them at home. I find by the United States census that there were in the United States in 1880, including all these that the hon. gentleman drove out, 36,385 operatives in the cotton mills, 6,096 blacksmiths, 7,581 shoemakers, 3,447 brick and tile makers, 15,036 carpenters and joiners, 5,000 railway employes, 50,000 laborers not specified, 22,000 domestic servants, 21,000 laborers, 2,000 harness and saddle makers. So that the hon. gentleman, by his policy, drove out these men and women to work in the workshops of the United States. Following these there went out 1,379 traders, 1,520 doctors, besides lawyers and clergymen; and in addition to all these, there went out 50,000 farmers to supply the wants of them all. We have changed that policy. We

are seeking to furnish employment to our own people in our own country; we are seeking to keep our own operatives and artisans and agriculturists to supply them at home. The hon. gentleman, before declaiming so loudly against the present Government for having helped the exodus, should consider that, under his own policy, he drove out of the country from one Province 400,000 to 500,000 people, and gave a permanent character to the exodus to the United States. The hon. gentleman complains we are now in a bad position because there has been a grant given to Prince Edward Island last year, and he complained that we had taken in British Columbia, which he urges was entirely premature. I would have thought that, backed up as he is by the little Province of Prince Edward Island, the hon. gentleman would have had a good word to say on behalf of that Province, whatever maledictions he might use against the Province of British Columbia. Then he said that there were great demands upon the Government for bridges across our great rivers and for harbor improvements, &c. Well, the hon. gentleman has given this House to understand that, under any policy he might adopt, there shall be no aid given to public works, either railway bridges or any other public work in the country, should he again assume the reins of power. The hon. gentleman has referred to the controllable expenditure of the country, and has compared, I regret to say, not fairly, the controllable expenditure of Canada with that of Great Britain and the United States. The hon. gentleman seems to take, on all occasions, a special delight in contrasting our condition with that of the United States, always endeavoring to make the contrast appear to our disadvantage. We have had speeches from the hon. gentleman in which he desires connection with the United States, and represents Canada in such a destitute condition that it would be the greatest exercise of charity on the part of the United States, if they would take into their Union such an impoverished country as he represents us to be. But he goes on to make this comparison between the controllable expenditure of this country and that of the United States, and he says:

"You will recollect, Mr. Speaker, that we were told that no economy could be practiced; no substantial economy could be practiced in the affairs of Canada."

Then he refers to his own record from 1874 to 1879, how he cut down the expenses in that period, but he did not tell us how far he came from meeting expenditure with revenue, and what was the deficit. In this comparison he cuts down the controllable expenditure of the United States from \$75,000,000 to \$54,000,000, and builds up the expenditure of Canada in all possible ways. For the purpose of comparison, he puts in our expenditure on Indians, \$1,200,000, and on Mounted Police, \$800,000, or \$2,000,000 together, as a controllable expenditure which could be reduced. The hon. gentleman knows something of the history of the Indians on the other side. He knows that there is always a special grant, a very large sum provided for the maintenance and care of the Indians, and for guarding against their inroads, and he knows something of the enormous cost to that country of the Indian wars that, from time to time, have waged there. There was a return called for in the United States on the 24th January, 1882, showing the cost of the Indian wars for the ten years from 1873 to 1882; and it foots up an amount of \$223,891,264 that the people of the United States have had to pay for Indian wars during the period of ten years. Now that we have provided a large sum for the maintenance of the Indians, and have provided \$800,000 for the maintenance of the Mounted Police to keep them in check and in good behavior, \$2,000,000 in all, the hon. gentleman puts that in the column of controllable expenditures which he says should be reduced. Then he puts in lighthouses, \$600,000. I suppose, under his wise and economical statesmanship, he would put out the lights of

every lighthouse, and save that expenditure. Then there is the protection of the fisheries, \$400,000. My hon. friend near me says that the hon. gentleman would make all things dark. He has been blackening the picture from the time he first entered Parliament until the last speech he has made; he has always been making the blackest possible picture of this country. You may go over this list which the hon. gentleman would compare with the expenditure of the United States and of Great Britain, and he says that we are expending an enormous proportion greater than the expenditure of Great Britain and the United States in matters which are controllable, and, therefore, he says we are enormously extravagant, because that expenditure is \$12,950,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You are getting mixed. That is for Canada.

Mr. McLELAN. I find that he says:

"I find in England, excluding services of education and similar services, and their legal expenditure, I find their civil list amounts to £1,000,000 sterling, their public works, £1,708,000, their civil departments, £2,468,000, with which we have nothing to compare."

He takes that out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are some reporter's errors in one or two lines there, and the hon. gentleman may be deluded by that; but I will tell him, if he likes, what I did say.

Mr. McLELAN. I am glad to find that the hon. gentleman has been misreported, and that there is no necessity for me to refer him to the speech of the Hon. Edward Blake, and especially to that line which is printed in large capital letters, "dishonest and absurd."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman want to know what I did say as to the expenditure? I will tell him, if he likes, as he seems to be very much mixed as to what I did say. He is quoting an erroneous report of my speech.

Mr. McLELAN. I accept the statement that that report is erroneous, and, therefore, there is no necessity to pursue that further, but I say that, if you make a proper comparison with the United States and Great Britain, considering the extent of the country over which we administer the Government, the comparison is not unfavorable to our country. But the hon. gentleman complained that the Finance Minister had not said anything about the Canadian Pacific Railway and the obligations which he says will be thrown upon the country in consequence of that arrangement. The hon. gentleman should have waited until that question was before the House before he made his complaint, and should have heard the explanation which the hon. gentleman will be able to give, the satisfactory explanation that he will give, that there is really no responsibility entailed upon the revenues of the country by the arrangement we have made. Why, the press of the hon. gentleman himself, when the terms were first made public, declared that the arrangement was as favorable as could be expected, and there was really no obligation thrown upon the country. The hon. gentleman comes back to the question of the taxation of the poor man, and he has been there so often and has been striving so long to excite our sympathy on behalf of the farmer and the laboring man, that one would think he was weary of the task he has undertaken. He wants to know what is free and what is untaxed in this country. I tell the hon. gentleman that, in regard to the necessities of life for the laboring man and the farmer, there are more articles untaxed or more lightly taxed than there were under his administration. The hon. gentleman says that we can get old masters free and rough diamonds free, and then he goes on to say, what about sugar? The hon. gentleman makes an enquiry about sugar: "I should like to

ask him, what about sugar?" I am glad that the hon. gentleman is seeking for information. I hardly expected, after the declaration that he had made, that he was able to grapple with this great problem of the taxation of the country, that he would come down to this House and confess his ignorance upon the sugar question. Still, there is no man in this country that should more earnestly seek for information upon the sugar question than the hon. gentleman opposite. That hon. gentleman had a teacher at one time; he had an old master free. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) undertook to give him some instruction at one time on the sugar question, and I supposed that, having that hon. gentleman behind him, he would not have found it necessary to appeal to this side of the House for information on the sugar question. In 1877, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), then supporting the hon. member, delivered himself thus on the Tariff debate:

"There was another point to which attention had been directed, and that was the sugar duties. He ventured to say it was a question regarding which the people might have expected legislation at the hands of the Government. An article of that importance, from which a large amount of revenue was collected, ought to have been more prominently referred to, considering the opportunity the Government had had for collecting information in regard to it."

You will see how the hon. member for Halifax berates the hon. gentleman for not having collected information on the sugar question during recess.

"He was aware that the Government might say they did not feel in a position to try an experiment in the present condition of the revenue."

The hon. gentleman now is ready to try an experiment, to the sacrifice of three-fourths of our customs duties; but, in 1876, in his own budget speech, he says: "It is no time to try experiments;" and the hon. member for Halifax, sitting beside him, says perhaps that was the reason he did not operate. But he says:

"They might have proposed it if they had taken the trouble to consider the information submitted to them."

It seems to me that the senior member for Halifax had been endeavoring to furnish him, and had furnished him, information which he did not even take the trouble to consider upon that question,—

"He thought the sugar interest had not been fairly treated in that respect. Every hon. member in business knew that the Government had laid down a rule that certain articles purchased in the United States could not be introduced in this country."

I will not trouble the House by reading the whole of this speech, but he says:

"If the Government had applied that same principle to sugar, he would not have complained; but the principle applied to the manufacturers had been refused to the sugar refiners. The sugar interest demanded some consideration, because, if some legislation did not speedily take place, he was afraid we were going to lose a large trade with the West Indies. That trade, in the Maritime Provinces, at the present moment, involved from three to four million dollars a year, but the inevitable result of the present policy would be to drive the whole trade to the United States. We sent our vessels with outward cargoes, which were sold in the West Indies, and they were obliged to take the sugar to the United States to have it refined. Cargoes of sugar pass through the Boston refineries, and in twenty-four to thirty-six hours were exported into Canada again, under a bounty of 50 per cent. Such a system could not continue very long. In a short time when the Americans found out that they had destroyed our trade, they would dictate their own terms, and then it would be seen how disastrous the present policy was."

Then he goes on to quote Lord Derby's views upon the same question. So the senior member for Halifax, in 1877, recognised the ignorance of the hon. gentleman upon the sugar question, and sought, as one of the old masters, to give him instruction upon it; but he seems not to have been successful. The hon. gentleman comes down now and says: What about sugar? Well, Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman, first, that we are not taxing sugar now nearly so high as he taxed it from 1874 to 1879.

Mr. McLELAN.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh!

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman says "oh." I have given him some information. It seems that more than one hon. gentleman on that side of the House desires to receive information on the sugar question. In 1878, we imported 109,000,000 lbs. of sugar, and upon that there was paid in duty \$2,783,605. In 1887, we imported 202,466,000 lbs. of sugar, and the duty upon that, nearly double in quantity what it was in 1878, was \$3,245,347.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How much did the refiners get?

Mr. McLELAN. Well, you go down and ask the poor man, ask every man how much he paid for his sugar from 1874 to 1879, and how much he paid during the year 1887, and he will tell you that there is a very perceptible difference in favor of the present period. Now, Sir, if we had imported at the same rate of duty last year that we did in 1878, the duty would have amounted to \$5,003,476, or an increase of \$1,758,127. Therefore, if we had the same rate of duty upon sugar last year that we did in 1878, we would have received \$1,758,127 more of duty. Then there is the article of tea. If we had taxed it as the hon. gentleman taxed it, there would have been another million of revenue. But, Sir, I am sure he amused the House and he amused the country with the calculation he made as to the amount of taxation upon the poor man's family in consequence of this iniquitous tariff. He commences with the sugar question, and he tells us that the mechanic, the laboring man, who only earns \$400 a year, consumes two lbs. of sugar a day, or for a family of five, 730 lbs. of sugar, or for a large family about half a ton.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You had better read what I said, then you will not fall into such a blunder.

Mr. McLELAN. I will read what he said:

"I have made a sort of rough average of the amount of taxation paid in Canada by an ordinary mechanic receiving that income, and having a wife and three or four children. I find that such a family will consume 2 lbs. of sugar a day."

Two lbs. of sugar a day, 365 days in a year, for a family of four, half a pound a day to each one, 180 lbs. of sugar. Why, Sir, the average consumption of sugar in the Dominion of Canada for a family, on the average, rich or poor, is only about 40 lbs., and the hon. gentleman would, in his kindness, give to this poor man 180 lbs. of sugar, in order to swell up that \$48 a year of taxation upon the poor man. But this is not the limit of his generosity to the poor man. He says that down in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, after he had imposed \$48 duty upon the poor man for sugar, dried fruits, and all these other luxuries, he says that in St. John, and I suppose in all the Maritime Provinces, they pay \$8 or \$10 a head more for their flour. Why, Sir, \$10 a head would give the poor man twenty barrels of flour. His late leader, Mr. Blake, went down to the Maritime Provinces with the poor man's shirt, containing nine yards, and the hon. gentleman, to outdo him, goes down to the Maritime Provinces with 180 lbs. of sugar for the poor man, and 20 barrels of flour for a family. Why, Sir, that is four barrels apiece. We are about a million people in the Maritime Provinces, and according to the hon. gentleman the Province of Ontario supplies us with about 4,000,000 barrels of flour. Good for the Province of Ontario. But, Mr. Speaker, the reality is, so far as I can make the calculation, that there are only about a million barrels of flour going down from the Province of Ontario to the three lower Provinces. What is the use of following these calculations any further? \$48 and \$50 a head for every head of a family, represents \$50,000,000 of customs revenue. I suppose my hon. friend the Finance Minister will be very glad to get so much revenue in order to wipe out the deficits which the hon. gentleman incurred from 1874 to 1879. Then he goes to the west. He is not

so generous there. He tells the poor man that he is taxed on iron, and he puts it as if the iron duty on pig and bar iron enters the soul of every poor man in the North-West. By his calculations, a man in Manitoba who builds a house requires over two tons of iron. He says he requires \$86 worth, which would be equal to two tons and a quarter. The hon. gentleman's mind must have been running on Dakota, that country of cyclones and tornadoes, where the people have to secure their houses and provide for their safety. I remember, when I was down in Nova Scotia, meeting the wife of one of my constituents who had gone to Dakota. She was visiting there, and in reply to questions she said she disliked the cyclones or tornadoes. She was asked what they did when tornadoes came. She replied that they built a cellar in which to go. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) evidently thought that the houses had to be iron fastened to meet tornadoes such as they had in Dakota. Then there was a ton and a half of iron for the barn, and so on. I am afraid, if I had not promised not to call the hon. gentleman's speech intolerable rubbish, I would now feel compelled to say that it was rubbish to talk to intelligent farmers, mechanics and laborers as to the taxes imposed on a family consuming 730 lbs. of sugar and 20 barrels of flour, and requiring two tons of iron to secure the house and one and a-half tons of iron to secure the barn. What intolerable rubbish. But the hon. gentleman said that this tariff would destroy the export trade, and he says that his friend Mr. Paterson had time and again referred to it. His friend Mr. Paterson had a little story that we have never disturbed. In 1878 the Norwegians had a craze for buying old ships, and they bought \$1,250,000 worth of old ships, and that was placed in the returns as exports, by which the returns for 1878 were increased, so that Mr. Paterson has been able to make a favorable comparison with 1886 and 1887; and I suppose in a short time we shall have the same old ships trotted out again to do duty on this occasion. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) also stated there had been a great reduction in the volume of trade. On every point to which the hon. gentleman refers his own record stands as condemnation of the words he utters, and it is no wonder he wishes to go back to 1874 to wipe out the record for that period. Let me trouble the House with a reference to our trade, and I will only refer to that with the United States. I go back as far as 1854, and I had some papers prepared some time ago, by the statistical officer of the Customs Department, of the values of the imports from the United States of articles enumerated in the Reciprocity Treaty, from 1855 to 1886 inclusive. The total value in those twelve years was \$520,278,650. In the next twelve years, from 1867 to 1878 inclusive, the value had run up, not decreased, as has been stated time and time again by hon. gentlemen opposite, to \$837,589,194. If you take the next twelve years, allowing for the three years at the same rate as the nine years that have passed, the value of trade with the United States will reach \$1,000,000,000. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite have been all the time declaring that our trade had dropped away to almost nothing, and that we should obtain unrestricted reciprocity with the United States in order that it might increase by leaps and bounds. We should be pretty well content with our trade, considering we are supplying so largely our own people, as is evidenced by the importation of raw material for manufactures. We ought to be content, moreover, with our trade, especially when we contrast it with that of the great country which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) wishes us to join. In 1887 the total value of imports to the United States was \$752,000,000, exports \$725,000,000, total \$1,477,000,000, which, for 60,000,000 of people, gave \$24.63 per head. The value of Canadian imports was \$112,000,000, exports

\$89,000,000, total \$201,000,000, giving \$40.48 per head. While the *per capita* trade of the United States was \$24.63, that of Canada last year was \$40.48. If the hon. gentleman will reduce the number of our inhabitants from 4,800,000, as he wishes to do, and place it at 4,600,000, that will give a total value of \$44 per head; so I think we should be content with the progress we are making, and the manner in which we are progressing. The hon. member for South Oxford says that all we have to do is to obtain unrestricted reciprocity with the United States and our export trade will go forward by leaps and bounds. The hon. gentleman has not pointed out the articles that we can export to the United States in order to build up that great trade, nor can he, unless there are included exports of articles through the United States to the old country that now go by the St. Lawrence and are shipped from our own ports. The hon. gentleman has told us that we have two customers, the United States and Great Britain. As was shown by the Finance Minister, and by almost every hon. gentleman who spoke on this side of the House, the articles of which we have a large surplus for export are the very articles of which the United States has a large surplus to export. I have before used an illustration of this, and it has been used elsewhere, but I may perhaps be permitted to give it on this occasion. The measure of the United States in the staple articles, of animals and their products, and of grain of all kinds is full and overflowing. Our cup is also full and overflowing; and is it common sense that, their cup being full and overflowing, we should, as the best outlet for our overflow, pour our surplus into theirs, already overflowing? No, we should pursue that course we have followed in the past, of facilitating exports direct to the mother country, the land that requires them. We should by all possible means cheapen the cost of transportation to the sea in order to benefit our agriculturists. But the hon. gentleman says: There are the great cities of the United States, New York, Chicago and Boston, all of which are ready to take the products of our farmers. The hon. gentleman did not tell us there were American farmers all around those cities, in closer proximity than are our people. He tells us that it is unwise to build up our own cities, and that we are building up Toronto, Montreal, Halifax and Quebec at the expense of the rural population. The hon. gentleman would strike down every industry in those cities and tell the farmers that they may send their products to the United States. He ought to have told them, however, that one city within their reach does more to increase the value of their lands than a hundred cities many miles distant from them. There is an article in *Scribner's Statistical Record* which I want to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to. It is respecting the value of farms; and he said a good deal here about the value of lands, and tried to make out apparently that the value of lands in Ontario had decreased. I do not think it is worth while to discuss the question as to whether Mr. Blue or the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is the more accurate in his figures, but the fact remains that in the North-West during the period which he refers to there have been sales of \$20,000,000 worth of land, a large portion of which has been paid in cash either to the Government or the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The following is the quotation which I wish to refer to:

"The gross value of farms is greatest in Ohio; New York follows, then Illinois, and Pennsylvania. The value per acre ranges highest in the densely populated States of the North Atlantic group, gradually decreasing westward throughout the Northern Central group. Southward, the value decreases greatly, the lands of the cotton States barely averaging five dollars per acre with the improvements.

"The highest value per acre accompanies the densest population, and the greatest relative importance of manufactures and other industries. In other words, the greater the proportional number of inhabitants dependent upon other industries than agriculture, the greater the value of agricultural property consequent, of course, upon the higher prices resulting from the greater demand for farm products, and their

more complete utilization. Much that is waste in a sparsely settled agricultural region, has a commercial value in cities and towns. Straw, burned as of no value in one place, sells readily where population is denser."

The hon. gentleman will see, and the country will see, that by his striking down the manufacturing industries of the Dominion; by his being willing to sweep them out entirely with one blow, he would do more to depreciate the value of lands in this country, by driving away all the artisans, and mechanics, and laborers, and those who purchase the farmers' products, than has ever been done. The hon. gentleman perhaps will deny that he wants to give over the manufacturers. We have been told in this House this Session, that it is useless to have upon the Statute-book an offer of reciprocity in natural products in the present state of the country. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says: You have not the right bait on your hook; and another hon. member says: It is only playing with the question to make this offer. But, Sir, they are going to bribe the Americans by giving over to them all the manufacturing industries of this country, and as the bait is not sufficient the hon. member for Norfolk says: We will bait the hook with the manufacturer, we will give you free access to our markets; and if the Americans cannot see that they will take the entire manufacturing industries of the country there would be no inducement for them to accept his challenge. The hon. member for South Oxford wanted to shut down all the manufacturing industries of the country, but he made one exception. If you turn to that resolution of the hon. gentleman you will find this one exception, and that is that all the manufacturing industries of the country were to be swept away except the distilleries. He exempts the excise duties; he protects the manufacturer and distiller of ardent spirits and beer, in the country. The man who spins cotton, the man who smelts iron, and the man who digs coal and performs all the other duties of life necessary for the production of articles may, be sacrificed, but the man who distills ardent spirits and makes whiskey and beer must be protected. Why, Sir, a short time previously, when the Dominion Alliance was in session here, the hon. gentleman advocated that we ought to amend the Temperance Act in order to have prohibition, but now he comes forward with this resolution which would protect the distillers of whiskey and the manufacturers of beer; and those are the only manufacturers that he proposes to protect in the whole land. Mr. Speaker, I have only one or two more points to refer to. The hon. gentleman was good enough to quote, in answer to the Minister of Finance, some remarks from President Cleveland, and in those remarks President Cleveland is advocating free trade. He is advocating a reduction of duties in order to reduce the price of goods. The hon. gentleman wants free trade with the United States. He wants our articles admitted free, our lumber, our barley, and so forth, and at the same time he furnishes a proof to the House that that freedom will reduce the price. Now, Mr. Speaker, he has given in evidence that in those articles that they require the people of the United States pay the duty on the articles which they receive from Canada. The hon. gentleman concludes by referring to the debt, and he says the debt has grown to enormous proportions and that we have nothing to show for it, except assets so unprofitable that they cost about a million of dollars to take care of. Well, Sir, I have not looked over the list of assets lately, but I dare say there are some assets there for which the hon. gentleman is responsible, and there are some of our assets that I do not think we expend much money for taking care of. I do not see anything in the Public Accounts for taking care of the locks at Fort Francis, and I do not see anything charged for taking care of the Neebing Hotel and a great many other things that the hon. gentleman is responsible for. When the hon. gentleman talks of the increase of the public indebtedness of this

Mr. McLELAN.

country and of our having no assets for it, I suppose he refers to his own deficits from 1875 to 1879-90, amounting in all to about \$7,900,000, for which he is responsible. I suppose he includes in our indebtedness for which we have no assets, the four and a half millions discounts, which he lost upon the bonds which he sold in Great Britain. I did expect, Sir, that an ex-Finance Minister, standing up here and representing a Government that had increased the public indebtedness at the rate of about \$8,000,000 a year for five years, and had comparatively nothing to show for it, would have been a little more careful in speaking of the public indebtedness. Why, Sir this Government is able to show good assets for all its expenses. It may be that some of our public works, such as our canals and our railroads, on which we have expended large sums of money, are not worked at such rates as to yield large profits, as is the case in some other countries. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Australian colonies—and he has sometimes referred to them to show that some of their public works are productive—he will find that the railroad charges there are equal to a tax of about \$10 a head on the people of the country. If we worked our railroads and canals at similar high rates of charges, we should have a large income from them; but the policy we have been pursuing is to cheapen the rates of transportation to the seaboard to the farmers of the west, in order that they may compete with the farmers of the United States in the markets of the world. Now, Sir, without detaining the House at greater length, I may just say that if the rules of this House permitted me to move an amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford, I should be very glad to do it, and I would do it, Sir, in this form:

That during five years, from 1874 to 1879, the present member for South Oxford, Sir Richard Cartwright, was, as Finance Minister, mainly responsible for the fiscal policy and administration of Canada. That previous to this, and from the date of Confederation, the Public Accounts show, each and every year, a surplus amounting in all to \$11,075,063.39.

That the condition of the country when handed over to the member for South Oxford, as Finance Minister in the Reform Administration, was such that in the first year and before the effects of the change were fully felt there was a further surplus of \$935,644, making the total surpluses \$12,010,707.

That thereafter and for every year for which he arranged the tariff and expenditure, there was, notwithstanding he materially increased the taxation on general goods and levied duties on tea and coffee, a deficit, as also in the following year (the country not having recovered from the effects of his policy) amounting to \$7,970,181.27.

That when the effects of the National Policy were felt upon the business of the country, the Public Accounts again show a surplus, continuous down to the latest, 1887, except in the years affected by the North-West troubles, making a grand total surplus of \$30,375,382.

That the net debt of Canada, on the 30th June, 1887, was, as shown by the Public Accounts. \$227,313,911

From which, if we deduct the amount allowed to the Provinces to cover their indebtedness and to provide revenue..... 106,472,934

There remain..... \$120,841,877

As the net debt incurred by the Federal Government for Dominion purposes, accounted for as follows:—

Intercolonial Railway and extension	\$ 33,335,971
Canadian Pacific Railway	61,760,755
Purchase of Canadian Pacific Railway lands	10,198,529
Deficits occurring from the policy of Sir Richard Cartwright	7,970,181
Losses on his several loans.....	4,500,000
Purchase from Hudson Bay Company of North-West, and organisation of territory.....	2,920,000

Thus making a total of..... \$120,685,457

That it appears that the total indebtedness incurred by the Dominion for federal purposes is covered by the purchase of the North-West, the construction of the great national highway from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific, and the deficits arising from the policy of the member for South Oxford, and the losses or discounts on the loans he negotiated; whilst under the administration of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, for fifteen years, the ordinary revenues have met the general wants of the country, and permitted a large expenditure on public buildings, harbor improvements, and aid to railways, as well as to meet expenses of the troubles in the North-West.

That in this latter period as well as in the former, under Sir John A. Macdonald, the country has made great advances, as shown by a comparison of some of the returns of 1878-79, with those of 1887:—

BANK AND DOMINION NOTES IN CIRCULATION.

1879..... \$23,881,324
1887..... 45,502,987

An increase in 8 years of..... \$ 16,621,663

1879.

Deposits in chartered banks..... \$63,635,932
“ savings and loan companies..... 9,426,148
“ Government savings banks..... 14,702,715

\$87,764,795

1887.

Deposits in chartered banks..... \$107,154,483
“ savings and loan companies..... 17,712,885
“ Government savings banks 50,944,785

\$175,812,153

An increase in 8 years of..... \$88,047,358

Mr. MULLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It appears to me that the hon. Minister is adopting an indirect mode of reading a speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot see that the rule would apply in this instance.

Mr. McLELAN—

That the money order system of the post office has grown from \$6,788,723 in 1879, to \$10,328,934 in 1887, an increase of \$3,540,261; whilst the correspondence through the post office (the best possible test of commercial activity) in the same period, has risen from 50,840,000 letters and post cards in 1879, to 90,650,000 in 1887.

That the agriculturists have benefited in having the supply of an increased home market, as shown by the fact that the value of grain imported has fallen, in the period already referred to (1879-1887) from \$9,882,315, to \$3,630,247, a considerable portion of the latter amount representing Indian corn for distillation; whilst the importations of all articles of food and drink which

In 1879 amounted to..... \$26,640,728

In 1887 amounted only to..... 13,107,286

Showing a reduction of..... \$13,533,442
and a corresponding increase of expenditure among our farmers.

That our agriculturists have not only supplied this largely increased home market, but have also maintained a large export trade in grains, and, in addition, increased the exports of animals and their products from \$14,100,604 in 1879, to \$24,246,937 in 1887.

That the miles of railway in operation in 1887, and the movement in freight and passengers thereby, are nearly double what they were in 1879, whilst the traffic by water has also largely increased.

That the enormous increase of business as shown by the foregoing comparisons, has been conducted on a more healthy basis than that of the period from 1874 to 1879, during which the business failures were, in each and every year, greater in amount than the entire revenues of the country, averaging \$28,627,000, whilst in the subsequent period the average has been \$11,574,330.

That notwithstanding the expenditure in the completion of a great interprovincial highway from ocean to ocean, and numerous other works, all tending to develop the country by promoting internal trade and intercourse, and cheapening transport of agricultural products to the seaboard, the taxation levied on the country in the last fiscal year, in which every obligation was met, has only averaged an increase of three quarters of one per cent. per year a head in customs and excise over 1876, under the taxation imposed by Sir Richard Cartwright in customs, excise and stamps.

That whilst the credit of Canada has never suffered as did that of the United States for a period of years—the value of \$100 currency being, at one time (July, 1864) only \$38 00 in gold—nor as did that of Great Britain during the closing years of the last and the opening ones of the present century, yet it suffered so much in the hands of the member for South Oxford that the unguaranteed bonds sold by him in 1874 and 1876, amounting to \$31,633,333, netted him only \$28,064,770, while, under a changed policy and the improved condition of our credit thence resulting, these same bonds now command a premium of from 13 to 15 per cent., or, in round numbers, \$8,000,000 more than the member for South Oxford sold them at.

That eminent statistical authorities—such as Sir John Gorst, Under Secretary for India—after elaborate investigation have declared that amongst the countries of the world, Canada stands third in respect to her ability to secure investors in her funds, only paying six pence per cent. more than the United States and £1 is. 3d. per cent. less than France; whilst the *London Economist*, in an elaborate presentation of British investments in the colonies shows that the external burdens paid of Australia were 3½ times those of Canada.

That, with this high standing, maintained until the maturity of our outstanding bonds, there will be no difficulty in placing upon the market other loans for their redemption at such a reduced rate of interest as will be practically equivalent to an extinction of at least \$50,000,000 of the country's indebtedness.”

That this House views with just pride and gratification this high position which the Dominion of Canada has attained, as well as the extremely rapid progress it has made since the adoption of the policy of protection to home industries, and would impress upon the Government the duty it owes to the country, to all farmers, day-laborers, mechanics, artisans and factory operatives, to guard that policy from the machinations of those who are seeking, under the name of unrestricted reciprocity, to give over to the Americans the entire manufacturing industries of Canada, except that of intoxicants, and to impose a burdensome and relentless system of direct taxation upon the people.

That is the amendment to the amendment which I would desire to place before the House, if the rules permitted. But I would not desire to do so because of any need on the part of the Government to receive instructions as to the performance of their duty of protecting the industries of the people. The Government received the mandate of the people, in 1878, to protect our home industries. The voice of 1882 repeated that mandate, and the people's command given in 1887 was that we should continue our policy of protection. This Government will discharge the high duty imposed on it by the people of this country, by doing what lies in our power to protect our industries, to give employment to our people, and to develop the great resources with which this country is blessed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I rise for the purpose of suggesting to the House that, at this late period of the Session, we should reach the question at as early a moment as possible. The hon. member for South Oxford gave a very elaborate review of the financial statement which I considered it my duty to lay before the House. My hon. friend the Postmaster General has replied to that speech, and thus the views of both sides are, I consider, very fairly and fully before the country. I hope, therefore, that at this late period of the Session the House will be disposed to allow the debate to rest there, and that we will at once be enabled to reach a division that will show the views of every hon. gentleman in this House, and then proceed with the business of the Session.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. the Finance Minister, has certainly paid a very great compliment to my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), by the request he has just made. The hon. gentleman, having an army of clerks at his disposal, knowing precisely the line of argument he had to take, and the tables he required, and having every facility at his disposal for the preparation of these tables, gave to the House an elaborate speech on the Budget. My hon. friend from South Oxford had to rise in reply as soon as the hon. gentleman took his seat; and he was of course at the disadvantage of having to answer a line of argument which he could not have been aware beforehand would be taken, and to tables which were new to him and to the House. My hon. friend has been followed to-day by the late Finance Minister (Mr. McLelan) in a speech of about two hours in length—a speech in reply to my hon. friend, which he had some days to prepare—and after the delivery of that speech, the hon. the Finance Minister (Sir Charles Tupper) has risen in his place, and by the request he has made has declared to the House that he considers the speech delivered by the hon. member for South Oxford a speech equal in weight and importance to the combined efforts of his colleague, the ex-Finance Minister and himself. I have every confidence in the correctness of the position the hon. gentleman has taken, and I therefore do not intend troubling the House at any great length. I had some intention, considering that the hon. the First Minister the other night was kind enough to adjourn the House at a very early hour at the request of the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. McLelan) who desired to have from Friday

night last until to-day to prepare a statement, or procure some one to prepare it, in reply to the speech of my hon. friend—I had some slight intention of asking the hon. the First Minister whether he should not grant me a similar favor and adjourn the House now, in order that I might have time to consider the amendment of the hon. the Postmaster General, which is ten times as long as that of my hon. friend from South Oxford. But the First Minister will no doubt agree with me that while the Postmaster General's amendment exceeds ten times the length of that of the hon. member for South Oxford, it contains only one-tenth of the sense of the latter, and, therefore, will not require so much time on my part to prepare a reply to it. The hon. the Postmaster General is of a poetic and a visionary turn of mind. He gave us to-day to understand, as he did in a celebrated financial speech of two years ago, that he has seen visions and dreamt dreams. To-day, however, his visions have taken the shape of snakes and blossoms, and he has seen snakes hidden in the blossoms. The last time he addressed us he saw blossoms without snakes; he saw blossoms, and wedding parties, and cradles, and babies, that would grow up and pay the taxes. We are delighted always to hear of the visions which the hon. gentleman sees, and when he is in dreamland he is certainly much more interesting than when he undertakes to descend to the plain world of facts and figures. Then he is apt to be confused, but he is to be forgiven, because it would require a man of much larger mental calibre than the hon. gentleman to do that which he undertakes to do; but, if he does undertake that task, he ought to show a little modesty, and then he would not render himself a subject for the remarks, a little severe or a little sarcastic, of those who may happen to follow him. What did the hon. gentleman tell us when he was alluding to the speech of my hon. friend? He alluded to a remark which was interjected when the Finance Minister was referring to the time during which my hon. friend occupied the position of Minister of Finance, and said that he would like to go back to 1874, and he said he supposed he would like to go back there to rectify the errors he had made, which I suppose meant to wipe out the deficit which occurred during that period. Was it not a piece of assurance on the part of the hon. gentleman to refer to the state of the finances at that time? If he remembers the state of the finances under his own administration, is it not a piece of assurance for him to talk about deficits? Can he venture to refer to deficits under the administration of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) with a tariff of 17½ per cent., and compare that with his tariff, ranging on an average to 22½ per cent., when he himself as Finance Minister had to come down to the House and confess to a deficit of two and a quarter millions in one year, and afterwards to a deficit which he expected would turn out, and which did as a matter of fact turn out, to be one of \$6,000,000; that is, that he had in one year a deficit amounting to more than the deficits of the combined years of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). But he found it necessary to bring that question before the House and to suggest that my hon. friend would like to go back to 1874 in order to remedy the errors which he made when he administered the finances of this country. I think the less they say about deficits the better. Then the hon. gentleman tells us, and he seemed to think it was a very weighty argument, and he attempted to be very funny and to be very sarcastic in reference to my hon. friend from South Oxford, in pointing to the fact that he had represented different constituencies at different times. I do not know that that is any discredit to that hon. gentleman, but, on the contrary, I think it shows that he is appreciated in every part of this country. I have never thought it necessary to find fault with the change of constituencies on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. If was found neces-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

sary in the case of the hon. the First Minister to change his constituency, and that is no reflection upon him, but rather a compliment paid to the worth in which he is held in the different Provinces of the Dominion, when it was found that a seat could be obtained for him on the Pacific coast. Any of us may lose his seat, and I know that, under the pressure which hon. gentlemen have been good enough to put me to I have had enough work to hold mine. Of course, I do not think that my position or my attainments would warrant another seat being found for me, as it was for the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); but, when I find that seats can be provided for prominent politicians, I think it is rather a testimony given by the people of the country that they recognise that there is great worth in the gentlemen for whom they make place, that it is recognised on all hands, and that it is not simply in the interest of any particular riding, but in the interest of this great Dominion of ours, that certain individuals should have a seat in the House. But I will ask the hon. gentleman who took his seat just now, who attempts in a side way to cast ridicule on my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), because he has represented different constituencies, if he thinks the adoption of such means as the late election trial in Colchester showed were adopted there, would not secure election in almost any county. I do not think that the record in that case is of such a nature that it need be referred to very much, or that the hon. gentleman need speak of the permanence of seats of hon. members on either side of this House. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the statement made by my hon. friend as to the extraordinary exodus of our citizens to the neighboring republic. He admitted the fact of the exodus, but he attempted to show how it came about, and he was not aware that he proved that it was only after the introduction of the National Policy, these States of the Union obtained such an influx of Canadians. That exodus has increased, as his statement showed, and has been intensified, as has been demonstrated on the floor of Parliament, Session after Session, and never refuted successfully by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not wish to thresh that subject out again, but I will remind the hon. gentleman that the figures which have been used by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) are based on reliable data supplied by the officers of the Government themselves. That is the case also in regard to the lamentable failure of the Government's policy in the North-West, and the hon. gentleman may remember that the First Minister himself expected that we would have had this year 400,000 or 500,000 souls there, whereas we had scarcely 108,000. In the Province of Manitoba, according to the calculation of the First Minister, we should have had last year 45,000 or 50,000 people going into that Province, but the records show that we only added to the population about 7,000. With these records before us, and with the census which was taken in 1885 and 1886, I think it is well for those hon. gentlemen to leave that part of the speech of my hon. friend alone, because it is unrefuted unless they can change the statements which have been given to the country. Then, the hon. gentleman referred to the question of taxation, and he waxed very witty, or thought he waxed very witty, as to the amount of sugar consumed by the people of this country. He referred to the statement in the *Hansard*, and my hon. friend asked him to read the context. He professed to do so, and members on the other side cheered him. The member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is correctly reported in the official debates with one exception. It is stated that the amount of sugar consumed per head of a family is 2 lbs. a day, and that the taxation is \$5 per annum. If the hon. gentleman had any knowledge at all of finance, or if he were willing to bring that knowledge to bear on this point, he would know that, when the hon.

member for South Oxford had stated that the amount of taxation that would come from each head of a family on the article of sugar would be \$5 per annum, the amount of 2 lbs. per day must be wrong, that it must be and error either on the part of the *Hansard* reporter or in the printing office. What the hon. member for South Oxford said was not that the amount consumed was 2 lbs. per day for each family, but 200 lbs of sugar per annum, and that upon that the taxes would be \$5. If the hon. gentleman understood figures, if he could grasp the simplest arithmetical problem, he would see that there must have been a mistake in the calculation of the amount of sugar consumed. Where is the laughter of hon. gentlemen now? They laughed at an error made by the *Hansard* reporter or in the printing office; they laughed at the fact that the taxes on that amount of 2 lbs. a day for each family would be \$5 per annum, but I challenge that hon. gentleman or any hon. gentleman to show that a family of four or five persons do not pay that amount of taxes on their sugar in the course of the year. It is estimated that each person consumes 40 lbs. of sugar per annum. That, with five in a family, would be 200 lbs. The hon. gentleman knows that 2½ cents a pound, at least, is taken out of the people for every pound of sugar that is consumed. Why do not hon. gentlemen laugh now? The question was not the amount of sugar which was consumed, but the amount of taxes which was paid, and that was stated by my hon. friend to be \$5 per annum, and was so reported in the *Hansard*. I challenge the hon. gentleman to show that it was any less. I need not follow him through his further statement, when he attempted to be funny again in reference to the cost of houses and barns. He ridicules the idea. Perhaps so, to hear these hon. gentlemen opposite talk as they often do talk, about the poor man not paying any taxes. This is the way they talk, and they go on to legislate in order that the poor man may escape taxes, they make him live the life of a pauper. If he settles in the North-West they do not allow him the conveniences that a settler ought to have. Sir, the figures are there, and let them worry over them as they see fit.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He thinks they use wooden pegs.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose he would not have them use iron eave spouts on their houses, but nail a couple of boards together and in that way run the water off. That would be good enough for settlers in the North-West. Of course, what are settlers in the North-West for, in the estimation of hon. gentlemen opposite, except to pay taxes, any way, and build up the Canadian Pacific Railway? Then he goes on and he calls me by name, asking to be excused for having done so. I readily grant it. He says I have stated in the House that our export trade of manufactures had diminished. He says his answer to that is to be found in this fact that when Norwegians came over to Nova Scotia they used to buy the old ships and enter these in the Trade and Navigation Returns and now they do not do that, and so that accounted for the decrease of exports. The hon. member for Halifax tells me that he is not cognisant of any Norwegians having bought any old ships about Nova Scotia, but of course that is a matter that the hon. gentlemen may know themselves. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that if he means to say that that wholly explains all the decrease in the exports of manufactured goods, I think he will find that he is entirely mistaken. Let him look through the list and see the manufactured articles, the export of which is being killed off by the National Policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. I know that. I live in a city where a large export trade had been done in a certain line, whereas they are driven out to-day under the taxation of hon. gentlemen opposite, and withholding the drawback that

they pledged themselves, as a Government, to give that trade, and it is now about destroyed. And, Sir, that firm to-day are the most ardent advocates of a policy of unrestricted reciprocity that will give them access to the markets of the United States, not only where they may have a chance to sell, but where they can buy the raw material entering into their manufactures as cheaply as the American manufacturers can buy, with whom they have to fight in Brazil, in Australia, in Hungary, Chili, and other countries I could mention. Then he thought he was making one point against my hon. friend, because he said the resolution he had offered was a proposition to wipe out the manufacturers of this country, and it was to save the distillers. Very well, that might do for a little clap trap upon the public hustings, with a not too intelligent audience before you, but one would rather wonder to see a gentleman who has occupied the position of Finance Minister, and who may, for aught I know, be called upon to fill that position again, indulging in that kind of thing, in the Canadian House of Commons, in the presence of the people's representatives. Why, Sir, can he not comprehend that resolution? To save the distillers! Why, the very reason he has asked that they be left out is for the purpose of taxing them, not for the purpose of protecting them at all; it is that they may be taxed, not that they may be protected, not that they may be saved. Well, now, I think I have gone over all the points except those that are recited in his amendment—I cannot remember all that was in it. I cannot be expected, of course, to take up all those points and allude to them, as it would be impossible to remember all that the hon. gentleman said. But I think he had some reference to his deficit, and some boasting with reference to the surpluses that they had had. It is true they had a surplus, but that surplus was just so much more money taken out of the pockets of the people of this country, that ought to have been left in them. It was just so much money taken from them in order to encourage a reckless Government and an extravagant Government in going on to more recklessness and more extravagance. I do not see the reason for boasting, it sounds bad now, inasmuch as the hon. member for South Oxford showed, that unless there had been a peculiar arrangement of accounts, differing from the arrangement of accounts during some years past, the hon. gentleman would have had to confess to a deficit this year, which he has, by the process described by my hon. friend, converted into a nominal surplus, as he calls it. He stands with it now staring him in the face, and I think he was almost honest enough to admit that in the years 1888-89, he would probably be called upon, even with the enormous rate of taxation now burdening this country, to face a deficit of a million dollars. Now, I am reminded that the hon. member touched on the price of sugar. Well, Sir, that was remarkable—the statement of the hon. gentleman with reference to the duties, that the people are not taxed so much now because less duty is paid on sugar than was paid under the old tariff. The hon. gentleman knows that under the arrangement of his tariff, sugar comes into this country in a raw state at a very low figure, while before, it came in refined, a large portion paying this duty, and of course, the price being higher, there was a larger revenue from it. But hon. gentlemen opposite cannot claim that the people of Canada are getting their sugar as cheap now, under the tariff as arranged by the hon. gentlemen opposite, as they could get sugar under a tariff arranged similarly to that in force when my hon. friend from South Oxford was Finance Minister. Sir, I make bold to say, after due consideration on this subject, that I believe the sugar duties could be so arranged as to leave a protection to the refiners, and give to the people of this country their sugar at as low a figure as they get it now,

and next year put a million dollars extra into the treasury to wipe out their expected deficit; and if they will go on the lines followed by the hon. member for South Oxford,—I do not say follow them absolutely, but base an arrangement on those lines,—I will venture to say that they will accomplish that result. And they will accomplish more than that. They will do away with the necessity of that commission that is sitting to ascertain the operation of this sugar combine and trust that the wholesale men, and other men engaged in the sugar trade, have entered into; they will find a remedy for this in a moment, and avoid the necessity of spending \$6,000 or \$7,000 in order to find out a remedy for the evil. If we, as manufacturers, are taking advantage of the tariff, to take more out of the people than we ought to—I say we, because I am a manufacturer myself—if that be true it is the bounden duty of the Government to reduce the taxation and take away our power of doing so. That sugar duty could be arranged by one stroke of a Finance Minister's pen so as to deal successfully with this difficulty, and at once put an end to this combine, and we would do no injury to the wholesale merchants scattered throughout the country. Sir, I believe they have gone into this combine in order to help themselves, yet I will venture to say that to-day they would rather have the privilege they had during the time my hon. friend was in office, of going to markets of the world and buying their sugar and standing their chance of making their profits on it—they would rather do that than to risk the profits they have now after they have entered into their combines, tied down, as they are, to the demands of the refiners, that can be made arbitrarily, and from which they cannot release themselves. Sir, I give that to the hon. gentleman with reference to this sugar duty.

Mr. GUILLET. Is not the hon. gentleman himself a member of combines?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am a member of an association, if the hon. gentleman wants to know, and, Sir, I do not feel that I am doing any wrong to the country. I hold this, that if I am in an association that is taking any advantage of the public, by means of this tariff, hon. gentlemen opposite are recreant to their duty if they do not wipe out the protection under which we are enabled to do it. That is the hon. gentleman's answer. He will find me frank in stating the position that I am in, and, Sir, I do not claim that I am wrong. I only state this as a personal explanation. I suppose the hon. gentleman can find out all about it, if he likes to, and he is welcome to it. If there is anything wrong in the position I am in, I would like to know it, for if I thought so I would get out of it. But if the hon. gentleman thinks that I am taking an advantage of the tariff, it is his bounden duty to urge upon the Government that which will cure the evil. Wipe out your protection, and open the markets of the world to the people, and you will manage it very successfully. With respect to the manufacture in which I am engaged the difference between the cost of the raw material and the price of the manufactured article does not give any great amount of protection, and the manufacturers are met with the competition of the world, as I hold should be the case in regard to sugar and all other articles consumed by the people, and in regard to which they are taxed to an exorbitant amount. I proceed to notice a few statements made by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech. I notice that the tables he gave seem to be pretty fairly prepared, and for them I presume he assumes responsibility; I do not desire to criticise them, as they have already been criticised by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I wish to leave them in that position. I simply wish to re-enforce the statements made by that hon. gentleman that the rate of taxation imposed upon the people is excessive, that the hon. gentleman has added enor-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

mously last year to that taxation in the form of iron duties, that he has also changed the duties on sugar so that the treasury received something like three-quarters of a million extra in taxes from the people. The Finance Minister was honest enough to admit that with all the increased taxation there is in Canada to-day depression in trade, that the progress of the country has been checked, and to that checking of progress and dulness of trade he attributed the loss of revenue that has taken place and the probability of a deficit. I was a little amused at the hon. gentleman. He is of a happy turn of mind, he is of a cheerful spirit when on the Treasury benches, but when in Opposition he has a long face and deplores and grumbles about the position of the country. When seated on the Treasury benches, however, he feels that everything is all right. He took a glance through the country and saw, what we all very much regret, a failure of crops in Ontario, which is a very serious matter for the whole country; yet he extracted consolation even out of that thought. He said that after all the short crop in Ontario was a blessing in disguise because it would prevent over importation. The short crop in Ontario is a blessing because the people are too poor to buy the goods they bought before. I have sometimes wondered how a large and kind hearted gentleman such as he is could heap burdens upon the country without having twinges of conscience; but the explanation is here. What the short crop did by impoverishing the people and making them less able to buy goods, which was in the hon. gentleman's opinion a blessing in disguise, the Finance Minister accomplished by making them poor through excessive taxation, thereby conferring a blessing in disguise on the people without their knowing it. That is the explanation of the hon. gentleman's conduct, and we can now understand that he is not so hard-hearted as we otherwise might think he is. I pass on to notice the increase in the national debt. It must be alarming to the people of the Dominion to contemplate a net debt of \$228,000,000. I am told, although I have not seen the notice myself, that the Finance Minister has given notice of a resolution asking power to effect a further loan of \$25,000,000. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) pointed out very clearly the large expenditures we shall have to meet in the near future, the great augmentation of the net debt that is taking place, and that the time has arrived when if we cannot reach the ears of the Government, we should reach the ears of the people and lead them to put a stop to the further accumulation of debt in the interests of the well-being of this country. The Finance Minister while admitting that there was somewhat of a depression to-day, went on to point out that there were some directions in which there was light, and that our trade was increasing in some quarters. While there was a poor crop in Ontario he said there was a good crop in Manitoba and the North-West, and I very much rejoice in that fact. The hon. gentleman also said there was a great increase in the West India trade, and in order to prove that statement he gave the House some statistics. I wish to call attention to those figures, because I am unable to reconcile them with those I find in the public documents. The hon. gentleman said, at page 1085 of *Hansard*:

"I find that in 1878 the total value of the imports entered for consumption from all the West Indies was \$1,181,728; and in 1886 it had increased to \$3,249,642."

He gave those figures as showing a gratifying increase in the West India trade, a trade which the Government prided themselves on developing. The figures quoted by the hon. gentleman show an increase in the years mentioned of \$2,067,914. But I desire to ask the Minister of Finance why he gave statistics for the year 1886 and not those for 1887. Surely when we take statistics of either private or public business we want them for the present year and not far

last year. The hon. gentleman should have made his speech last year—he is a year late. I will give the figures for 1887 instead of 1886, which in all fairness the hon. gentleman was bound to have done, if he wished the people to thoroughly understand the question. I find by the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1887 that the value of imports entered for home consumption from the West Indies in 1878 was \$1,033,849; 1887, \$1,942,182, so that the increase in the West Indies import trade, during those nine years, was only \$908,333, but the Finance Minister, by selecting 1886, led the country to understand that the trade had increased by over \$2,000,000. The hon. gentleman further said:

“As regards the whole trade, both imports and exports, I find that in 1878 the total value of these amounted to \$4,689,473, in 1886 to \$5,553,892.”

The Finance Minister thus gave the House to understand that the total trade, exports and imports, had increased by the value of \$864,419. What are the facts? If he had dealt frankly with the House and had given us, as he was bound to give us, the figures for 1887, in reference to this matter, as disclosed by Table No. 4, of the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the total value of the imports to the West Indies in 1878 amounted to \$4,397,996, and in 1887, \$4,017,593. Thus, Sir, instead of there being an increase in the total trade with the West Indies, as would appear by the figures given us by the Minister of Finance, there was a positive decrease in the total trade with the West Indies of \$380,403. I think I am justified in bringing that fact before the notice of the Finance Minister, and in asking him to explain how it was that in making his financial statement to this House and pretending to show the progress we in Canada were making that he should have gone back to 1886 and overlooked the figures for 1887 which must have been before him? The hon. the Finance Minister was pleased to say that in addition to developing our West India trade we were also developing our interprovincial trade, and he gave us figures to show the increase of traffic over the Intercolonial Railway, and pointed to that as an evidence of increased provincial trade. I say here, as I said not long ago from my seat in this House, that the hon. gentleman would not delight more than I would delight if it were possible for us, in a business way, to increase our interprovincial trade. I said on a previous occasion, and I do not hesitate to say it now, that I believe the Minister of Finance is the founder of the National Policy, and has the honor of being its founder, if there be any honor in it. I believe that one of the objects of the National Policy, was as had been told us, if possible to develop an interprovincial trade. He saw the necessity, if we could not develop a foreign trade, to promote a trade between ourselves. I would rejoice with him if his figures could be taken as indicating that between Springhill, Cape Breton and Pictou, there could be a legitimate interprovincial trade, but I felt constrained to interject a question to the Finance Minister, which he was kind enough to answer at the time. I did not wish to disconcert him during the progress of his speech, but I asked him if he had a comparative statement of the expenditure and receipts during this period on the Intercolonial Railway. He said he had not, but that he considered it was a matter of very small importance—I think those were his words—in consideration of the vast benefits that would flow to this country from the encouragement of an interprovincial trade. Still, Sir, I can scarcely agree with him on that point. I ask the Finance Minister this question: Can you not develop an interprovincial trade to a much greater extent than at the present time, provided you run your Intercolonial Railway for nothing; provided you carry and lay down in the Maritime Provinces flour for nothing. Then our friends from the Maritime Provinces would buy all their flour from us, and they would not import any American

flour and pay taxes upon it as they do to-day. If you bring the Springhill mines and the Pictou and Cape Breton mines and lay their products down in my city, free of cost to me, then I will purchase those products, or let you bring them over your railway, as far as it comes, free of cost, and then, Sir, I might be found using them, and that may develop the trade. But where would be the saving to the country? Why, Sir, you would be paying out of the pockets of the people of the country the expenses to run your road. We can only rejoice in a development of trade and commerce when that commerce is brought about legitimately, and when it is not brought at the expense of taxes that are taken out of the pockets of the people to pay for losses incurred in other directions.

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

After Recess.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to have been able to conclude my remarks before the House rose at six o'clock, but I found there were a few points I desired to touch upon, having reference more particularly to some of the statements that were made by the Minister of Finance in the speech he delivered to this House. I have discussed what I conceive to be the effect of the sugar duties, and of our trade in that direction, and I would propose now for a short time to consider the effect of the iron duties that were proposed by the Finance Minister last Session and from which he predicted such grand results would flow. The question of the great blessings to be derived in this country from the imposition of duties upon iron has been often pictured to us. As long ago as 1882 it was brought positively before our minds and the hon. Minister of Finance, Sir Leonard Tilley, told us that the reason that Parliament was prematurely dissolved was to give the people an opportunity of pronouncing whether the National Policy was the settled policy of the people of this country or not. He told us that he was in a position to say that if the people would endorse that policy in 1882, that he knew of millions of capital that was waiting ready to be invested in the manufacture of iron in this country. The First Minister, in speeches delivered throughout the country in various places, notably in the city of Toronto in 1882, during the general election, stated that to his own knowledge such was the case. I will not trouble you with long quotations but I will just read you in a few sentences what he said upon one occasion:

“I tell you—and this is not a matter of supposition but of certainty and knowledge on my part—that there are millions of dollars waiting to be invested in Canada; millions in England and large sums in the United States waiting to come to Canada, waiting to be invested in every kind of industry, in mines and in manufactures of every kind, but the capitalists say: Your Opposition say that your policy is only the result of a temporary madness on the part of the people in Canada in 1878 because times were bad then and that it will be reversed at the next election.”

He pointed out, Sir, in continuing, what the result would be if the people supported his Government and said that those millions of dollars were waiting to develop our iron industry if they did so. Nearly six years have elapsed since then, and I would ask those gentlemen, who spoke of their own knowledge, of their own certainty, not on supposition at all as they declared; whether those millions of dollars have been invested? The Government have been sustained in that election, the Government have been sustained in an election since then, and I ask where are those millions of dollars that were to have been invested? But last Session the hon. the Finance Minister told us that they had found out that this blessed policy of theirs that was to build up—that was so complete, and perfect, and harmonious in all its parts, and that was working such wonders in this land, had

one serious fault. They had discovered that the iron duties were arranged on a wrong basis and that this was the serious trouble in this much belauded National Policy, that was the model of perfection itself. He applied the remedy; he asked Parliament to give an increase of taxes on iron and that this would remedy the trouble. We had him prophesying what would be the effect of this change. He said: Allow the imposition of those duties on iron and you will find blast furnaces springing up in those places immediately. I am no prophet, he said, and no son of a prophet, but I venture to say that there will be found very great prosperity in this country as a result of that policy. May I ask the hon. Finance Minister to-night, a year after the imposition of those duties, when we should have some promise of the fulfilment of his prophesies, whether he can point to any instances that prove that he was a true prophet on that occasion? Although he disclaimed to be a prophet or the son of a prophet, he was a prophet, Sir, but of a certain kind. Now, the Book from which he took that quotation tells us about a class of prophets who existed in other times and in another nation. They were prophets of a people who were steeped in iniquity, who wished to continue in their perverse ways, who did not wish to be disturbed, and who said: "Prophecy unto us smooth things, and they prophesied them." I think the hon. gentleman might be classed among those prophets. I would not like to apply to him the term applied to them, that of being false prophets; but he seemed to be ready to do what they did, and to prophecy unto us smooth things. Let the public debt be heaped up, say they; let the taxes be increased on the people, let there be a shrinkage in our trade, let us draw closer the lines and restrict our commercial intercourse with other nations, let us cripple our industries and our resources; we are at ease in our beds; do not talk about the accumulation of the debt; do not talk about bad times; do not talk about men being out of work or about people leaving the country; do not disturb us in our slumbers; they say: Prophecy unto us smooth things; and the hon. gentleman does so. Now, I would ask the hon. gentleman to-night to point out some of the proofs of his prophesies. Where are the blast furnaces which he said were to be brought into existence? I should like to know if there has been one brought into existence. I would like to ask my hon. friend from Carleton N. B., (Mr. Hule) whether that blast furnace in his county, whose fires were damped some years ago, has had them relighted. I would like to ask, where are the blast furnaces at Cobourg, at Weller's Bay, at Kingston, and at other places where the hon. Finance Minister said they were going to spring up? He said, there is only one thing in addition to these iron duties that we require in order to have blast furnaces established at all these points, and that is, to have the duty taken off anthracite coal. A year ago that was done and yet there are no blast furnaces at Cobourg, at Weller's Bay, or at Kingston, I have looked around the country, and I have failed to discover that any great stimulus has been given to the industry, while the iron duties imposed at that time have borne down heavily on the agricultural classes. The hon. Finance Minister told us that certain factories had increased their output. I will not challenge all the statements he made, but I will refer to a sample of them. I am not blaming the Finance Minister, who I believe was misled, but I blame the gentlemen who gave him the information. He told us that a wood screw factory was being erected in Hamilton that was not employing, but—the language was very guarded—to be capable of employing 400 hands. I think I am correct in what I am about to say, but I shall be very happy to be corrected if I am wrong. He told us that that was a new industry; but my impression is that that wood screw factory, that was to be capable of employing 400 hands as the effect of these iron duties, is the same factory that was located in

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

the town of Dundas, five miles distant from Hamilton, for years and years, and was only removed to Hamilton.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. For twenty years.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Long before the National Policy was thought of, that factory was in existence in Dundas, and as a matter of convenience, as a better shipping point I suppose, it was removed to Hamilton. I think I am correct in that statement; if I am not, the hon. Finance Minister will correct me.

Mr. BROWN. I should like to correct the hon. gentleman, if I am in order. The hon. gentleman is correct to some extent, that the screw factory, a small concern, had been in existence in Dundas for some time, and did remove its machinery to Hamilton. But this establishment which has been organised in Hamilton is eight or ten times the size of the one that was in Dundas, and its creation is entirely a result of the tariff that was adopted at the last Session; and had that tariff not been adopted that large factory would not have been erected in the city of Hamilton or anywhere else. It is entirely due to the tariff adopted last Session that that large establishment is now in successful operation, giving employment to some 400 or 500 hands.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Perhaps I may be permitted to a word of explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for South Brant has the floor.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As these hon. gentlemen live in the town of Dundas, and are conversant with all the circumstances, I am quite willing that they should state the facts, because I would be glad to know whether this is a new industry or not, and to what extent it has benefited by the iron duties.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will lead to four or five explanations of the same kind, and I think it would be better, and expedite business, if the hon. member proceeded with his speech.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. May I call your attention to the fact that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) chose to intervene and interrupt my hon. friend, and thereby induced this reply. Now, he ought not to have been allowed to speak, or else I think the hon. member for Wentworth should be allowed to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would have stopped him at once, but the hon. member for Brant seemed to be willing to have that interference.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He is willing that the hon. member for Wentworth should speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; but if we go on in that way, we shall have four or five speaking on the same subject.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The reason I was willing to give way was that the hon. member for Wentworth represents Dundas. I do not represent it, but I know all the facts, and I would just say—

Mr. SPEAKER. I would interrupt the hon. gentleman. These statements will very well come after the hon. member for South Brant has concluded his speech.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, I think the House is pretty well seized of the fact. At any rate, the hon. Finance Minister has been misled as to this being a new industry, started under the stimulating influence of the tariff, and it is possible that the gentleman who gave the explanation is the same one who gave the information to the hon. Finance Minister, and it would be natural that he should wish to make the best of the case. These cases which are given of

manufacturers sending in their own statements about their output being so much greater than before, and all that kind of thing, really do not prove anything. We are capable of using business arguments, and determining for ourselves as business men what the effect would be; and to speak of an increased number of hands in my factory or your factory or anybody else's, proves nothing in an argument of this kind. It is quite possible that there might be, in these cases, something such as there is in the city of Toronto. If you consider the manufacturing industries located there, and say, in such a year, only a few years ago, there were only so many factories in existence, but to-day there are so many, hon. gentlemen would say they are the effect of the National Policy. Some of the factories are not the effect of the National Policy, but were in existence years before the imposition of the National Policy, and were simply transferred from one city to another. Cases of that kind continually offer themselves; and they were thus transferred, not under the stimulating influence of his National Policy but of the bonuses offered by rival towns. For instance, I need refer, as an illustration of this statement, to the offer made lately of a bonus of \$30,000 by the town of St. Mary's to a factory in Paris, to induce the proprietors of that factory to remove their establishment to St. Mary's; and should that offer be accepted, no doubt some hon. gentleman opposite will claim the establishment of that enterprise in the latter town as due solely to the National Policy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, but I would like to ask him whether the National Policy and the bonuses had not something to do with each other? Does he think the bonuses would have been given but for the National Policy?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I will answer the hon. gentleman. I believe that in that particular case, the effect of his tariff has not been to stimulate that industry to that extent, as I was able to show when the reciprocity debate was before the House; I gave the testimony of the manufacturers in that line given before the committee of this House in 1876, in which they declared that the increase in the tariff would be injurious instead of beneficial to them. But the National Policy has had this effect, that manufactories have been transferred, by means of the bonuses, from one place to another; and I tell the hon. gentleman further, that one other effect of the National Policy has been this: Whether that effect has been good or bad I will not stop now to argue, but one effect has been to concentrate numerous small establishments into a few large ones. Take, for instance, the large boot and shoe manufacturers. You will find that they employ a large number of hands, but how does that come about? Is it that there are so many more men employed making boots and shoes than formerly? I think you will agree with me that there are not, but you will find that where formerly boot and shoe makers were widely distributed and employed men in their own shops—each boot and shoe maker employing in his own shop, in his own town or village, several apprentices—to-day the large factories have absorbed these smaller institutions, and the men who were formerly employed in smaller shops now have to turn to something else or to go into the large factories. You cannot say, therefore, that these factories are the effect of the National Policy, but you must trace them directly to the combining of the small shops into large factories. I have always made these statements with the reservation that I am willing to be corrected if wrong, and I make them to-day under the same reservation. But I have asked, time and again, hon. gentlemen to point to me a single manufacturing industry now in existence in this country, that was not in existence years before the National Policy came into effect at all.

Mr. HESSON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must allow the hon. member for South Brant to proceed with his speech.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. member for Wentworth was not allowed to interrupt, and, as a matter of course, the hon. member for North Perth must not object to the same rule being applied to him.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would have been quite willing to allow the hon. gentleman to interrupt, but as I do not intend to occupy the time of the House long, he will have the perfect right to rise after I have finished, and enumerate the numerous industries which have been started after the National Policy, that he knows of. I have doubted that there are any, but, if hon. gentlemen opposite say there are any, I have asked them frequently to name them. That there are more factories to-day in existence, more woollen mills, more cotton mills, and more factories of that kind, I do not deny.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But can it be expected that the country is to go on increasing in population, and hon. gentlemen opposite will surely not urge that we have not increased somewhat, though at a slower pace than we should have increased—and that there should not, in the natural order of progress, be also an increase in these different kinds of manufactories? But in order that hon. gentlemen opposite may establish the claim they urge on behalf of the National Policy, they must prove that industries are to-day in existence in Canada which were not in existence before the National Policy was adopted. Sir, the great manufacturing industries of this country were in existence years before these hon. gentlemen attained the Treasury benches the second time. Years before that, the manufactures of Canada were exhibited at the Centennial Exhibition of Philadelphia and challenged there the admiration of the world; and as the result of the display our Canadian manufacturers there made and which attracted the attention of the people of Australia and Europe, a foreign trade sprung up in those industries which still continues, and I believe a larger trade would have been promoted between Canada and the outside world had not these manufacturers been restricted and burdened by the imposition of the National Policy. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to point to a new industry which has been brought into existence by the National Policy. Take the census of 1871, take the census of 1881, or take any tables you may know of, of a later date, and point to me any new industry started since the National Policy. I will not deny that you may find some, but I venture to say that the lines will be very few and very difficult to name. I was told once by a gentleman, when I put this question on the public platform, that there was a pin factory started in Galt and that such a factory was unknown in Canada before the adoption of the National Policy. I accepted his statement, but I was corrected afterwards by a gentleman who stated that years before the National Policy came into force there was a pin factory in existence somewhere else in Canada. Another gentleman stated that the electro-plate business was brought into existence in Hamilton by the National Policy. I was not able to contradict that statement, but my impression is that there was one established in Canada before the adoption of our protective tariff. Therefore, these glorious prophecies, those grand, proud swelling words, which are uttered by Ministers and their supporters, are mere sound and fury, and carry no argument, unless those gentlemen are able to point to the case of any new industries which have been started into existence by our National Policy. Let these hon. gentlemen look over our census of 1871, and they will find that all these various industries about which we now hear so much, were in existence in this country then and prospering. I wish just to refer briefly to a statement that was

made by the Finance Minister, and which afforded me some pleasure. I was pleased to hear him state that while he imposed an additional duty of \$2.44 per ton on pig iron the price had only increased \$1.25 per ton and he argued from that that the manufacturer in Canada had not availed himself of the full amount of duty, but that the foreign manufacturer in order to get his goods in Canada had to lower his prices. I think the facts hardly bear out that statement. I have not got access to the papers from which the hon. gentleman quoted. He selected the months of December and February, but I thought it would be as good a test as any, and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me in this to take the figures from the *London Economist*. These figures are pretty reliable as a rule, and taking their quotations on pig iron for the month of March, 1888, and the corresponding month of March, 1887, they show the following exports from Great Britain to British North America:—In March, 1887, the export was 1,252 tons of pig iron, valued at \$3,492; in 1888 the export was 1,877 tons, or a larger import in 1888 after the imposition of the high duties, and the value of that was \$4,639. I call the attention of the Finance Minister to this fact, that in 1887, that iron averaged per ton, as quoted in the *London Economist*, £2 15s. 9½d., while the quotations of March, 1888, are £2 9s. 5d.; so there you find a reduction in the price in the old country, in Britain, of something like \$1.52 on iron, and if you add to that the \$1.25 that the Finance Minister admits it has to pay here, you have an increase of \$2.77, provided the price of iron had not fallen in the old country market. I have not got the same months the Finance Minister had; I have not any access to them, but I have taken March, 1888, and compared that with the corresponding week in 1887, which I think is just as fair a comparison. Now having spoken with reference to the question of iron, and the duty on iron, and what it has failed to do in its effect on manufactures, notwithstanding the grand promises we had held out to us, I wish to ask the attention of the House for a few moments to another point on which the Minister congratulated the House, as being part of his policy, and that was when, in his round, swelling tones, he declared that the policy of this Government was to protect the labor interests of the country, to protect the artisan, the mechanic, the workingman, that their interests had been taken under the fatherly care of this Government. Well, Sir, I charge that that is just what this Government have not done. They have protected the manufacturers, or they have sought to protect the manufacturers, but I deny most emphatically that they have given any protection to labor at all. I think I can demonstrate that, instead of granting any protection to labor, they have discriminated against labor, they have oppressed labor, they have brought unjust competition to bear against labor in this country. Why, the very tables the Finance Minister gave us to show the increase in the output of the Londonderry works as the result of his tariff, if I understand his tables aright, though his figures are rather confused, demonstrate, if you go into the calculation, that while there are more hands employed in those Londonderry iron works, the rate of wages per hand is less than it was before. What does the workingman feel in reference to this matter? Is it any benefit to a mechanic to know that the shop in which he works is somewhat enlarged, and that other mechanics are found by his side, brought as it may be from Germany, from England or from the United States, to work at the same wages, or to lower the wages which he has received? What the mechanic and the laboring man want is not work for more mechanics. The country, as a whole, may benefit by an increased number of mechanics, but the interest of the laboring man and the mechanic of Canada is that his condition shall be improved and his wages raised, and he does not consider that he is benefited by a policy which brings in other artisans, so that he has to work for less wages, and I think it is proved

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

by the tables of the hon. gentleman himself that this is what the Government have done. What have the Government done in reference to the protection of labor? They have, as my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has pointed out, taxed the workingman upon everything almost that he consumes. There is scarcely an article which he needs in his household, or for the use of his family, or for his own use, that is not heavily taxed; but, in regard to what he has to sell, his labor, have they protected his labor? No, but they have taken taxes out of the public treasury of this country, taxes that in part were paid by these hard-working, industrious mechanics, and have given them to mechanics in England and other countries to help to pay their passages to Canada to lower the wages of the mechanics who are working in our factories. That is the way in which those hon. gentlemen protect our labor. It would be amusing, if it did not raise a feeling of indignation, to hear an hon. gentleman professing to speak of protecting labor, when all the effect of his policy is to burden the mechanic with fresh taxes and compel the mechanic not only to contend against the labor market of the world, but also to take the taxes which he has contributed in part and apply them to the purpose of enabling other mechanics to come here and lower the wages which he was receiving before their advent into this country. The hon. gentleman spoke as to the condition of the manufacturers, and there has been a great deal of sympathy expressed on account of the manufacturers. What is the condition of the manufacturers in this country to-day? Of course there are manufacturers and manufacturerers. Some of them, I suppose, are doing fairly well; some, I suppose, are doing very well; but some are doing very ill indeed. That will always be the case. Fortunate circumstances may perhaps attend one man's ventures which may be absent from another's, so that under any tariff some men will prosper in business while others may not; but take trade as a whole—and I call the attention of the Finance Minister to this, because he stated in his speech to us last year what I believe to be a truth, and I like to quote truth whenever it is stated by the Finance Minister, and he saw as a public man, and knew what he was giving utterance to a year ago, and that was that production in manufactured goods in this country had about overtaken consumption. He was within the mark that time. Sometimes he is charged with overshooting the mark, but he was within the mark that time. Production has not only overtaken consumption, it has done more, it has outrun consumption, and, as a result, you have found men who, in order to save their capital, in order to save their resources, have found themselves under the necessity, as they considered, to band themselves together in order to restrict production and to keep up the price, which of course means a hardship to the consumer. The hon. gentleman recognised that, and he suggested that it would be the duty of the Government, and of every Government under those circumstances, to look abroad and to use every energy they were possessed of to open up new and foreign markets which might take the surplus of our manufactures; and he told us that the Government had sent commissioners to various countries, to the Argentine republic, and to Brazil, and to other countries, to open up additional trade. But no result has come from those efforts. I think a commissioner was sent to Australia, but I am afraid that nothing has resulted from that either. But, while the hon. gentleman admits the absolute necessity that our manufacturers should have larger fields in which to operate, he tells us that he is an avowed opponent of any scheme to open a market of 60,000,000 of people at our own doors or to give our manufacturers a chance to open that market. Why, instead of sending commissioners to these distant countries, does he not himself, with tenfold the ability of the men he

has sent there, go to the neighboring republic, to the capital of the United States to which he was invited to go where he was told that they were ready to treat on a basis of larger commercial relations with us, and see if he could open up the markets of that great consuming people of sixty millions? Our manufacturers may be timid. Capital is always timid. Our manufacturers may dread radical changes, but, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has pointed out, what the manufacturers of Canada have to be anxious about is this, that, as soon as the United States are able to reduce their duties on raw material, or to wipe them out altogether, as they soon will be able to do in view of their overflowing treasury, then the Canadian manufacturer will be subjected to a closer, a keener, a stronger competition than ever before. That, Sir, being the case with the American manufacturer, and that being the case with our manufacturer, under the policy of expenditure that has been followed by these hon. gentlemen, they will tell you that the maintenance of high taxes upon their raw material would place them at a disadvantage in their own country, to say nothing of the absolute disadvantage that they would be under competing with the Americans in other parts of the world. Now, Mr. Speaker, suppose we leave the subject of trade, and finance, and figures, which are dry, and discuss lofty and exalted principles. We had a little novelty of that kind the other day when the Finance Minister did so. The Finance Minister left off his discussion of trade and commerce in order to read hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House a lecture as to how they ought to behave themselves. He was kind enough to tell us that a party, in seeking to obtain power, should only seek power for the sake of the good they would be able to do when they got there, for the sake of giving effect to their principles; that if a party sought to attain power simply for the sake of holding and exercising power, it was a most unworthy, a most base thing. Sir, I agree with him. It was refreshing to hear sentiments so grand from the Finance Minister—not that I mean to say he is incapable of feeling them, but he has to deal so much in a hard, matter of fact region, that he does not often soar into the region of fixed principles. But I would like to ask him this question, agreeing with him in that: Is it proper for a party, in seeking to attain power, to do so with a single eye to carrying out their principles, and giving effect to them, whether he does not think it would be a good plan for a party after they have attained power, to retain their principles while they remain in office. I think that would be well. Now, we cannot tell exactly what the hon. gentleman's principles were when he was struggling for power; but let me ask him, in all frankness, Has he held on to his fixed principles since he got in? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a departure from sound principle by one or other of the gentlemen opposite, when I see a Tupper and a McLellan sitting in the same Cabinet. I think there must be. I cannot conceive, myself, that one gentleman who denounced another as the high priest of corruption, who pictured him as robbing his fellow passengers with false arms in a stage coach—I cannot believe it possible that these two men were honest at that time, and can be found sitting in the same Cabinet together to-day, unless there has been a departure from principle on the part of one or the other. I will do the Finance Minister the credit of saying this, though, that he did not seek a seat in the Cabinet with the hon. member for Colchester, (Mr. McLellan), but the member for Colchester sought, and was willing to accept, a seat in the Cabinet side by side with this gentleman that he had thus described. I am afraid there has been a departure from principle somewhere. I would like the hon. gentleman, when lecturing this side of the House, to remember that while it is a high, and a lofty, and a proper thing to be actuated solely by a desire to maintain principles when striving for the Treasury benches, it

is equally laudable to maintain these principles in all their purity when occupying this seat. I would remind him that it would be only a proper thing, in maintaining these fixed principles, if gentlemen, having that sense of honor of the way in which public business should be conducted, would be willing, in making an appeal to the electorate of this country for a renewal of their confidences, to go before that electorate and say: Gentlemen, these are our principles, this is our policy, these are our acts, this is what we have done; judge whether we have been faithful stewards of your affairs; in your hands we leave the decision of this case. We have empanelled you as a jury, and to your verdict we will bow. Sir, gentlemen of fixed principles, gentlemen who will trust to their principles and believe that they are right, would not hesitate for a moment to go to the country under such circumstances. But have these gentlemen opposite ever dared to go to the country on their principles? Have they ever dared to go to the country and fight their opponents in a fair field with no favor? No, Sir, the records of this country show not. Sir, gentlemen of fixed principles ought never to condescend to such acts as the Gerry-mander Act, as the Franchise Act, as the Revising Barrister Act, as the Returning Officer Act, if they felt strong, and confident that they were virtuous in their principles. Sir, I am afraid there has been a departure from fixed principles on the part of members of the Cabinet—though undoubtedly their sole desire in seeking to attain that position was not to remain there a day, or a year, but simply to give effect to principles that they believed in. My hon. friend beside me says, and I believe that is true, that, perhaps, with them there is one grand, overshadowing principle, which outweighs all other considerations to which they may bow, and that it is their fundamental principle to cling to office, no matter by what means, or under what circumstances. But then my hon. friend the Finance Minister will not say that that is a high and lofty principle. He will not stand on the pedestal that he did the other day, when delivering a lecture to gentlemen on this side of the House. Well, now let us examine and see what are the fixed principles of the party opposite. What is their policy? I remember last year and the year before, gentlemen on this side of the House had a fixed policy on a particular question, that it was the duty of the Federal Government to allow the Provincial Governments to exercise their undoubted rights within their constitutional sphere; and, therefore, they moved a resolution censuring the disallowance of Manitoba railway charters by the gentlemen who are in power. Well, Sir, we were answered by hon. gentlemen opposite: We will not consent to the abandonment of the disallowance policy, we will not consent to allow Manitoba to charter railways that will tap the Canadian Pacific Railway and divert the trade of our great North-West into American channels. They pointed out to us that millions and tens of millions of dollars of the taxes of the people of the older Provinces had been expended in building that road, and it was not in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was not in the interest of the older Provinces, that disallowance should be abandoned, and they would not cease their rights, as they claim to have the right, to disallow the charters and thus prevent our trade from being diverted. Well, there was their policy, fixed and unalterable, a year ago. Where are they to-day? The very same gentlemen have now on the notice paper a resolution to be offered by the Finance Minister himself, by which he will ask the assent of this House, not only to permit Manitoba to charter railways to take the traffic of the North-West, to carry it into American channels, but that we shall guarantee the interest for 50 years on \$15,000,000 to the Canada Pacific Railway Company. This is the fixed principle of hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, they had a fixed principle in reference to this National Policy, to the industries of the

country that were to be protected. Among them was to be protected the great tree, fruit-growing, and nursery interest, which, they claimed, has sprung up in this country as one of the beneficent results of their National Policy. Well, Sir, what is the fact? We had one day the First Minister and the Minister of Justice rising and declaring that though the Americans had put these articles upon their free list, and though we had a statutory officer upon our books, saying if they did that we would do the same with their products, these hon. gentlemen said they would not do it, that they had the liberty to select what they saw fit, that they would not consent to do it, that it would be treasonable to the interests of the country to do it. Within one short week the hon. the Finance Minister came down and said that that was all wrong, that already an Order in Council had been issued placing those articles upon the free list, where they remain to-day. One of the fixed principles of hon. gentlemen opposite has been that Canada must not discriminate against the mother country. Yet in that very Order in Council they discriminated against the mother country by declaring that those articles might come in free from the United States but not free from the land against which they would on no account discriminate. They had also a fixed policy in regard to the manner in which they would deal with the liquor traffic. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the First Minister put their heads together and a Bill was introduced known as the McCarthy Act. What was the result? They abandoned that principle, I will not say voluntarily, but they had to abandon it after an appeal to the highest judicial tribunal of the Empire. Their fixed principle of dealing with the liquor traffic is a thing of the past and all that remains of it is in the shape of taxes to the extent of nearly a quarter of a million to pay for the blunder the Government committed at that time. Then they had until a short year ago a decided policy and principle in dealing with the Americans and our fisheries. They were not to be allowed the use of our fisheries on any consideration; the Treaty of 1818 was to be entirely carried out and we were to uphold our rights. Less than a year ago the Minister of Finance went to Washington and arranged a treaty by which under certain conditions the Americans would be permitted to enjoy every privilege that hon. gentlemen opposite declared Canada would never consent to accept. I am not finding fault with the fisheries treaty, it is not necessary for the purposes of my argument, but I am simply pointing out that one year the Government had a fixed policy and were determined to carry it out, and in fact did carry it out, in such a manner that the Finance Minister has declared that it produced a feeling of irritation in the United States that led us to the borders of war, and yet now we find an abandonment of all those contentions, all done it is said for the sake of peace. The Finance Minister himself had a policy last year with respect to the United States, and he was not disturbed by the prospect of what was known as the Retaliation Bill being passed in the United States. Some fears were expressed in regard to the results that might follow from non-intercourse with our neighbors, and it was thought it would prove very injurious, but the hon. gentleman could even see in that Bill, as he saw in the poor crop in Ontario, a blessing in disguise. The whole outlook was not dark, there was a silver lining to the cloud, and he went on to picture the silver lining and it appeared to be not a silver lining but the bright cloud itself, and the non-intercourse would be in Canadian interests. What were the hon. gentleman's statements in regard to that non-intercourse Bill, as given to us last year? He said then:

"Non-intercourse would build up Montreal, Quebec, St. Andrews and St. John, &c., with a rapidity which the people of this country can scarcely understand."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

That certainly would not be a bad result. Cities could not be built up except by providing employment for the people and giving a stimulus to trade generally. Hon. gentlemen opposite claimed it was part of their policy to build up great cities, and the effect of passing a non-intercourse Bill on the part of the United States would be that our cities would be built up with a rapidity we could scarcely understand. What more did the hon. gentleman say?

"Non-intercourse would lead England to put on differential duties on grain to such an extent as would vivify the industries of this country, especially the great farming industry of this country, to an extent which would make the most marvellous change in this Dominion."

If the result would be that it would advance our agricultural interests to such an extent as to produce a marvellous change in their favor non-intercourse would be of great benefit to us, and it would not be a cloud with a silver lining but a cloud white altogether with perhaps a dark rim. Yet this was the fixed principle which hon. gentlemen opposite declared a year ago, but within a year the Finance Minister comes to this House and declares that if the non-intercourse Bill had been put into effect it would have been the most disastrous thing that could have happened to Canada, and one of the great objects in surrendering what we did surrender to the United States of the fisheries was almost necessitated by the state of public opinion over there, owing to the policy we had pursued and to the danger that they might put into effect that very non-intercourse, which, according to the hon. gentleman's statement last year, would have been fraught with blessing to us. I think, therefore, we may fairly ask hon. gentlemen opposite when they read us lectures with regard to having fixed principles, to be themselves consistent not only in their utterances but also in their actions, because I would venture to propose this question: What principle is there that has been held by the party which occupies the Treasury benches which they are not ready to sacrifice if necessary in order to hold their present seats? Theirs has been a changing and a vacillating course, their promises have been broken and violated, their pledges have not been kept, they have not succeeded in giving that prosperity to the country which they promised that the country should enjoy. They to-day sit there with all their predictions not only unfulfilled but with many of them looked upon in the light of events that have transpired as having been perfectly ridiculous in their nature and in their expression, if I might be permitted to use language as strong as that without giving offence to hon. gentlemen opposite. But it is not too strong language to use when we look at their prediction of immigration into the North-West, when we read the predictions of the First Minister endorsed by the Finance Minister, given five, six or eight years ago and look at the actual result to-day, and on comparing them the question will force itself upon all minds. Can those hon. gentlemen have ability sufficient to manage a great and prosperous people like the people of Canada when they are unable to gauge with greater accuracy the state and condition of this country and the results likely to follow from the course and policy they are initiating? I will touch for a few moments on that which the hon. the Finance Minister has been pleased to term a new principle and new policy that we were grasping at. Several hon. gentlemen have pleased to tell us this and in the same breath have quoted the speech of the late leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) in which he stated that one of the settled principles of the Liberal party was to secure reciprocal trade relations with our neighbors to the south. We are told it is an entirely new principle, and the Postmaster General was pleased to tell us that the resolution offered by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was annexation in disguise. He sees he tells us, a snake in the

resolution, and he seems to imply that this is a party ready and anxious to promote annexation with the United States. I do not think there is any necessity for saying things that are offensive in their nature when it is not at all necessary. What right had he to charge any such sentiments or the holding of any such sentiments upon gentlemen on this side of the House? Did he produce a tittle of proof that the great Liberal party that were represented in that resolution by the mover, have ever advocated annexation to the United States? Why; no, Sir, he did not. He would have failed of proof, and I say that I am only tempted to mention this fact because the hon. gentleman has provoked it by seeking to fasten the charge upon the Liberal party of this country, that they desired a severance of the political relations that bind them to the mother land. I only allude to the fact that if he wants to find the annexation party he would find it in days gone by, not in the ranks of the Liberal party, but in the ranks of the party he himself belongs to to-day. He would have found men prominent in the party with which he is connected, in high places in the State and in high places in the mother land advocating annexation. Therefore, before he attempts to make an insinuation, or to make a statement of that kind, he should make himself aware of the history of this country, and know what the history of the political parties of this country has been. I hold in my hand what purports to be the annexation manifesto of 1849. It is said to be reprinted from the original pamphlet with the names of the signers. I have not time to read it, but I will read you the 6th article, and what does it say:

"Of all the remedies that have been suggested for the acknowledged and insufferable ills with which our country is afflicted, there remains but one to be considered. It propounds a sweeping and important change in our political and social condition, involving considerations which demand our most serious examination. This remedy consists in a friendly and peaceful separation from British connection and a union upon equitable terms with the Great North American confederacy of sovereign States."

I find, Sir, appended to that document such names as "J. J. C. Abbott," I find the name of "John Rose," I find the name "D. L. Macpherson." Will the hon. gentleman answer if he has ever known any persons bearing those names or any names having before them those initials? and if he has I would suggest that he would confer with them and ask them whether they are the individuals who signed their names to that document, the sixth article of which I have read to this House? If he finds they are the same gentlemen then I would ask him in very modesty, before he levels charges of treason and rebellion against this side of the House, that he should take care that his own skirts, and the skirts of his own party are clean in this matter. In the course of the debate which took place on unrestricted reciprocity, we were told by the hon. the Finance Minister in his speech the other night that there was a certain gentleman who came from the United States and sought to place himself at the head of the Liberal party, to carry out the principle of commercial union. He gave us the name of that individual. He said it was Mr. Wiman. He said Mr. Wiman was a gentleman of large means—and the Finance Minister seemed to speak feelingly and knowingly when he said it was a great advantage to a party to have a man of large means connected with it. My friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkir) said: "Like Sir Hugh Allan." What made him make that interjection? I will let him explain himself. But the Finance Minister understood the advantage of it. The hon. gentleman was pleased to say also that Mr. Wiman was a man of great ability and acknowledged power as well, and that he had come here to attempt to put himself at the head of the Liberal party and to lead the Liberal party to adopt commercial union. He told us also that the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) was too much for the gentleman from New York, and that he had got the better of Mr. Wiman, with all his wealth, and all his ability, and that he

had rescued the Liberal party from Mr. Wiman's leadership, and had thus saved the ship of the Liberal party from being dashed into pieces on the rocks of commercial union, but only to be stranded on the shoals of unrestricted reciprocity. I know nothing of Mr. Wiman myself. I am a humble member of the Liberal party sometimes consulted with, sometimes knowing what is going on within the ranks, and perhaps knowing as much of what goes on as the hon. the Finance Minister himself. Not that I claim to have any great intelligence or influence but simply from the fact that we would not consider him as trusted a member to admit to the caucuses even with all his ability, as I am myself. I am not aware that Mr. Wiman ever attempted to set himself up as the leader of the Liberal party in Canada, but I have the statement from the hon. gentleman himself that Mr. Wiman not only set himself up to be, but that he actually was the leader of the Finance Minister. Why, Sir, what glorifications we had over the consummation of the fishery treaty. What poems of praise were sung by the High Commissioner to the plenipotentiaries who arranged this fishery treaty. Great praise was given to them, and the Finance Minister, in that self-sacrificing manner which so eminently characterises him, took nearly an hour and a half to describe the admirable qualities of those gentlemen who had been engaged in the superhuman task of defining the Treaty of 1818. But it all came back to the Finance Minister, because those plenipotentiaries were appointed, at his suggestion, because he made representations to Mr. Bayard and Mr. Bayard made representations to the United States Government and Sir Charles made representations to the British Government and those representations were carried out, and, as a matter of fact then the credit came back to Canada's High Commissioner, as being the one who conceived the project of settling this question and devising the means whereby it could be settled. In a moment of frankness the hon. the Finance Minister told us how all this came about. Shall the Canadian High Commissioner have the credit? If he was the first cause, yes; if he was not the first cause, no. Was he the first cause? He was not. He himself told us he was not. Why, he told us that the way he came to go to Washington, and the reason he took the initiatory step was, that our mutual friend, Mr. Wiman, told me that he had a conversation with Mr. Bayard, and if you go over there Mr. Bayard will talk to you about the trade relations between Canada and the United States. Here is an admission that he received his instructions from Mr. Wiman, and although Parliament was in session—may be there was a holiday at that time—the Finance Minister takes a trip across to Washington, sees Mr. Bayard, and then followed the result that we all know. The point I wish to get at is this: The Finance Minister, who charges us with having sought to put ourselves as a Liberal party under Mr. Wiman's leadership, and charges Mr. Wiman with having sought to obtain the leadership of this party, he himself has confessed that he was a follower of Mr. Wiman, and, as far as we know, the only follower that Mr. Wiman had in this country, and that he followed him in this direction with the results that followed from it. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite—I wish to ask the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. C. H. Tupper) if he is in his seat, what he thinks of the conduct of the Finance Minister of Canada who has himself declared that this Mr. Wiman was "our mutual friend," and the member for Pictou knows what he told us about Mr. Wiman. He told us that Mr. Wiman was the apostle of commercial union, the apostle of unrestricted reciprocity or anything else that would lead to annexation. That is the description that was given to us of Mr. Wiman by the member for Pictou (Mr. C. H. Tupper). The member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) described Mr. Wiman as a renegade Canadian. What do these gentlemen

think of the Finance Minister acknowledging him "his mutual friend" and acting upon the suggestion of this annexationist, and this gentleman who is the apostle of anything that would tend to annexation? I think that the hon. the Minister of Finance need not have looked to the Liberal party as those likely to follow Mr. Wiman's lead or those likely to look for a new leader. It would rather bear the significance and we would be more justified in considering that the hon. gentleman himself was prepared to enter into a league with Mr. Wiman to bring about not unrestricted reciprocity, but commercial union with the United States, than he is to charge the Liberal party that they sought to effect it by means of Mr. Wiman himself. Sir, he has declared that he had communications with Mr. Wiman, that he had negotiations with him, that he had received suggestions from him, and that he had acted on those suggestions; and I think he will not find that the Liberal party have ever done that. Now, Sir, the Liberal party have adopted the principle of unrestricted reciprocity, that is, they desire to promote the trade and the varied industries of this country. The agricultural interest of this country is not benefited, as I think the hon. gentleman himself will now be almost prepared to admit, by his so-called National Policy. What they want is larger markets and freer markets. Much of their produce has to go to the neighboring states as almost their only market. It is met there by heavy duties. The like products in the United States are so large and great in comparison with the quantity that we send to them that our products do not regulate the price in that market, but their own greater products regulate the price; and under these circumstances, as the hon. Minister of Finance himself pointed out, the Canadian seller has to lose the duty. Therefore we propose by this policy of unrestricted reciprocity to secure an open market, in order that the great agricultural interests of this country may reap the benefits that would flow to them from wiping out the American duties, and giving them the amount of cash which those duties represent in addition to what they now receive from the sale of their products. But the hon. gentleman tells us that the Liberal ship is stranded upon the shoals of unrestricted reciprocity. Well, I ventured to say to the hon. Finance Minister, when he said that, that he was very near there himself. It was about the only time that I perceived a shade of irritation upon his countenance. He had taken one or two previous interruptions from me in good temper; but when I felt impelled to point out that he was very near unrestricted reciprocity himself, he turned upon me rather fiercely, and said he was at a loss to understand the mental organisation of a man who could not understand the difference between unrestricted reciprocity and an unrestricted offer of reciprocity. Well, I do not dwell on that. I was sorry for the hon. Minister of Finance when he said it. The mental organisation is not a peculiar one, I trust, in this country. It is a mental organisation that you will find among honorable men, I take it, in any country—the organisation that believes that when you make an offer to a man you make it in good faith, and that making it in good faith you will be honorable enough to carry it out if he accepts it. That is all that is peculiar in the mental organisation of some men, and I venture to say that that is what the hon. Finance Minister did. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), who spoke with power and authority—I know not whence he got it—told us that the offer made by the Finance Minister of Canada to the American commissioners in reference to trade relations was as broad and free as it was possible to make it. Sir, I cannot understand anything that could be plainer than that; I cannot understand a trade that could be more free and unrestricted if the offer had been accepted, than that involved in the proposition which the hon. gentleman himself made. When the hon. gentleman was asked

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), did you offer what you did not mean to grant? He answered, no, that would be a mean thing to do, and he would not do it. If he made an unrestricted offer, the broadest, freest possible offer, to settle this fishery question, and to give the Americans free access and all the rights to our fisheries that we enjoy ourselves, if he offered to give them unrestricted free trade upon the land as well as upon the sea, and if the United States had said, we will accept your offer, and the commercial barrier shall be removed from the sea as well as from the land, and commercially we shall be one people, I say from his own description of his offer, he would have been bound as a man of honor, and doubly bound as one of the trusted plenipotentiaries of the British Empire, to have consented to that arrangement with the United States. Sir, he asked, in replying to the question of the hon. member for East York, if I had made this offer, and if the American Government had said, well, we will accept so and so, and we will not accept so and so, would I not be at liberty then to say, no, I will not agree to that? Grant that there is some argument in that; grant that if they had made an offer of partial reciprocity, then he might say, this partial offer of reciprocity that you make has been well considered by you, and will work more in your interests than ours, and I cannot consent to it. But if they had accepted the unrestricted offer, and had said, we will adopt what you have suggested, perfect, unrestricted freedom of trade, then, Sir, I hold that the hon. gentleman would have been bound, and would have had no excuse for rejecting such an arrangement. Therefore, Sir, we were not so very far apart a short time ago. This hon. gentleman who lectured us on fixed principles, ought to have held to the fixed principles he had when he was negotiating with Mr. Bayard, and was making this offer to that gentleman. If he had remained true to that fixed principle, he would have been to-day found in accord with the Liberal party and seeking to give effect to that offer of unrestricted freedom of trade to the American Government on perfectly equal conditions. Sir, the Liberal ship is not stranded on the shoals of unrestricted reciprocity. I do not think it will be stranded there. The hon. Finance Minister himself, sailing in his ship of unrestricted reciprocity, a few months ago, anchored in the waters of unrestricted reciprocity bay. The command of the ship was for a time given to him by the captain, who wanted to sleep and take his ease; but some of his crew from the county of Welland, some from the county of Lincoln, and some from other counties, mutinied and said, if you put us on shore to trade with these people, they will be smarter than we are, and we shall be beaten in the bargain; and they woke up the captain and called upon him to resume the command of the ship in place of the mate; so the anchor was lifted, and the ship was drifted to sea, and now they are drifting about, no one knows where, I suppose for some fixed principle to which they can tie their ship. No, Sir, the offer that was made by the Canadian people and adopted by the Liberal party is this. We propose, what I understood the hon. Minister of Finance proposed, to go to the United States and say, we are living on this same continent, we are speaking the same language, we are people descended from the same nationality, we are a people of the same blood,—let us reason together, let us talk this matter over, and see whether it will not be better for both of us to remove these artificial barriers that divide us. Let us see whether we cannot have access into each other's markets and trade together as a people in perfect amity, although differing in our political institutions, for Mr. Bayard was very careful to say that by no intention whatever did he propose to alter the political status of either country, but simply that he desired we should commercially be one people, and thus thrive, prosper and progress. Let the hon. the Finance Minister tell me, realising as he does the vast importance of this

inter-provincial trade, and the great wealth that a great inter-provincial trade flowing freely in natural channels must produce—let him tell me that he is insensible to the effect of the wave of prosperity that will sweep over Canada, should we be permitted to enjoy the benefits of that vast inter-state commerce which has made the great American nation one of the greatest nations on the face of the earth to-day. Should that freedom of commercial intercourse be brought about between the two countries, which would have the best of the bargain? Which is the better, to have a market of 5,000,000 or a market of 60,000,000? Would we not be the gainers thereby? Yet hon. gentlemen opposite tell us to-day that our duty is to prevent our obtaining access to this great market by every possible means, because Canada's interests do not lie in that way. Why? Is it because it would not benefit our agricultural interests? Some hon. gentlemen opposite have ventured on that line of argument, but I venture to say that the hon. the Finance Minister will not. And I venture to say that hon. gentlemen opposite who have given utterance to this opinion will be glad to recede from that position. The great lumbering interests of this country must assuredly benefit by it. So must the mining industry, the fishing industry, and the shipping industry. There remains but one industry, so-called, the manufacturing industry, and what do hon. gentlemen opposite tell us with respect to that? They must all admit that free commerce between the two countries must be of great benefit, I will not say incalculable benefit, to the agricultural, the mining, the fishing, and the shipping industries of the country, to, in fact, nine-tenths of the people of Canada; and yet peradventure, because it might jeopardise the business standing and wealth of the remaining tenth who are engaged in the manufacturing industries, they oppose this policy. Is that the principle that prevails on the Treasury benches? Or do they hold to the old constitutional maxim of "the greatest good to the greatest number?" Hon. gentlemen who speak about fixed principles ought to take that as a fixed principle, and then let them tell me where the justice is in denying the right and the liberty to trade and increased prosperity to nine people in the country simply because of the danger, and I believe in many instances only a supposed danger, to the establishment of the other the tenth individual. They say that this policy will crush out our manufacturing industries. Why, the hon. the Finance Minister, in one part of his speech, declared—and I was glad to hear him declare it—that Canadians were the equals of any people on the face of the earth in a fair field and no favor. That was a sentiment I was glad to hear him utter, but I did not like to hear him say afterwards, with a singular want of logic in one who possesses a logical mind, that Canadians, who are the equals of any men on the face of the earth, could not hold their own with the people of the United States in manufacturing, in a perfectly fair field and with no favor, such as would be afforded were unrestricted free trade to exist between the United States and this country. As I have said on a previous occasion, that policy does not mean the Canadian bars down to the Canadian manufacturers, and the American bars up to the Canadian manufacturers, but it means all bars down and a fair field and no favor to both. Now, then, can the hon. the Minister of Finance go back on the statement he made, with apparent sincerity, that the Canadians would be able to hold their own under these circumstances? If the manufactures of this country would be destroyed under unrestricted free trade with the United States, how would their destruction be brought about? I would like the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who is a manufacturer himself, to tell me. I think he must admit, as a manufacturer, that the only way they could be destroyed would be by the manufacturers on the other side of the line being able to sell their products at lower prices

than can those of this country. That is the only way in which I can see our manufacturing industries would be killed by this policy. And if the American manufacturers, under unrestricted free trade, could sell their goods cheaper than could the Canadian manufacturers, it seems to me the Canadian consumer must be now paying more for his goods than he would be under unrestricted reciprocity, notwithstanding all the assertions to the contrary of hon. gentlemen opposite. Do they not see that they must take either one horn of the dilemma or the other? We can in a perfect free and open market hold our own; or if we cannot, it can only be because we are forced to charge higher prices than would the American manufacturers. I believe the Canadian manufacturer, under perfectly fair conditions, would be not only able to hold his share of his own Canadian market, but to secure his share of the trade of the United States as well. If this offer, which we made in the resolution that was voted down, had been instead endorsed by this House, and were accepted by the United States, it would produce some changes, and in these changes no doubt some men would suffer. That is an incident of everyday life. These changes and reverses are taking place continually, but I believe its great effect as a whole upon the country would be to give a stimulus to all our industries. I believe that it would promote immigration to our shores, develop and extend our North-West, and remove the feeling of irritation that exists in the Maritime Provinces by opening to them their natural markets. I believe that it would give to the people of Ontario their natural market, I believe it would weld our country together and solidify us as a Canadian nationality; I believe it would make us free commercially, and bind us together politically as a strong Canadian nationality, built up on the North American continent, a nationality that would do credit to the people from which we have sprung. I have been led into making these remarks in reference to this question, because I was disappointed in hearing the Finance Minister declare so emphatically against this policy, which, if I understood his offer to the United States aright, he proposed to them in good faith, not many months before. I do not desire to continue the debate any longer, I have made these remarks, as they occurred to me, in the endeavor to give expression to what I consider to be the principles of the Liberal party, and the hon. member for North Perth may now avail himself of the privilege of pointing out to us any new industries which have been brought into existence in this Canada of ours under the influence of the National Policy.

Mr. HESSON. I understood this debate was to be closed as soon as the hon. gentleman had completed his remarks, but as he has thrown out to me a challenge, I think it is but fair now that I should take that challenge up, by pointing out what has occurred in my own constituency with reference to establishment of new industries which did not exist there before the adoption of the National Policy. The hon. gentleman may refer, if he does not choose to accept my statement, to the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) who knows whereof I am about to speak. I refer especially to an industry which has been brought into Canada from the State of Michigan, where its headquarters existed, and which gave employment to some 500 men. Owing to the policy adopted by the Government, the proprietors of this industry found they could not go into Canada with their manufactured goods and sell to our Canadian millers, and, consequently, as they possessed a specialty of their own, which had a large sale, here, they came over to our side. They came to our city, and seeing that the premises there were lying idle which formerly belonged to the Thompson William's firm, but had been silent for a number of years, they made a proposition to open works there. The town

gave them a small bonus of \$8,000, and the result was that those gentlemen established a business there which has given employment to 120 or 140 skilled mechanics, and they are paying every year from \$50,000 to \$60,000 in wages. This is what is called the Smith-Mills Purifying Company, and they manufacture a special article for mills. They brought many excellent hands with them from Michigan, including Mr. Hayward, the manager, with whom I engaged in conversation a short time ago. Speaking of the effects of commercial union, I asked him what the effect would be on that business. He said: "Mr. Hesson, I do not hesitate to say that the business would be closed up in four months if such legislation should take place in Canada. If we could get our goods into Canada we could manufacture them more cheaply in Michigan, in Jackson, than we can here, but, in order to keep the Canadian market, we find it better to manufacture here. If unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union were carried out, we would close our works in four months." My hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow) knows very well what that means as far as my own city is concerned. I leave other gentlemen to speak in regard to their own observations, but, as the hon. gentleman threw out a challenge that no industry had been established in Canada under the National Policy, and asked hon. gentlemen to say where any existed, I think it is only right that I should make this statement. That industry would not have come to Canada but for the protective policy of this Government. In future, I think my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) will not throw out that challenge when he knows now, if he did not before, that there are industries—and that is one of them,—that have been established in this country under the National Policy. I will not occupy the time of the House further, as I understand that there has been an arrangement to close this debate to-night.

Mr. TROW. I beg to correct the statement of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson). I had no desire to rise on this occasion, but my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) stated that no new industry had been started under the National Policy, and my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Hesson) took up the challenge, and said that a large industry had been started in the city of Stratford. I may state that that industry was started in the city of Toronto long prior to the time when it was brought to Stratford. It was started in Toronto under the name of Holland & Co. I had something to do, as my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Hesson) knows, with bringing it to Stratford. I had the honor and pleasure of taking down \$8,000 to Toronto to bring the plant which was under way to that city long before it was brought into Stratford.

Mr. HESSON. It is quite correct, as my hon. friend has stated, that this industry was brought to Toronto. I believe the company had existed there for two years, but as they found they could do better with us than they could in Toronto, they removed to Stratford. My hon. friend is quite correct in stating that he took the \$8,000 to Toronto, and, as he is aware, I was one of the guarantors of the fund until it was adopted by the corporation; but I may say that they would not have been in Stratford or in Canada if the National Policy was not in force.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the company in question commenced operations in Toronto, not by reason of the tariff laws at all, but by reason of the Patent Act. The company had a patent, and every hon. member knows that that Act requires that the articles which are patented must be manufactured in Canada within a certain time, I think within two years after the patent is issued. They desired to preserve their monopoly under the patent laws, and, therefore, they opened their factory in Canada instead of in the United States.

Mr. HESSON.

Mr. COOK. I have heard for the first time from the member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) that there was an arrangement made by which this debate was to be brought to a close. I am not aware of such an arrangement. I think every member has a right to speak at any time he thinks proper, and I do not think the member for North Perth, the Finance Minister, the leader of the Government, or any gentleman in this House, or any number of gentlemen have a right to make an arrangement to gag any hon. gentleman in this House. For my part, when I feel disposed to speak, I will speak, and I will not be dictated to by the leaders on either side of the House. I propose to offer a few remarks on this question, and I am going to do it as briefly as I can, if hon. gentlemen on that side will hold their peace for a time. If they do not, it will take me so much longer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COOK. It does not make much difference to me when they cheer, as far as I am concerned. This is probably the proper time when any hon. member may discuss any question of importance in connection with the tariff rates of the country, and the members on both sides of the House, in this and in former debates have discussed the questions relating to their peculiar calling and also questions which they did not know so much about; but I was surprised to learn from a speech of an hon. gentleman who is interested in the lumber trade that the National Policy was a blessing to the lumber trade. I propose to deal with that matter for a time, but I do not propose to confine myself exclusively to the lumber trade. I think I know something about that trade, and I have the authority of a gentleman, who is perhaps the most intelligent of all the lumbermen of this country, and who is a supporter of the present Government but is opposed to the National Policy, that is Mr. Campbell of the Muskoka Lumber Co., who stated to me yesterday in Toronto that the National Policy has caused a loss to the lumbermen this year of not less than \$2 a thousand. When you take into consideration the vast amount of lumber which is manufactured in the Dominion of Canada, you will see what an immense loss the lumbermen and the people of Canada have sustained. But I will go more minutely into the matter of the lumber trade. I will not deal with the lumber trade in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, nor the spruce trade in Quebec. I shall not allude to the trade in the North-West or British Columbia, but I shall confine my remarks almost exclusively to the pine trade in Ontario and Quebec. I think I will be able to show pretty clearly how that trade stands. I wish to show to the House the sales that have been made by the Province of Ontario since Confederation up to the present time. Before Confederation the hon. gentleman now leading the Government was in the habit of dealing out to his supporters, piece by piece, without any sale, or money, or reward, such limits as they felt inclined to take. He has adopted the same principle in the North West Territories, giving to all his supporters timber limits in those territories that come within the jurisdiction of this House. In 1871, under the Sandfield Macdonald Administration, we had a sale in the Province of Ontario of 487 square miles, at an average price per mile of \$241.62. In 1872, we had a sale on the north shore of Lake Superior, when Mr. Scott was Commissioner of Crown Lands, comprising an area of 5,031 square miles, the average price of which was \$117.79. A great deal of that section of country had very poor timber, and a large amount of land having been put upon the market, the average price was low. But, on the whole, it was a very good sale. In 1877, there were 375 square miles sold, at an average of \$201.97; in 1881, 1,397 square miles, at an average of \$532.03; in 1885, there was a sale of 1,012 square miles, which averaged \$314.87. Last year there was a sale of 459 square miles, at an average of \$2,559 per mile. Now, hon.

gentlemen will see how rapid of late the price of limits has increased. What is the cause of it? Well, it simply means that American capitalists are coming over here and acquiring our limits, competition is becoming greater, and consequently the price is increased. I claim that what is now going on in reference to timber limits, will occur in all other branches of business in the country. I claim that if our markets are thrown open, and we have the privilege of dealing with the Americans, American capital will come into this country, and what is now occurring in lumber will take place in the mining interests, the agricultural interests, and the manufacturing interests. Now, I will give some figures concerning the timber limits under license in Ontario. I give the figures for 1886; I do not take the figures for 1887, because a great many licenses have not been renewed in consequence of the depression in the lumber trade. The lumbermen are not very flush of money; and, therefore, have not yet renewed their limits. In 1886 we had under license in Ontario, 18,486 square miles, or 11,831,040 acres, estimated at \$1,000 a mile, which would give a total value of \$18,486,000. We have in the Province of Quebec—I take the figures for 1886 for the reason that we have not the Crown Lands report for 1887, which will not be brought down till the meeting of the Provincial Legislature—we have in Quebec, in 1886, 46,078 square miles of timber limits, or 29,489,920 acres, at an estimated value of \$500 per square mile, which gives \$23,039,000. The total value of timber limits in Ontario and Quebec is put down at \$41,525,000. Now, we all know the timber resources of the Province of British Columbia, and of the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The timber of British Columbia differs from that of the Lower Provinces and of Quebec, because the spruce limits renew themselves every 8 or 16 years, according to the closeness with which they have been cut, and from the fact of the timber growing so thickly, the trees being so close together, the ground is sheltered, and there is a perpetual moisture, so that the fires do not destroy them, as a rule. Therefore the spruce limits in the Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick will remain in perpetuity. Now, Sir, there was cut, in the Province of Ontario last year, 2,339,016 standard logs, at 200 feet to a standard, making 567,803,200 feet; and at \$10 per thousand, we have the total value of the pine cut in the Province of Ontario for 1887, amounting to \$5,678,032. In Quebec, according to the report of 1886, they got out 2,187,098 standards white pine logs, making 437,419,600 feet, which, at \$10 a thousand, would give a value of \$4,374,196. Therefore we have a total cut of pine timber in Ontario and Quebec for 1886 and 1887, of 1,005,222,800 feet, valued at \$10,052,228. Now, according to Mr. Campbell's figures, the Canadian lumbermen are losers to the extent of \$2 per thousand; but I take it at \$1 per thousand, so that upon that vast amount of lumber, we are losing, according to that estimate, \$1,005,222 a year. Then there is another great difficulty in that we have to compete with the American lumber in Michigan and Wisconsin. We have to cut our lumber considerably thicker than they do on the other side; as an average we cut it one-sixteenth of an inch thicker than the American lumber, so that upon every 16,000,000 feet of lumber that we manufacture, we lose a million feet, which is a very serious loss. Then there is a difficulty in getting Americans to come in and purchase our lumber, in consequence of their customs duty being so great. The fact is that we have to send our lumber there and pay our transportation and duties, and then when we get it into the American markets at Albany, Troy and other large cities, we have to compete with the Michigan lumber. Now the estimate is that we lose, for the reason stated, upon the whole cut of our lumber from Ontario and Quebec, no less than 62,826,425 feet, which, at \$10 a thousand, would amount to \$628,264 per year. We have a still greater difficulty to contend with. In consequence of the duties on our lumber

we are unable to send inferior classes into the American market, and we are obliged to export the best, and to do so we have to cut the finest trees and leave the poor ones to rot. Taking an average, I suppose probably one-quarter of the timber is left in the woods, but that could be marketed if we had unrestricted trade. We could send our coarse grades there and relieve our market in Canada, which would be a very great advantage, because lumbermen are all aware that the coarser grades are more abundant. We sustain a still further loss, and it is a very important one. If we had unrestricted trade with the United States we would not be compelled to ship our lumber in the rough. There is a duty of 35 per cent. upon manufactured lumber, that is planed lumber or lumber put in shape for building purposes. That is a very serious matter. If the duty were removed we would manufacture lumber in Canada for the American market; we would be able to send lumber tongued and grooved and in proper condition for house building and other purposes, and this country would have the further advantage of having mills erected for that purpose and labor employed here to a very large extent. At the present time several of our lumber kings, such as Mr. McLaren and Mr. Bronson of Ottawa, and others, have large planing mills at Burlington, Vermont. They send lumber there and it is manufactured and sent all through the United States. If we had unrestricted trade with the United States all that work could be done in this country by our own people. I have prepared an estimate of the number of men we would employ under such a state of things. I place the loss on freight alone at over \$400,000. The loss on these three items is therefore \$2,033,486 a year, or taking the nine years during which hon. gentlemen opposite have had the National Policy in force, that policy which was going to be a blessing to the lumberman, the manufacturer, the agriculturist, the miner and the laborer, the loss has been \$18,301,374. I have made another estimate and I find that we employ about 24,000 men in the woods getting out logs and timber. The last census shows that there are employed in saw mills, shingle mills, door and sash factories, 47,352 men, and that the capital invested in those industries amounted to \$27,932,238—with a total output of \$14,091,112. These figures give a total population of 353,760, taking five to a family. I remember that only last Session when the Minister of Finance was proposing to increase the duty on iron, he declared that in a very short time we would obtain an increased population of 100,000 people on that account. I claim that by manufacturing lumber in Canada and being able to ship it free to the United States we would employ directly half a million people. What do we find in regard to all the manufacturing establishments of the country which hon. gentlemen opposite claim they have protected? In all the manufactures of this country there are only 206,583 persons employed, and I am sure not more than one-half of those manufactures are protected by the National Policy. I claim, therefore, that the lumbermen as a whole do not receive that fair consideration from the Government which they deserve. I will not speak of the vast amount of money employed in plant required for the manufacture of lumber to place it in a state for shipment, or speak further of the question of the increased value of the timber limits in this country; but we know that the Americans gave the increased value to our timber limits and that many of the citizens of Ottawa and those largely employed in the lumber trade were at one time foreigners, and they have been the means of developing the lumber resources of the Ottawa Valley. At the last sale of timber limits Americans who have not heretofore been interested in Canadian limits, were instrumental in increasing the price of those limits to such an extent that the limits are now considered to be one of the main sources of revenue to the Province of Ontario. I will not detain the House by giving details of the lumber shipped to the United States last year, but I may just say

that we shipped 508,304,000 feet, of the value of \$5,209,023. I refer to shipments to the United States and not to any other foreign country. There can be no doubt that the American market is the proper market for the lumber of this country. We have exported timber to Great Britain and in small quantities to other countries, but Great Britain will not take our better grades, for they find they can obtain timber to suit their purposes cheaper from the Baltic. We find, moreover, that the Americans are more inclined to pay high prices for lumber than are the people of Great Britain, and, therefore, we must look to the United States for our market, and the sooner we make arrangements with that country to admit our lumber on good terms so much the better will it be for Canada. The United States will also be the gainers thereby, because at present they have to pay very high prices for coarse grades of lumber. If we were at liberty to ship the coarser grades of lumber the Americans would be benefited by that to a greater extent, and then our lumber coming into competition with theirs, the prices would be somewhat reduced. I happened to be in the House at the time we were discussing the probabilities of this tariff system—this blessed National Policy that hon. gentlemen opposite then proposed to inaugurate. After they came into power in 1878 I did not happen to be in Parliament when that system was inaugurated, for like many other hon. gentlemen I was swept out by the bugaboo cry of the National Policy. But just as soon as the electorate discovered that it was a sham and a snare they reelected me, and I have been here ever since. I expect to remain here, notwithstanding the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite to defeat me, not alone in the election contest, but in the law courts. I had the pleasure the other night of telling the Finance Minister that now that the election had been decided and that there was no chance of another election, that he might appoint a collector of customs at Penetanguishene, a place he had kept open as a sop for his friends in the event of another election. I understood that the hon. gentleman stated something across the floor of the House to the effect that he had made the appointment, but I did not catch his words. I hope he has made the appointment, and I hope he has made a good one. We have heard a great deal about the balance of trade. We were told that unless the National Policy were adopted we would become poorer, and that the balance of trade was against us. But what is the result? In the time of Mr. Mackenzie the balance of trade against us amounted to \$11,576,910, and according to this year's reports the balance against us is \$24,678,519, a difference of \$13,801,609. I would like to ask the Finance Minister what has become of his promises which he made when his party were in Opposition, and when he was the financial critic on this side of the House? But it was said the poor miners at that time were in dire distress. Have they been benefited a great deal by this National Policy? The condition of the farmers at that time was one of the great cries. Sir John—if I may be permitted to use his name—who was leader of the Opposition, then said he would not touch the National Policy unless the farmers were to be protected. And one of his friends (I think it was Dr. Orton) moved a resolution that the farmers should share in the blessings of the National Policy. How have the farmers shared in that policy? We find that in agricultural products there is a falling off of \$8,454,854. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: Oh, we consume it. Who consumes it? How many people more have you got to consume it now than you had then? You have only got 400,000 more people. The fact is the farmers have become disgusted with the whole matter and they are not raising the amount of cereals they raised at that time. The farmers have been disappointed and disgusted because they expected something great from the National Policy and they did not

Mr. Cook.

got it. Although I was defeated by the cry of the National Policy, I must do the farmers of my constituency the credit to say that in the county of Simcoe they were not hoodwinked by the National Policy cry, because in every polling booth where the farmers voted they increased my majority instead of decreasing it. It was only in the towns that my majority was decreased, and that was on account of the promises that the villages were to be built into towns and the towns into cities. They were to have more smokestacks in the towns, and the towns were to be crowded with artisans. I remember the hon. the leader of the Government when he was in Barrie, the chief town of the county, stated what he was going to do for that town, and that he was going to make it a city. It is a town still, and has not progressed nearly as rapidly as some other places in the county. He appears by his presence to have put a blight on the place, because immediately after the inauguration of the National Policy the increase was much slower than it had been for years before, and, Sir, it will be many years yet—unless they get such legislation in the Province of Ontario—before that town will attain the position of a city. It is said that during the last nine years the National Policy has been in force that a good deal has been done for the manufacturers in the country. We know that every other industry in the country, the farming, the lumbering and the mining have been bled to support the manufacturers, and yet we find that the manufacturers have only increased their export this year over that of 1878 by \$1,635,804. The fisheries was another industry they were going to foster. How do they foster that? By a reduction of the export this year as compared with 1878 of \$53,556. The hon. gentleman stated before he got into power that the Province of Ontario, under the Liberal rule, would become a pasture field and that we would grow nothing but cattle. It appears, however, that those gentlemen, by the National Policy, have made this country a pasture field to a large extent. Let us take the total exports of 1887, and we find that we have exported only \$1,637,242 worth more this year than we did in 1878. I would like to know what the National Policy has done for all our industries? The National Policy was the means of putting the hon. gentlemen opposite in power, and the means of defeating Mackenzie's Government, but, Sir, the National Policy is not the means that has kept those gentlemen in power for the last two terms. It is something else that has been done in the name of the National Policy, because the people are sick, and tired, of that policy. They are kept in power by such means as the Minister of Finance stated when he said: It is well to have a Mr. Wiman in your ranks, a gentleman of means. They had some wealthy manufacturers and we all know of the leader of the Government going to Toronto and calling those gentlemen together and asking them to put up the money to keep him in power. We know where the means came from. When they resurrected the Neebing Hotel, the steel rails, and the Fort Frances locks, as the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McLelan) did to-day, I would refer them back to the Pacific scandal; and if the truth could only be known, we have had greater Pacific scandals than that of 1873, and many of those hon. gentlemen on that side of the House owe their seats to Pacific railway scandals. They were going to stop the exodus. They said the people were going out of the country too rapidly; the country was being depopulated; it would never do. But what classes have gone since? The flower of the country. Not the old men and the children, but the young men, twenty or twenty-five years old, who have just received their education, they are the men who go to swell the numbers in Uncle Sam's dominions. After we have been at the expense of educating them, and before they have become of any service, benefit or advantage to the country, they leave us and go to another country; and no wonder we are not growing the

cereals that we did before. No wonder that our mines are not being worked; no wonder that the lumber trade is not in as flourishing a condition as it was in 1873, although one of the greatest depressions that was ever known swept over this country at that time, and not only over this country but over the United States and all other countries in the world, except little Switzerland, which was the greatest free trade country in the world. But those gentlemen on that side of the House did not hesitate to cry mad dog all along the line, or in declaring that we were not true to our country. They were the disloyal men at that time; they were the men who were crying stinking fish, and saying that the resources of the country were becoming exhausted by the system adopted, a system that had been in vogue for years under the management of the present leader of the Government. Sir, when he got to this side of the House, it was anything to return to the Treasury benches. He did not care how his friends decried the country, or what injury they did to the country, but when we on this side of the House state the plain facts of the case, we are disloyal. Well, Sir, I will have something to say about that loyalty question after a while. The hon. gentleman's chickens are coming home to roost. More than one hon. gentleman on this side of the House has spoken of the somersaults that have been taken by gentlemen on that side of the House during the last fortnight; most of them have been standing on their heads, if they have any heads. But if I were sitting behind a leader or a Government that would ask me to do as the hon. gentleman who leads them asked them to do within the last two or three weeks, I would soon say what I thought of them. The hon. Minister of Finance tells us in one breath that he made an offer of unrestricted reciprocity to the United States, and in the next breath I did not do it, or, at any rate, if I did I did not mean it. Fine diplomatists they are to represent this country! Great High Commissioner! Wonderful man to deal with a nation like the United States! He says to them, we will offer you so and so, and then he comes home and tells us on the floor of Parliament, and the people of the United States too: We did not mean it; we only did it to draw them out; we only did it for a lark; we wanted to see how far they would go. Then he states that he did not meet a man in that country who was in favor of unrestricted reciprocity; he was in every class of society, from the highest to the lowest, and every man was against it. But he forgot to tell us what measures were being discussed in Congress at the present time. He forgot to tell us about the Mills' Bill that is going to reduce the taxes of the United States by a vast amount. He forgot to tell us that President Cleveland, in his inaugural address, stated that he proposed making a reduction in the tariff. He forgot all these things, or probably he thought the people of this country do not read. Well, the hon. gentleman spoke of Mr. Wiman as the leader of the Liberal party to day, and the disciple of commercial union, and said we were going to be stranded on the rock of unrestricted reciprocity. Well, Sir, I am willing to be stranded on that rock; I would rather be stranded on it than on the rock of the National Policy, which has been a pretty hard one, not only on the branch of business with which I am connected, but on almost every other industry in the country. But the Finance Minister was a big man while he was there. He could consult with Mr. Wiman on that occasion. Mr. Wiman was not above his notice before he went there; and does he think that we have forgotten that Mr. Bayard recommended the hon. gentleman to the position of plenipotentiary? Does he forget that Mr. Wiman told Mr. Bayard that he thought Sir Charles Tupper would be a good man for that position? Was it Mr. Wiman who recommended him to Mr. Bayard? Was it Mr. Bayard who recommended him to the Home Government? And was he the sponta-

neous choice of the Home Government? We have some light thrown on the diplomatic arrangements that have been going on between the two countries; but, Sir, it is an exhibition that I hope I will never again witness the like of. Something has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side, in reference to the question, how are we going to manage affairs so as to meet our expenses, suppose we obtain unrestricted reciprocity with the United States? How are we going to raise the revenue? Well, the hon. member for South Oxford has stated pretty plainly how it is to be done. We know from the past history of the country that these gentlemen opposite, through their extravagance, have increased our expenses during these last years from \$23,000,000 to \$35,000,000, and increased our national debt to a very large amount, about \$100,000,000, or thereabouts. Then they raise the cry of direct taxation, should the policy we advocate be adopted. That is their great bugaboo. All over the country their supporters are crying themselves hoarse declaring that the Grits propose to have direct taxation. I am not in favor of direct taxation. I do not believe it would be practicable in Dominion politics and I have come to the conclusion that perhaps it would not do to have it. But we have, as it is, a large direct taxation in this country, and the people do not find fault with it. We have a direct taxation in Ontario for municipal purposes, which, in 1873, amounted to \$5,605,779, or \$15.54 per head; in 1879 it amounted to \$7,157,366, or \$16.27 per head; and in 1885 to \$8,333,370, or \$17.20 per head of the rate-payers. But the people have the opportunity of turning out the men who transact their business in the municipal councils, and if those gentlemen do not manage their affairs properly, the people soon get rid of them. Such would be the case here if we had direct taxation, and the hon. gentlemen opposite would not long remain on the Treasury benches. If every man who went into a store paid the price of the goods without taxation, and then was met by the custom house officer on going out and forced to pay the duty in cash separate from the price of the goods, he would soon find out what he has to pay under the present extravagant administration of the Government. But as it is, the people now pay taxes without knowing what they pay. On every \$100 of revenue that is collected the people have to pay \$54. Now hon. gentlemen opposite say a good deal about the deposits in the post office savings banks, and point to them as a source of wealth to the country. Well, the people put their money there because the Government give 4 per cent, and because there is no risk of loss. People who are afraid to invest their money in business put their money in the post office savings banks because they believe they are the safest institutions. You remember, Sir (Mr. White, Renfrew) because you were in the House at that time and took a lively interest in the debate, how you and your friends spoke of the faults of the system then in existence, and glorified the system that was to be put in operation when you succeeded in attaining office. I regret, Sir, that you did not succeed in reaching the Treasury benches, because I think you would be much more capable than some hon. gentlemen who got there. But now, when there are vacancies occurring in the Cabinet, it would give unbounded satisfaction to us on this side, so long as a Tory Government must be in power, to see you occupy one of the Treasury benches. I do not say this to boom you because you do not require it, and your leader must know you by this time, as you have been a long time in Parliament and have materially assisted your party throughout the country in their elections. To judge from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, you would think it was all sunshine throughout the country, and that there was not such a thing known as destitution at all. These hon. gentlemen ought to visit some of the quarters in our cities, and they would soon discover that the contrary is the case. Only a short time ago, sermons were preached in

every pulpit throughout the length and breadth of the country, on depression and on the dire distress of the people. Only the other day, the Rev. Mr. McDonnell, of St. Andrew's Church, in Toronto, preached a sermon on that question, in which he stated that if he were to attend to all the cases of poverty brought under his notice, his usefulness as a minister would be gone, because he would have to give the whole of his attention to looking after the poor of Toronto. Hon. gentlemen opposite talked about soup kitchens. There are worse than soup kitchens now. The people, whenever they get the opportunity, are going to visit the sins of this Government upon the Administration, and I hope that opportunity will not be long in coming. Hon. gentlemen opposite pretend that on this question of unrestricted reciprocity the people are heartily with them. But let them only dissolve Parliament and go to the country and they will soon find out that the reverse is the case. Hon. gentlemen opposite take credit for the National Policy. Well, in my constituency, at every meeting held, both in the towns and in country places, my opponents on the platform, whoever they might be, took this National Policy as their stock in trade, and yet every time they attempted to talk on that question they were hooted. Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite are in office, it is due largely to the Gerrymander Act. Why, if the representation of Ontario in this House were based on a fair numerical adjustment of the population, instead of the Government having a majority of sixteen from that Province, they would have a majority of only one. I would like to ask, therefore, if that Gerrymander Act was an honest fair Act. I think the hon. gentlemen should follow the principles laid down in England, whereby the counties are not laid out by the Government of the day, but by the judiciary. I wish he would do that, and further, that he would change the constitution so that the Provinces would raise their own revenue, so that we would not have the Province of Quebec, or the Province of Manitoba, or the Province of Prince Edward Island, or the Province of Ontario coming to the Government on their knees, rapping at the doors of Parliament, and asking for increased subsidies. The Provinces are masters of the situation. The Provinces existed long before the Dominion was known, and to-day the Provinces ought not to be hampered in that way. They should be as free as the water which flows in the Niagara River. It would make the Provinces more economical to do this, because, if they had to depend upon their own resources, they would be very careful with their funds; but now they say, we will expend our money, we will make our people happy and contented, and then we will go to the Dominion Government, and we will give Sir John a wink as to what we are going to do in the next election, and we will get what we want. As far as the National Policy is concerned, I think these gentlemen have come to the end of their tether. I was surprised to hear the Finance Minister declare that he was to have a surplus of \$97,000, when in reality he has a deficit of \$350,000. How did he do that? By changing his accounts, by a sort of *hocus pocus*. If I had a book-keeper, or if any man in business in this country had a book-keeper who would so fix his accounts, he would dismiss him at once. The fact is that the hon. gentleman forces a trial balance, and he should be amenable to the law, and he would be amenable to the law if he were in the employment of any private firm. He is in a humiliating position to-day, by making these changes in his books, I suppose by giving instructions to his clerks to make the changes which have been made. How much more manly, and upright, and just it would have been if the hon. gentleman had come forward and said honestly: We have a deficit of \$350,000; how much more would we have thought of him; but, when he changed that deficit into a surplus of \$97,000, what will the hon. gentleman's friends think of him when they learn the

Mr. Cook.

fact? But, perhaps, he does not care about it. Perhaps he is going to leave us, he is going to London, where he can live comfortably and can hobnob with the nobility of the land, where he can sit in the midst of his wine tumbler and that sort of thing, and no doubt he will be more comfortable there than Croesus was when he was surrounded with the greatest amount of gold that any man ever had. I give the hon. gentleman this credit: that he is very obliging, very respectable, and I will not say very intelligent, because everyone knows that he is intelligent and obliging and respectable, but I think in his capacity in London he deals fairly and honestly and liberally with every class of the community that comes from Canada, and I give him credit for that. There is one question I have rather overlooked, that is, the mineral resources of the country. My hon. friend the Finance Minister, last year, attempted to do something for the mineral resources by increasing the taxes, but that is not the way to increase a national industry. I say the taxes should be removed altogether, that it should be as free as the air and the water that flows, and that, under those circumstances alone, will we be able to succeed in this country, particularly with the small population which we have. If we were a great country, like the United States, with 60,000,000 of people, we would be in a different position. If we had that barrier taken down, the manufacturers of this country would succeed better than they do now. The market has been glutted to a large extent. We have not the consuming population those hon. gentlemen promised us, and, except in regard to taxation, they have signally failed in the promises they made as to the results of the National Policy. What have we done in the way of minerals? It is well known that this country is possessed of great mineral resources, gold, copper, iron, silver, lead and other minerals. Last year, we only exported of all our minerals \$3,805,959 worth, and in the last six years we only exported of silver, iron and copper, \$318,660 worth from the whole Dominion. Now, what do we find on the other side? We find that in Michigan alone they produced in the last census year 45,830,000 lbs. of ingot copper, valued at \$7,979,000, while in the same year the iron mines of that State produced 1,838,712 tons of ore, valued at \$6,034,000. The copper companies of the State paid, in four years, from 1882 to 1885, dividends aggregating \$10,352,000. We have as good copper mines in this country if they were developed, as they have, but we will never develop this country until we can induce people to come into it to help us to do it. If we would take down the barriers on both sides, American capital would flow in here. Perhaps some manufacturers would succumb, and some of them should, because if they could not live with a market of 65,000,000 or 70,000,000 of people, while they can exist on a population of 5,000,000, they should go to the wall. We have no right to pamper them. There is no reason why the people of this country should be taxed to keep them up. Then, salt was another of the great industries that the Government were going to protect. They did protect it and what was the result? The first return we had from the Geological report was in 1880, and that shows that the manufacturer of salt was 472,000 barrels, while in 1887 it was only 106,643 bushels, valued at \$9,463. In Michigan, in 1860, when they were just developing their salt industries in the Saginaw Valley, they produced 4,000 barrels; in 1870, they produced 621,352 barrels; in 1880, they produced 2,685,588 barrels, and in 1886, they produced 3,677,257 barrels. So they steadily increased during those years, and we did not increase, but, on the contrary, we decreased largely, though our salt is, I am told, as good as any which is produced in the Saginaw Valley. But the difference is this, the salt manufacturers of Michigan have 60,000,000 of people to sell to, and our salt manufacturers in Canada have only a few people to sell to, and, therefore, they could not succeed. Now, I want to make

a few comparisons in order to show this House that although we have the finest country on the face of the earth—I believe there is no better in America, at all events, for growing cereals—our farmers are not progressing. Why, Sir, the farms of this country are not nearly so valuable as they are on the other side. Farm property in the State of Michigan, or Indiana, or New York, is almost double the value of land in Ontario, and the best part of Ontario, too. Now, I will give you a comparison between the city of Rochester and the city of Toronto—the emporium of Ontario, one of the finest cities, probably, in Canada, not to make any invidious comparisons. We all know that Rochester is a slow-going place compared with other cities of the United States. Therefore I am prepared to make a comparison between Rochester and one of the most prosperous cities of Canada. Land for business purposes, in the heart of the city of Toronto, is worth \$1,500 a foot, in the city of Rochester, in the business part of the city, is worth over \$3,000 a foot. So much for the value of land. If we had unrestricted reciprocity, our city property and farming lands would be worth as much as they are on the other side of the line. Now, Sir, I will give you a comparison in wheat. In the State of New York they grow 14·8 bushels per acre; Pennsylvania, 12·6; Ohio, 13·3; Michigan, 16·4; Indiana, 13; Illinois, 12·9; Missouri, 10·9; California, 12; Kansas, 15·2; in Ontario we grow 21 bushels per acre, four or five bushels more than the best wheat-growing States in the Union. Now, how does this compare with the statement made by the Minister of Finance with reference to wheat growing in the North-west—60 bushels per acre? Sir, the farmers sitting on this side of the House—and I know something about growing wheat myself; I have done a little in that line—all shook their heads and laughed. Every farmer, I don't care who he may be, who has ever grown a bushel of wheat in this country, well knows the exaggerated statement made by the Minister of Finance. He made a similar statement a few years ago about the enormous yield in the North-West, and he reiterated it the other night, that they grow 60 bushels to the acre. Why, Sir, the farmers would laugh at him. He cannot go and hold a meeting among the farmers of this country, anywhere, and make such a statement as that. If he does, they will say that if his other statements are as correct as that, they would know just how much confidence to place in him. Then there is the question of spring wheat. In Nebraska they grow 12·7 bushels per acre; in Minnesota, 13·2; Wisconsin, 12·7; Dakota, 13·1; Iowa, 11·4; in Ontario we grow 16·1 bushels per acre, over three bushels per acre more than they do in the best States of the Union. Then we come to oats, and that brings me back to the campaign of 1878, when the leader of the Government went holding forth with his Neebing Hotel under one arm, and his steel rails under the other, and I don't know but that he had a model of the St. Frances locks. But he depicted them to the people. These were the three great cries he had against the Government. \$10,000 in the Neebing Hotel. And the Minister of Finance and the Postmaster General had the hardihood to repeat those statements to-day. The Postmaster General might have let them die, but he felt inclined not to do so. But at present I am speaking of oats. The hon. gentleman spoke of myself as a lumber king, and he said the lumber king buys all his oats in Chicago, all American oats. I wrote the hon. gentleman a letter contradicting the statement. I do not know whether he received the letter, but he reiterated the statement, and I then had a statement put in the papers. I think he is a pretty close observer of the papers, although he may have overlooked that small item. I had a statement inserted in one of the papers that the statement he had made was entirely unfounded; but he still kept repeating it. Up to the present time, I have never bought an oat from the State of Michigan, or any other State.

If I can buy them cheaper there, I will go there to buy them. Hon. gentlemen do it themselves. They go to the other side to buy everything that they require, and they can get the same here just as well. They are such sticklers for their country, and their National Policy, and the manufacturers of this country. Why, Sir, we know that hon. gentlemen even go to London to buy their clothes. They have the measures taken, even for their clothes, in a shop on Bond street, in the city of London, and the clothes are sent out here. Whether they pay the duties or not I do not know, but the poor tailors of this country have discovered that a great many men, who are loud-mouthed in their cry for protecting that class of industry, do not get their clothes made here after all. Well, Sir, in the State of New York they grow 29·6 bushels of oats per acre; in Michigan, 32·9; Wisconsin, 31·1; Missouri, 26·2; Pennsylvania, 28·1; Indiana, 28·8; Minnesota, 34·6; Kansas, 31·9; Ohio, 32; Illinois, 34·5; Iowa, 34; Nebraska, 32. In Ontario, we grow 37·1 bushels per acre, so that we grow, of all these cereals, more bushels per acre than do the most favored States of the United States. Now, after looking at these figures, I want to know how it is that the farmers of this country have not raised more grain than they did in 1878? Why should there be such a falling off? Then there is the great question of barley. Barley is one of the most profitable crops our farmers raise. We exported last year over 8,000,000 bushels to the Americans. They will always take our barley, they are always glad to get it. Suppose, now, the duty of 10 cents per bushel was taken off barley going to the United States, what an advantage it would be to the farming community of this country! Now, we have an opportunity of making terms with the Americans for unrestricted reciprocity. I think it is within our reach, if our Government would only take the matter in hand. I do not wish to make it a question of turning the Government out of power. I am honest in my conviction that the Government should take hold of the matter and give us unrestricted reciprocity. They have discovered that the National Policy has been a failure, and knowing that they should grapple with this great question. By doing so they might keep themselves in power ten years longer, and I would be pleased to sit in Opposition for ten years if they would give us that great boon rather than cross the floor and sit under the National Policy. But if hon. gentlemen opposite do not give the people that for which they ask, and meetings have been held in different parts of the country and resolutions unanimously passed in favor of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, then they will discover when it is too late that they have made a mistake in not taking the advice given them from this side of the House. I know it to be a fact that many of our large and wealthy manufacturers are only waiting for the bars to be taken down to enter the United States market and compete with the Americans on their own ground. They can do it. Give them the opportunity; do not decry the ability of the Canadian manufacturer and workman. History has shown that the freer trade is the larger are the wages received by the workingman. Compare the wages in England and in Germany and you will at once see the difference. Those are the two European nations having different trade policies, Germany being highly protective and Great Britain free trade. Here is a comparison of wages:

	Gt. Britain.	Germany.
Bricklayers	\$7.56	\$4.21
Masons	7.68	4.07
Plasterers	7.80	4.43
Carpenters	7.68	4.11
Blacksmiths	7.37	4.00
Cabinet-makers	7.68	4.25
Cigar-makers	6.07	3.68
Coopers	7.50	3.97
Laborers	4.70	3.11
Saddlers	6.83	3.96
Tinsmiths	6.56	3.56

In conversing, some time before the question of reciprocity arose, with a prominent Conservative in Toronto, he said to me: The moment you propose that resolution Sir John will haul up the loyal flag and the people will flock to him. The Premier has hauled up the loyal flag, as he has done on many occasions before; but he has got to be a pretty old man now and there are a great many young men coming up who cannot be hoodwinked, the young portion of the country cannot be carried by the loyalty cry and will not be hoodwinked by it. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will raise this question at the general election, because I am satisfied that if that cry is raised we will be the victors. You know the story about the quaker and the mad dog.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. COOK. The quaker said: I will not raise my hand against it, but I will give it a bad name, and forever afterwards it will be called the mad dog. The hon. gentleman is going to raise the loyalty cry, and like the quaker is going to raise the cry of mad dog, hoping that that will bring the people around him; but he is very much mistaken. Let me say a few words about loyalty. Who have been the loyal party? I am descended from the United Empire Loyalists, and I do not yield my loyalty to the leader of the Government or any one else. Hon. gentlemen opposite are loyal so long as it keeps them in place and power and they get the benefit of it. So soon as they see they could, by turning round and hob-nobbing with the United States, gain any advantage, politically, they would do it quicker than any men living, for it is a question of keeping themselves in power. I believe the leader of the Government is desirous of promoting the well-being of the country, but if it stands between him and political success, then the interests of the country will have to give way to political success. Who signed the annexation manifesto? Hon. gentlemen opposite know very well. The leader of the Government knows that he sat in council with some of those men! Who burned the Parliament buildings at Montreal? Why, the Tories! Who rotten-egged the Governor General, Lord Elgin, at Montreal? Why, the Tories! That very mace now lying on the Table before you, Mr. Speaker, has a history. The beaver was stolen from it at the time of the fire in Montreal. Who did it? The men who burned the Parliament buildings and rotten-egged the Governor General—they stole the beaver off the mace! Who was it that hoisted the black flag in Brockville? It was the Tories! Wherever there is anything disloyal you will find a Tory mixed up with it, and when there is anything to be carried out that is not loyal it is carried out by the party who are always claiming they are the loyal party in the country.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That the net debt of the Dominion of Canada was \$140,363,069 on the 30th June, 1878;

That the net debt of the said Dominion was \$228,235,786 on the 31st March, 1888;

That the total annual expenditure of the Dominion was \$13,508,158 for the year ending 30th June, 1878, and \$35,658,161 for the year ending 30th June, 1887;

That the estimated expenditure for the year ending the 30th June, 1889, is \$35,321,440, wholly apart from divers known unprovided expenditures which will raise the total amount likely to be expended to at least \$37,000,000, being an increase of the net debt to the amount of \$88,000,000, and of the total annual expenditure of \$13,500,000, in the space of 11 years;

That the said debt and expenditure have increased in a ratio very far in excess of the increase of the wealth and population of the country during the said interval;

That the said expenditure is provided for by a system of taxation so adjusted as to press with extreme and unjust severity upon the thrifty and industrious producer, and especially upon all farmers, day laborers, mechanics, artisans, and factory operatives, who are at present subject to a customs taxation on articles necessary to life and comfort, amounting to nearly one thousand per cent. more than that levied upon members of the corresponding classes in Great Britain and Ireland.

That the mischief caused by the present system are further aggravated by the very general substitution of specific for *ad valorem* duties,

Mr. COOK.

whereby the injustice of the existing mode of taxation and the unfair preference shown to rich consumers over the less wealthy is at once and the same time increased and concealed, and that it is expedient that the said injustice should be remedied and that the wealthy classes should be compelled to bear their fair proportionate share of the burden of taxation;

That this House views with alarm the extremely rapid increase of the debt and taxation of the Dominion, especially in view of the fact that there has been contemporaneously a very great reduction in the debt and amount required for necessary taxation by the United States, and that this House is of opinion that any considerable addition to the debt or taxation of the people of Canada will work very great hardship to the great bulk of the population and will tend powerfully to place them in a position of great disadvantage as regards the people of the United States, besides seriously prejudicing their chances of securing improved commercial relations with the people of that country.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fiset,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Mitchell,
Barron,	Flynn,	Mulock,
Béchar, d,	Csuthier,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	Perry,
Borden,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Sourassa,	Holton,	Purcell,
Bowman,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Brien,	Jones (Halifax),	Robertson,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Kirk,	Rowand,
Casey,	Landerkin,	Ste. Marie,
Casgrain,	Lang,	Scriver,
Charlton,	Langelier (Quebec),	Sempie,
Choquette,	Laurier,	Somerville,
Cook,	Lister,	Sutherland,
Davis,	Livingston,	Trow,
De St. Georges,	Lovitt,	Turcot,
Dessaint,	Macdonald (Huron),	Watson,
Doyon,	McIntyre,	Weldon (St. John),
Edgar,	McMillan (Huron),	Welsb,
Eisenhauer,	McMullen,	Wilson (Elgin),
Ellis,	Meigs,	Yeo.—66.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Audet,	Ferguson (Benfrew),	Masson,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Welland),	Mills (Annapolis),
Baird,	Foster,	Moffat,
Baker,	Freeman,	Moncreiff,
Bell,	Gigault,	Montague,
Bergaron,	Gordon,	Montplaisir,
Bergin,	Grandbois,	O'Brien,
Bowell,	Guilbault,	Perley (Assinibois),
Boyle,	Guillet,	Perley (Ottawa),
Brown,	Haggart,	Porter,
Bryson,	Hale,	Priot,
Burns,	Hall,	Pitnam,
Cameron,	Henderson,	Reid,
Cargill,	Hesson,	Robillard,
Carling,	Hickey,	Roome,
Carpenter,	Hudspeth,	Roos,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jamieson,	Royal,
Chapleau,	Joncas,	Shanly,
Chisholm,	Jones (Digby),	Small,
Cimon,	Kenny,	Smith (Ontario),
Gochrane,	Kirkpatrick,	Sproule,
Cockburn,	Labelle,	Stevenson,
Colby,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Corby,	Landry,	Temple,
Costigan,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Thompson,
Coughlin,	Laurie,	Tisdale,
Coulombe,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Couture,	Macdowall,	Tupper (Picton),
Curran,	McGulla,	Tyrwhitt,
Daly,	McDougald (Picton),	Wallace,
Daoust,	McDougall (O. Breton),	Ward,
Davin,	McKay,	Weldon (Albert),
Davis,	McKeen,	White (Benfrew),
Dawson,	McLellan,	Wilmot,
Denison,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Desaulniers,	McNeill,	Whon (Lennox),
Dejardins,	Madill,	Wood (Brockville),
Dickinson,	Mars,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dupont,	Marshall,	Wright.—117.

Amendment negatived.

House resolved itself into Committee on Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved :

1. That the Governor in Council may, by proclamation, whenever it appears to his satisfaction to be desirable in the public interest so to do, either reduce or remove entirely or in part, the export duties provided for by section six of the Act respecting the duties of customs, and by schedule E thereto, or by an Act in amendment thereof.

2. That section nine of the said Act be repealed and the following substituted therefor :—

" 9. Any or all of the following things, that is to say :—Animals of all kinds, hay, straw, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), salt, peas, beans, barley, malt, rye, oats, buckwheat, flour of rye, oatmeal, buckwheat flour, butter, cheese, fish of all kinds, fish oil, products of fish and of all other creatures living in the water, fresh meats, poultry, stone and marble in its crude or unwrought state, lime, gypsum or plaster of Paris (unground, ground, or calcined) hewn or wrought or unwrought burr and grindstones, and timber and lumber of all kinds, unmanufactured in whole or in part, including shingles, clapboards and wood pulp, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided for by any Act at the time in force, upon proclamation of the Governor General, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada."

3. That section ten of the said Act be repealed ; and items 592 and 781 in Schedule C to the said Act be also hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor respectively :—

" 592. Coffee, green, except as hereinbefore provided."

" 781. Tea, except as hereinbefore provided."

4. That the excise duty on spirits manufactured from raw or unmalted grain used in combination, in such proportions as the Department of Inland Revenue prescribes, with malted barley taken to the distillery in bond, shall be the same as that in spirits manufactured exclusively from malted barley.

5. That when any substitute for methylated spirits is supplied to any manufacturer in accordance with section 238 of "The Inland Revenue Act," the price thereof shall not exceed the actual cost with the addition of 15 per cent.

6. That the excise duty on cigarettes, whether the product of foreign or of domestic leaf tobacco, weighing not more than three pounds per thousand, shall be sixty cents on every pound ; and on those weighing more than three pounds per thousand one dollar per pound.

7. That the excise duty on all cigars, whether the product of foreign or domestic raw leaf tobacco, when put up in packages containing less than ten each, shall be seven dollars per thousand.

8. The foregoing changes in duties of excise shall come into effect on and after the second day of May, 1888.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Just state the alteration proposed to be made in the existing law.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What articles are left out ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The article of green fruit is left out, because they are now there by proclamation.

Mr. MULOCK. Will not the repeal of the Act repeal the proclamation ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No ; the proclamation has placed them on the free list, and nothing would subject them to duty but an Act of Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. Does not the proclamation depend upon that Act ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What are the articles ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am now reading the articles omitted from the old list. Green fruit is omitted, bran is omitted, seeds of all kinds—for the same reason that they have been included in the proclamation ; also plants, trees and shrubs have been made free by proclamation. Coal and coke, hops, wheat, Indian corn, flour of wheat, flour and meals of any other kind, lard, tallow, salted or smoked meats are omitted ; and there are added, that are not now in the present list, fish of all kinds.

Mr. MITCHELL. Salted as well as fresh ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, fish of all kinds ; also fish-oil, fish products, fresh meats, poultry, wood pulp, stone in the rough, marble in the rough, burr and grindstones, lime and calcined gypsum. I may say that many of those alterations are made in conformity with the Mills' Bill, so that I have adopted the same designations as were used there, and

have added some articles ; for instance, stone in the rough, marble in the rough, grindstones calcined gypsum, and poultry, which are included in the Mills' Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Were not wheat and the produce of wheat in the Bill ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No ; none of those were in the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the hon. gentleman's reasons for omitting those articles that he now omits from the statutory offer beginning with bran, if I took him down correctly, and going down to salted meat ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I stated that while you would be prepared, as a question of treaty, to put on a number of articles that you might not desire to have made free, because, taking the arrangement as a whole, you obtained the insertion of other articles that you desired very much. When you come to make those articles free by legislative enactment it became necessary to revise the list and the list would be revised from time to time. I am governed to some extent by the movements made in the Congress of the United States. I considered it not desirable to embrace in this articles which are not embraced in the Mills' Bill, and I have embraced a number that are embraced in that Bill. I think we must now deal with the revision of the system from time to time. While we retain it as a statutory offer, it must be from time to time revised in such a way as to meet the interests of Canada and the wishes of our own Parliament.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is coal in the Mills' Bill ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, I did not feel disposed to take up the time of the House as gentlemen much more able to discuss the Budget than myself desired to speak, and have spoken, at considerable length ; but I cannot allow this measure to pass without again, as I have done Session after Session, calling the attention of the Government to the fact that wheat and the produce of wheat, and corn and the produce of corn, have been omitted from the list. I have repeatedly on former occasions pointed out the great injustice that is done to the lumbering, laboring and fishing classes in my own county, by the principle that makes them pay a duty on the food they eat as well as the clothing they wear, and everything that enters into the consumption and maintenance of life. I feel that year after year, when the system of protection is being aggravated very much, that it is an injustice to that numerous class of the community, to allow such an opportunity as this to pass without adding these items to that statutory offer of reciprocity. I am not going to make a speech about it ; it is useless. If I did not know it was so hopeless I would take up a good deal of time to prove to this House the injustice, and I would feel it my duty to divide this House on the point. But as I have done it before, and may have an opportunity of doing it again before the Session closes, unless the Government revise their decision, I will not take up the time of the committee at this late hour. I therefore simply enter my protest against the omission from that statutory offer of these articles, at the present time, when everything looks so favorable to our getting the United States to meet us on a fair reciprocal basis. I think if there is anything that should be put on the free list it is the food of the working classes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I object to the course the Government are pursuing in this matter, from exactly the opposite reason to that stated by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I think their course is objectionable on several grounds. It is objectionable because I think it is humiliating for this country to be playing this sort of game with the

United States. I object to playing a game when I am playing second hand with a low card, can never have the lead and never get a trick, and that is exactly the position we are standing in with relation to the United States. I also object because I think, as a matter of principle, any such arrangement, whether by treaty or by statutory enactment, is in itself antagonistic to the National Policy. I contend that if we are to carry out the National Policy we must carry it out in its entirety. We cannot add a little bit here, and take off a little bit there, and say we will put this or that on the free list; and at the same time do justice to the great bulk of the community. I merely mention these two grounds, because I think the time must soon come, and the sooner the better, when if the Government are to stand by the National Policy, which this House and the country have supported them in, they must begin by repealing that statutory clause altogether. It may be said that that clause is only permissive; yet so long as we have it on the Statute-book, it is to some extent binding and obligatory upon us. If not, why do we put it there? We must also remember what we seem to have forgotten on this side of the House at any rate, in the debates that have taken place, that this country has not stood still since 1878—that what would have been a perfectly just and reasonable policy at the time of the initiation of the National Policy may naturally be expected to be entirely unreasonable and unsuitable to the present conditions. If the National Policy has done anything during the time it has been in force, it must have created a great many industries, and therefore have placed the country in an entirely different position. Therefore acting, as we are doing now, is almost equivalent to saying that the National Policy has not altered the condition of things in this country. I contend that it has altered them, and very much for the better; and it is because I believe in it that I do not wish to see it hampered in its operation by a reciprocity treaty or by any such provision as this, which is in some respects as binding and obligatory as a treaty. For these reasons I object to the course taken by the Government. In pursuing it, I think they will be digging a pitfall into which they will ultimately fall.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I regret that the hon. gentleman should have taken from the list any article that was there before. He has taken off corn and corn meal, and wheat and the flour of wheat. In doing so I think he is making a very great mistake. He is certainly not acting in the interest of the agricultural population of this country. He is leaving on barley; yet when there was no duty at all imposed on American barley coming into this country, none came; the barley went in the other direction. Does he suppose that the Americans are going to act on that statutory offer by taking the duty off barley if he leaves the duty on corn? It is in the interest of the agricultural population, who are raising stock, to have the privilege of obtaining corn from the United States to feed to their stock, because we raise in this country a quantity of that article altogether inadequate to our wants. The hon. gentleman proposes to agree to have free trade with the United States in certain natural products in which the exports are from Canada; but in regard to those articles which Canada imports he does not propose that any statutory offer shall exist. In making that proposition I cannot believe the hon. gentleman to be sincere. It looks like an attempt to put on the Statute-book an offer which he knows will not be accepted. What is he asking the House to do? He is asking it to guarantee the interest of a very large sum to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to remove the restraints that exist against the importation into the United States of the growing products of the North-West, and yet he proposes by removing wheat and wheat flour from that statutory offer to interfere with the freedom of

Mr. O'BRIEN.

trade between the North-West and the United States. I say that in doing that he is taking a retrograde step. If he is, as he says, in favor of free trade in natural products, why does he remove any natural product from the list? He is either in favor of free trade in natural products or he is not. Why, every Minister who has spoken on the subject has declared himself in favor of free trade in natural products. Then, why remove any natural product from that statutory offer. Take another case. The hon. gentleman told us he was in favor of free trade in coal with the United States. He has told us so repeatedly. But now what does he propose to do? He proposes to take coal out of the statutory offer. He proposes to keep upon the people of Ontario a tax that is imposed upon the people of none of the other Provinces; he proposes to retain this very large tax that falls exclusively upon the people of Ontario. The hon. gentleman knows that he has repeated every Session, and hon. gentlemen behind him have echoed his statement, that the tax on coal does not increase the price of Canadian coal in Canadian markets. But he knows that he has collected nearly \$1,000,000 from the people of Ontario on coal alone. There is not a town or city in the Province of Ontario, the people of which do not consume coal during five months of the year, and yet the hon. gentleman undertakes to impose a serious tax upon them, which must seriously weigh on their earnings. Why, I have seen myself, during the present winter in London, the children of poor people purchasing 10 cents, 15 cents, or 20 cents worth of coal or wood, and the hon. gentleman proposes to impose a tax upon the fuel which is to keep these people in comfort during the winter season. That is what the hon. gentleman proposes to do. He knows that at present there is a Bill before Congress proposing to remove the duty upon coal, which Bill will probably be carried, and yet, in order that he may avoid removing the tax upon coal, which falls very severely upon the poorer population of the cities—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What Bill does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I refer to the proposition that is now before the Congress of the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Any tariff Bill?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is it?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I cannot tell the hon. gentleman at this moment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know of no such Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the hon. gentleman has not taken the trouble to read the American papers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have followed them closely.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman now is proposing to remove coal from the list in the statutory offer. Why does he do so? If he thinks that there is no proposition to be made by the United States, no mischief, even according to the protectionist's view, can arise from leaving coal there. If there is to be such a proposition, the hon. gentleman puts it out of his power to place coal on the free list; and I say it is a serious tax upon the poorer population of Ontario. Then the hon. gentleman has referred to the effect of the proclamation that has issued. Of course the proclamation does not remain in force when the statute upon which it rests is repealed. The proclamation falls with the statute. The articles are put upon the free list, but they may not remain there. If they do, it is because there is no provision of the law that the former state of things shall be revived. I do not know whether there is a provision in the hon. gentleman's Tariff Bill which provides that the unenumerated articles shall be subject to a certain rate of taxation. If so, it is possible that those articles might be so included,

but I suppose the hon. gentleman intends to put those articles, upon which the duty has been removed by the proclamation, in the tariff, upon the free list.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are on the free list now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman propose to put them on the enumerated free list of the tariff?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are on the free list by law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact: that the proclamation by which they are put there is gone when the statute is repealed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say if you repeal section 9, you repeal the proclamation which was carried in virtue of the power given by section 9. There can be no doubt about that. If an article is put upon the free list and there is no statute to interfere, and there is a provision that the former state of things is not to revive, it will remain on the free list. It will require a positive Act to revive the tax once it is removed, but the hon. gentleman knows there is a provision in the law that all unenumerated articles—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not an enumeration of the articles to leave them out of the list.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They will require to be put on the free list and specified in the tariff.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says no. I have not looked carefully into the Act for that purpose, but certainly the reason he has given is not at all adequate. The hon. gentleman says he proposes to follow the Mills' Bill. I find that petroleum is put in that Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that I proposed to follow the Mills' Bill. I said the very reverse.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman said he would leave certain articles out of this Bill, because they were left out of the Mills' Bill, and that he would include certain articles because they were put in the Mills' Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did, but I did not say I proposed to follow the Mills' Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The statement the hon. gentleman has just made, is wonderfully like the same thing:

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is a great distinction between the two. I stated that when you came to deal with this question by legislation, both Governments were left entirely free to pursue the course that their own interests indicated as the best. That is the position I took; and wherever I found in the Mills' Bill an article I wanted to take advantage of and to make free I embraced it in this list, and if I find an article in that Bill that it is not in the interest of this country to have free, I am under no obligation whatever, because I know it was put in the Mills' Bill purely and simply with the view of considering the interests of the United States market.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the Mills' Bill were going on the line which the hon. gentleman mentioned, and without reference to what might be done here, it is very extraordinary, as the hon. gentleman must see, that the article of corn should be left out. What I was calling the hon. gentleman's attention to was that he might find that while the Americans would be willing to give us a remission of duty upon barley and a number of other articles, the natural products of the country, they might be willing to do so wholly upon the condition that we would be willing to take the duty off corn; yet the hon. gentleman puts it out of his

power to accept an offer which on the whole might be advantageous to the country. Even taking the hon. gentleman's view that some of them are more advantageous than others, and some may not be advantageous at all standing alone, they might be advantageous taking the whole together. The hon. gentleman has said that his leader has stated that they would like to have reciprocity with the United States in natural products, and I am calling the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he is seeking, by these provisions, to leave out some of those natural products, the free interchange of which he thinks would be to the advantage of this country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I find myself between two fires. In the first place, my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) objects to our having a statutory clause at all. I must remind my hon. friend that we are not bringing forward a statutory clause, but that, from 1849, in the old Province of Canada, this clause has been on our Statute-book. The Treaty of 1854 enlarged it very much; then, in 1866, the treaty having been abrogated, the clause was again put on our Statute-book, and it was re-enacted in 1867, 1868, 1870 and 1879. So we are not bringing forward the clause now. I am inclined to think that, if it was not already there, we might not be occupied as we are at this moment, but, the clause being on the Statute-book, we are of the opinion that it would not be wise that it should disappear, it would not be wise, at the present time and under the present circumstances, that it should be taken away. I do not hesitate to state to the House my position and my opinion in reference to this subject. I am in favor of having all the products of the farm, the products of the forest, the products of the mine, and the products of the sea, made free between ourselves and the United States. In my judgment, we might adopt the whole of that policy, and I say more, that both parties in this country have professed to desire that for many years. In my judgment, such a policy would be one that might fairly be entered upon with advantage to both countries, but we know that all our efforts to obtain a reciprocity treaty, which would make all these products free, have entirely failed; and, under those circumstances, the Legislature of Canada ever since 1849 have been placing a statutory provision in their laws in regard to a number of articles—not all those which were in the Reciprocity Treaty, not by any means all those articles which would be embraced in the category to which I have alluded the natural products of both countries—but they have selected a number of articles to be placed in this position. Now the time has come when it is clearly indicated on the part of the Congress of the United States that they do not intend to deal with fiscal questions by any other mode than by legislation, and we find a Bill brought forward in the House of Representatives there which proposes to place certain natural products of this country and others upon the free list. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) on the other hand, unlike my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who thinks this provision goes too far, complains that it does not go far enough, and he speaks especially, he says, in the interest of the lumbermen. What is the first clause of the Bill? It is a new enactment which I am asking the House to put on the Statute-book in the interests of the lumbermen. I do not think my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), much as he may object to making some of the natural products free, will say that it would injure the lumbering interests of Canada to obtain free admission for all our lumber to the market of the United States.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Our lumber, but not our saw logs—that is the point.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the position in which we find ourselves. Here is the great lumber interest of this country which has the prospect of having the market of the

United States opened to it free by the Mills' Bill, which I am strongly of opinion will become law during the present Session of Congress. If that is put on the Statute-book of the United States, we would not be able to take advantage of it, because there is a provision which says that no lumber shall be admitted into the United States free from any country which has an export duty on logs. We have an export duty on logs, and the first clause in this Bill is to enable the Governor General in Council to remove that export duty on logs so as to give the great lumber interest of this country free admission into the markets of the United States, if that Bill passes. I have already stated why this measure has been revised. It is one thing, as I have already said, to make a treaty, but it is an entirely different thing to deal with questions of this kind by legislative enactment, and the moment this question was settled, as it undoubtedly was settled, by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, that it is in violation of their constitution to deal with these fiscal matters without legislation passed by both Houses, we have to decide how far we shall go on one side or the other. The United States will decide to put on the free list, as they did in regard to lumber, such articles as they think will conduce to their own interests without any reference to our action. We, from time to time, will revise our list, and deal with our fiscal policy precisely as the Congress of the United States declares it will deal with theirs. We will make such articles free as we think the interests of Canada demand, and we will impose duties on such articles as we think the interests of Canada require. I think that will commend itself to members on both sides of the House. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has referred to coal. He must not forget that this Government without being moved to it by any party anywhere, removed the duty on anthracite coal, which had given us a revenue of \$500,000 a year, and the hon. gentleman knows that the Province of Ontario, from which he comes, largely receives the benefit and the advantages of the remission of that duty. The hon. gentleman is perfectly aware that, deriving, as we do a large revenue from coal, it might seriously derange our financial arrangements if suddenly, in relation to that or any other article, an alteration were made, and we were placed in such a position that we would have no option but to make that article free. We have confined this list to such articles as it would be in the interest of Canada to make free, and that will be subject to revision from time to time as, in the judgment of Parliament, it may be found necessary to act in the interests of this country.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. the Finance Minister has referred to my objections to the form of the statutory offer, and he says I referred especially to the lumbermen and to the fishermen, and in that he is correct. He states that the provision in the first part of the Bill covers any advantage which the lumbermen might fairly expect.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say so. I said the first clause was in the interest of lumber and in the interest of salt, which are the two articles the first clause deals with.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend knows that no portion of the class of people I have referred to in the Lower Provinces, will derive any benefit whatever from the first clause. Talk about salt. Can they take salt from Western Ontario down to the fishermen along our coast?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not mean to say that; but I meant to correct myself in saying that the first clause dealt entirely with the interest of the lumbermen. I had omitted to state that salt is also included, and that it had no reference to the hon. gentleman's constituents.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am speaking from the standpoint of constituents now, and from the standpoint of a very much

larger sphere. I wish to let the hon. gentleman understand that the advantages given, as he claims, to the fishermen by the first section of the Bill providing for salt—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I had no reference to advantages to fishermen whatever. The salt industry is entirely an Ontario interest, so far as the action of this Bill is concerned. It had no reference to the fishermen whatever. I merely referred to it as being in the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman referred by special direction to the objections I took on the ground of the fishermen and lumbermen, and when he spoke of lumber and salt I assumed that he meant to point out the special advantages to be derived by the class of constituents I represent. The fishermen of that section of the country know better than the hon. gentleman that a very large portion of the population of the Maritime Provinces is largely engaged in fishing, and another large portion engaged in lumbering and as laborers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And they have all the salt free now.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know they have salt free, but the hon. gentleman put forward the question of salt, and I assume that he referred to that as he did to the question of the lumbermen being benefited by the first clause of that Bill. As to the advantages lumbermen get under that Bill, I do not think it has anything to do with the duty on flour and provisions that are used by men engaged in the lumber business. When I speak of the lumber interest I do not allude only to the men who carry on business in the woods, but I allude to the laboring classes that form so necessary a part of the lumber business, forming forty to one of the class the hon. gentleman refers to, the lumbermen proper. Now, I think it is pursuing a course to be regretted to leave out all these items and also the item of coal; and I think it is pursuing a course not to the advantage of the country. The hon. gentleman speaks of the advantages that have been given to Ontario by the admission of hard coal free. Why should a special portion of this country be selected for special advantages under this Bill? Why should New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, and a considerable portion of Nova Scotia too, be left out of the advantages which free coal would give them? If there is a loss of duty amounting to nearly half a million, by the act of the Government, in the admission of anthracite coal free for the benefit of Ontario, why should not the Maritime Provinces participate in those benefits, by taking the duty off soft coal? My hon. friend will say it would tend to discourage the miners of Nova Scotia. Sir, I was speaking to the manager of one of the leading mines in Nova Scotia the other day, the Spring Hill mine, and I asked his opinion about the effect of free coal. He said he would be glad to see coal free, he wanted no advantage from it; and he pointed out to me why, and his explanation was perfectly satisfactory. I can see no reason whatever why our people should be subjected to the disadvantages which result from the treatment which they have received by the preferences given, as shown in the instance the hon. gentleman has referred to in the case of Ontario and free coal. Now, this treatment has been going on quite long enough. I recollect the subject was brought four years ago before the then Finance Minister, the present Governor of New Brunswick, and an intimation was given very like a half promise that the duty would be taken off cornmeal, and I dare say some hon. gentlemen will recollect it. Now, if the hon. gentleman takes out of this list of statutory articles which they propose to make free—omits from it corn and the produce of corn, wheat and the produce of wheat, and barley and the produce of barley—if the Americans adopt the Mills' Bill

and put them in, he precludes this country from getting the advantages of the powers that these very gentlemen would have the right to exercise under the law now, if these things were included. The hon. gentleman speaks as if we were to follow the United States alone. Why should they only follow the United States? Why should they only follow the Mills' Bill? The hon. gentleman says that if the United States make a certain article free, it is for the interest of Canada that that article should be made free also, that they may come, Session after Session, and take powers to make it free. Why do they not take powers now and reserve to themselves the right only to accept such articles as are in the interest of Canada—and this House would not hesitate to give them the power. That is, in my opinion, the course these hon. gentlemen should pursue, and not pursue that which is evidently their determination, and refuse to let the food of the people come in free. It is time this legislation for localities was done away with. I would remind my hon. friend that it has been stated in the press of the United States that there should be a clause—I do not know whether it should be put in the Mills' Bill or whether in a separate Bill, because there is a separate Bill talked of—there should be a clause put in one of these Bills that the free list which it is proposed largely to extend by that or some other Bill, shall not apply to Canada or any country that has certain stipulations against the United States which Canada has to-day. Now, Sir, one of these is fish, and I would like to know if my hon. friend is determined to impose upon the fishermen of our country the exclusion of fresh fish from the markets of the United States?—for that is what that Bill would mean, if there is anything in the statements of the American press. I need not tell my hon. friend that it would mean hundreds of thousands of dollars out of the pockets of the fishermen of the Province of which I have the honor to represent one county. It is a very serious position in which to place the fishermen of our country, in the future, in carrying on their business. I need not tell this House, because a dozen men in this House already know it, that to some counties in the northern portion of New Brunswick, and especially the one I represent, the free markets of the United States for fresh fish are of the greatest importance, and are, perhaps, the source of the living of a large number of people during the winter season in catching fresh fish and sending them through to the United States. But I very much fear, from the tone of the press of the United States, and what is said in relation to the treatment Canada has given them, that we may find ourselves excluded in the article of fresh fish from the markets of the United States, and I would very much regret it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have no doubt the Finance Minister is correct when he said that the changes proposed by the American tariff Bill were more with reference to their own interests than to the interest of Canada. But be that as it may, I think it would not be wise for us to close the doors against any proposal looking to the enlargement of the free list between the two countries. Now, the list which is proposed by the present resolution embraces articles which we do not import from the United States, that is to say, animals of all kinds, hay, straw, potatoes, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, buckwheat, oatmeal, buckwheat, flour, cheese, gypsum, timber, and lumber of all kinds, manufactured wholly or in part, including clapboards and wood pulp. Now, it must be remembered that we do not import any of these articles from the United States at the present moment; therefore putting them on this list is merely with the object of conveying to the country the idea that we are going to be very generous in making an offer to the United States for the free admission into our country of certain articles when these articles are placed on the free list of the United States.

The omission of coal and wheat from the free list may, it appears to me, prevent our having the advantage of the Mills' Bill, provided it passes. The hon. gentleman drew attention to the fact that last year we paid, as he said, although I see it is corrected in his revised speech, \$1,800,000 on lumber shipped to the United States. If they place that on the free list and other articles which are on the free list at present, and should also place coal, which the hon. gentleman says they propose doing, and we should place certain articles, not coal or wheat, on the free list, then I am afraid it might prevent their allowing that clause to go into operation. They might say that unless you admit all those articles free, including coal, coke, wheat and breadstuffs of all kinds, we will not admit lumber and other articles which it is to the interest of this country should be admitted free into the United States. It would, therefore, be wise for the Government to take power, whether they exercise it or not, to be able under certain circumstances that may arise, when the Government may be able to dispense with the revenue which they at present derive from the importation of coal and which I admit is a large item—if the Americans should place coal and other articles on the free list the Government would be able to deal with the matter, if they saw their way clear to do so. If they put it out of their power to deal with it and the Americans pass that Bill enabling lumber and other articles to go free to the United States, I say they may naturally turn round and say: We are not going to give you what you offer unless you place all those articles on the free list in Canada. It is in that sense the Finance Minister would do well to amend his proposal and place those articles on the free list, coal and coke, and breadstuffs of all kinds, so that they may be able to deal with the matter if occasion should arise by the Americans placing them on the free list, otherwise the interests in which we are concerned in the proposal now before Congress might lose the benefit of free admission into the United States.

Mr. WATSON. I desire to ask the Minister of Finance if it is his intention to include flooring and siding in manufactured lumber.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We say manufactured in whole or in part.

Mr. WATSON. You specified clapboarding. I regret that the Finance Minister has not seen fit to place on the statutory offer the two articles which some of the members for Nova Scotia are afraid that unless they are placed on the free list will not be admitted into the United States free. As representing a country that might be supposed to be protected by the duty on wheat, I say that Manitoba regrets as well as New Brunswick does that the duty has not been taken off wheat. The Americans are now coming into the North-West to buy our hard wheat, which has brought 10 cents more per bushel in Dakota this year than in Manitoba. In fact they have sought that wheat in large quantities, notwithstanding the duties, and about 100,000 bushels have been shipped to the United States for seed, with a view to improving the quality of wheat grown there. It is well known that the area in the United States for producing hard wheat is rapidly diminishing, and I believe it would be to the interests of Manitoba to place wheat on the free list. A duty on wheat is no protection to any farmer in the Dominion, it simply prevents their selling wheat in the best market available. I also wish to draw the attention of the committee to the duty on coal. I believe if the duty were removed from coal a large part of the North-western States would be supplied with soft coal from mines in our Canadian North-West. There has been a large shipment of anthracite coal from Banff mine to California, some 10,000 tons having been shipped already. If we had unrestricted reciprocity a large portion of the North-western States would be supplied from our North-West coal fields,

and if coal were placed on that list we might hope to have unrestricted trade. Another article from which the duty should be removed is potatoes. There have been a hundred carloads of potatoes sent to St. Paul and Chicago during the present season, and some also to St. Louis. It was my intention to have addressed the House on the question of unrestricted trade, but I am able to say that so far as Manitoba is concerned we have nothing to protect and no benefit can be obtained by us from a protective tariff. We are in a position to defy the competition of the world in natural products. Of manufactures we have very little indeed, and we do not wish to have them protected to the injury of the development of our agricultural resources. Manitoba would hail with pleasure the adoption of such a policy as has been introduced by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). We grow the best wheat, we have the largest number of acres in natural products, and if we had free intercourse with the United States, the North-West would prosper more rapidly than it has in the past. I hope that agricultural products and agricultural implements will be placed on the free list ere long. It is as important for a farmer to obtain cheap implements as it is to protect him in anything for him to grow. The duties paid on certain articles are imposed in the interests of two or three constituencies in Canada. The duty on fruit, which has been referred to, benefits only two or three constituencies. Coal in a like manner. Hon. gentlemen from the east have explained to me that if coal was placed on the free list they would be in a better position than at present. It is unnatural for coal to reach further west than Ottawa. Not a ton of coal from Nova Scotia goes as far west as Toronto. If the Government propose to operate a railway in the interests of the coal miners of Nova Scotia and carry coal free to them, but at the cost of the people at large, it may be done. But this is an unfair and unjust principle to adopt.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman seems entirely to misapprehend the scope of this measure. It is not to place anything on the free list. We have not power to put anything on the free list in the manner to which the hon. gentleman has referred, coal or wheat or breadstuffs entering the United States. It is the other way. All this does is to enable us, in case of legislation in the United States making the articles free, to place them on our free list by a proclamation. The hon. gentleman must not forget, and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) must not forget, that we have had coal on the statutory offer since 1879. The United States have not placed it on their free list. There are only two tariff measures now before Congress and neither the Mills nor the Randall Bill has any reference to coal, corn, wheat, flour or meal.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.). Does the hon. gentleman say Indian meal is not in the Mills' Bill?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say it is not, and while we have had it on our statutory offer since 1879, as well as coal, coke, and meal, and grain, and flour, and potatoes, not one of those articles are in either of the Bills that are before the United States Congress. It has been shown that putting those in the statutory offer has not accomplished anything at all in respect to those articles. We have tried that and it has failed. In fact I am inclined to think it has had a very contrary effect. I am inclined to think that putting coal on our statutory offer leads them to the conclusion that it is a great advantage to us to have coal free, and that rather prevents its being put on the free list in the United States. The same thing may be said of wheat and those other articles. I am just as anxious as the hon. gentleman is to see them include potatoes and I hope their Bill may be still amended before it becomes law as to include potatoes, and therefore I am anxious we should be in a position to take advantage of it.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Do you wish them to include coal and wheat?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not said that. I said we have had it in the statutory offer since 1879 and neither the Mills' Bill nor the Randall Bill now before Congress propose to make those articles free.

Mr MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has told us two or three times to-night that those articles were on the statutory offer since 1879. Knowing as he does the hostility to anything like free trade in the United States during that time, he has taken good care not to tell the House what I believe to be, viz., the change of sentiment, and what others believe to be the change of sentiment in the United States, in the direction of free trade. Notwithstanding the arguments that are made to the contrary, I believe that the free trade sentiment is making its way in the United States, and in view of that fact it is now proposed that we should take off some of the most important items, such as coal and wheat, flour and meal, from the statutory offer. I think the present time is the best chance for our offer being accepted, and these articles should not be dropped.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman is naturally enough in a difficulty. He and his colleagues have brought things to such a pass here, that we are now, according to his own statement, face to face with a considerable difficulty. I understand that the real reason for taking those off is, as he almost admitted, that he cannot dispense with the revenue he receives from them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would not like to lose it without having means to provide for the same.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am aware that the hon. gentlemen, by the mode in which they have conducted the public affairs of the country, have brought us to this condition—that in spite of the enormous taxation we are face to face with a deficit. Under those circumstances, with a known deficit of about a million on the next year, the hon. gentleman does not like to face another deficit, of as far as I can judge, a million and a quarter of dollars, if those articles should be placed on the free list. I think he is playing with edged tools. I have no doubt that when his proposition comes to be known and discussed, as it will in a short time be known and discussed in the United States Congress, that very much the conclusion will be drawn that has already been drawn and that is that he is carefully eliminating a number of articles which the United States might export to us in considerable quantities, and take from us in return other articles we desire to make free. As my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mitchell) very properly says there was no disposition during the last nine years on the part of the then American Government to relax their highly protective system, but it does seem very expedient, to say the least of it, that now that there is good ground to believe that their opinions are altering, that these articles should be left on the free list. The hon. gentleman very materially reduces the scope of the articles which he had formerly proposed to make free, and, though I am bound to admit that there is force in the objection he took as to the probable loss of revenue, I think that he will find that the action he is now taking will be apt to be construed to our disadvantage and that it will prevent a number of articles which would be greatly to our advantage to put on the free list in the United States, from being put there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think it is possible that can arise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman will find that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would consider it a serious question if I could take that view. I do not think it is

possible that any person in Congress can object to the elimination of those articles. How can they take objection when they have refused to accept it for nine years, and when they find that in a number of articles they propose in their Bill to make free we immediately take power for the Governor in Council, the moment their Act becomes law, to make those articles free also?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is just as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) pointed out. We sell the Americans no Indian corn, as the hon. gentleman well knows. I do not suppose we send a bushel except for the purpose of seed to the United States. On the other hand, everybody knows that but for our arbitrary tariff restriction we would import considerable quantities of corn from the United States. Then, as the hon. gentleman knows, too, we want to get our barley in there free. I think there is great force in the objection made by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that in striking out such an article as grain we may possibly prevent the Americans from admitting such articles as barley free.

Mr. WATSON. I finally comprehend the question and I have this to say, that I believe the Government ought to place such articles on the free list as would induce the Americans to give us reciprocal trade in certain lines.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The offer had no such effect. We have had it there since 1879.

Mr. WATSON. It is only now we could reap advantage from that. As far as we are concerned in the West we had nothing to trade with the Americans, but we find now that notwithstanding the duty they are seeking our potatoes and wheat to-day, and we wish to have those articles they are seeking in the American market placed on the free list if possible. I know that the Minister has not power now, but I wish he would take power to put them on the list, and the American people who are legislating now in the interest of the American citizens would, I am sure, ask power to place them on the free list also. I maintain that the Canadian agriculturist is handicapped by this policy. He has to pay more for his farm implements and he gets less for his farm products than he did before. It has been stated in this House that the farmer does not pay more for his implements than he did before. I know from my knowledge of facts and from my own experience that the Canadian farmer has got to pay a little more than the extra duty on implements, and more than that again in Manitoba, because the excessive freights charged on implements going into that country makes up the difference for the duty. I wish to see the agriculturist legislated for now, and I say legislation has not been in his interest, although that has been contradicted in this House by members, and by members from the North-West. I hold that the farmer of the North-West, who should be encouraged by this Government in settling that country, is handicapped as compared with the American farmer of to-day. A farmer in Dakota can buy his implements 35 per cent. less than a farmer can in Manitoba, and in some instances it is more than 35 per cent. less, because of the excessive freight to Manitoba. If time would admit I could give you the list of necessaries a farmer requires to settle on a farm in Manitoba and what he requires to settle on the same farm in Dakota. The balance is in favor of the American farmer by \$270. That is the cost of the goods taken from actual figures paid in 1887.

Mr. FISHER. If I understand the hon. Finance Minister, he has taken off certain things which are in the old standing offer, because he does not find them either in the Mills' Bill or in the other tariff Bill before the United States Congress; but I find, notwithstanding this, that there are a lot of things in this offer which are not in the Mills' Bill. The hon. Minister mentioned potatoes as one

article which he hoped to see introduced into that Bill before its passage through Congress, and therefore he left potatoes in this standing offer. Do I understand him then to build a hope that what articles he has in this standing offer will be placed in the Mills' Bill before it becomes law, and that we shall have that opportunity to have all these articles free? I did not understand him to say that much.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. FISHER. Then, I ask him why he has taken some articles off, and left some on which are in the same position. I would like him to say why he has left on animals, for instance, which he does not hope to have introduced into that Bill, and taken off such things as wheat, Indian corn, flour, Indian meal or meal of any other grain, lard, tallow, salt meats and smoked, some of which are still left on the free list by the Order in Council lately passed by the Government? The hon. Minister has not explained his reason for picking and choosing between these things at all, and I do not see why he should have taken from this standing offer these particular things. Does he intend it to operate against particular classes in this country, who might enjoy the freedom of the things which are put on the free list? I cannot understand any other reason for his having omitted these articles. I sympathise with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) who has called attention to the fact that Indian corn and meal and meal of other grains are removed from the chance of being put on the free list. Not only are the fishermen and lumbermen interested in these articles, but a large portion of our farming population as well. The hon. Minister knows perfectly well that Indian corn is not grown in this country to any extent, and we cannot raise it as cheaply as it is raised in the Western States. The farming community, especially in Ontario and Quebec, buy these grains from the Americans for fattening their cattle, which they export and make a profit on. Therefore the duty imposed on corn is a detriment to them, making their meat dear, and putting them at a disadvantage in competing with the Americans in the English market. This is only one article, and I think others would come under the same reasoning. I was surprised to find the hon. Minister so candid as to say that he based this legislation on the legislation which was taking place at Washington. He did not say it in so many words, but he practically acknowledged that he is regulating our tariff by the action of the American Congress. Yet it was only a few days ago that his followers called us disloyal, and applied almost every opprobrious epithet to us, because they said we proposed to give the American Congress some power over our tariff. If it is so disloyal and wrong on our part, how is it possible that it is right in the Finance Minister of Canada to make this proposition? I say the hon. Minister and his colleagues are driven to it by the tortuous and varying policy which they have adopted towards the United States. While at one time, as they did in 1873, they try to threaten the United States into reciprocity, at another time they try to coax them into it to such an extent as they are willing to go, but will not accept anything except what they are willing to give. But just now the hon. Finance Minister stated that he was going to take some of those things from the standing offer so as to intimidate the United States, I understood he wants to try and force them to give us a chance of getting some of our articles free into that country. I think the Government's experience in the past in trying to intimidate the United States should show the hon. gentleman that he is not likely to succeed to-day, and I do not imagine that the United States are going to be influenced by his action in this matter. But so far, I have not had any sort of information from the hon. Finance Minister as to the reason he has taken these particular articles out of the standing offer, while he has left others

which are exactly in the same category. If he does not explain that, we can only suppose that he has been entirely arbitrary in his selection.

Mr. PLATT. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to a matter of considerable and continually growing importance, with reference to the admission of certain classes of corn into this country free of duty. It is well known that the system known among farmers as ensilage, or green feeding of cattle, is carried on in many parts of Western Ontario as well as in the section I represent. It is produced from green corn, which is taken from the green stalk. This corn is grown from a seed which does not ripen in Canada, and which the farmers have to import. That seed is imported every year in large quantities, and the dairymen and farmers of the country would consider it a very great advantage to be allowed to import that kind of corn free. In the county I represent it is a new business, but last year some 200 bushels were imported for such purposes, and this year I am informed by the dairymen 600 bushels will be imported for seeding purposes, and the success of the dairymen in carrying on that system will depend on the cheapness at which they can obtain that food.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I understood the hon. Minister in the early part of his speech to emphasise that it has been and is now the policy of his party to obtain a treaty which would admit as far as possible the products of the farm, the sea, the forest and the mine from the one country into the other free of duty, and he gave us to understand that that policy was embodied in the old statutory offer. He has now revised that statutory offer, and has introduced a new one, omitting not only certain articles which by proclamation were taken out of the old statutory offer, and are now on the free list; but as my hon. friend behind me has remarked, he has omitted a large number of articles that were in the statutory offer and has limited the general character of that offer very largely. I think the House is entitled to know at greater length why he has done this. The hon. member for Northumberland asked a question on the subject of Indian corn and never obtained an answer. Why was that included in the old statutory offer and omitted in this? If the hon. gentleman is desirous that we should have reciprocity in the natural products, why omit these articles in the statutory offer? I hold the substance of a letter which the First Minister is alleged to have written a year or two ago to a leading statesman in the United States. It is contained in the letter of Mr. J. S. Ritchie, of Acron, Ohio, a gentleman well known in Ottawa, addressed to the *Washington National Republican*, and in that letter the First Minister stated what the policy of his Government was. Mr. Ritchie says:

"When the first Morrison Bill was under consideration in Congress I received a letter from the Canadian Premier, Sir John A. Macdonald, accompanied by a list of all the articles covered by the above mentioned provision (the standing offer) in her tariff law, and a large number of articles not there enumerated. In that letter he promised that if the Morrison Bill passed and included any or all of these articles in its free list, or admitted them at a lower rate of duty, Canada would at once treat all such articles which were the product of United States in a like manner. I gave that letter to Mr. Hewitt, the present mayor of New York, who was then an active member of Mr. Morrison's committee, and he gave it to Mr. Morrison, who expressed to me great satisfaction with the proposition contained in it. The letter, I believe, is to-day among the papers of the present Ways and Means Committee, and I do not doubt that the offer contained in it is as good as the day it was made."

The hon. gentleman will see that the expression of belief that Mr. Ritchie gives utterance to is not well founded, because the promise of the First Minister is not kept. A new statutory offer is introduced by the hon. gentleman, which, while it is extended to certain articles not mentioned in the old offer, deliberately omits a number that are mentioned in it. If they were omitted for the purpose of revenue, that reason is indefensible, because the taxation bears very

Mr. FISHER.

heavily on the poorer classes. I would like to know whether the First Minister has changed his policy or whether he is prepared to adhere to the proposition he made in his letter to Mr. Ritchie. Before the hon. gentleman asks us to carry this resolution, he should explain why the articles in the old offer have been omitted in the new one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will read over *Hansard*, he will find there an answer to all that both he and the hon. member for Brome have said. In endeavoring to draw a distinction between a treaty and a legislative enactment, I have endeavored to mark the difference between a broad comprehensive policy entered into by two nations by treaty and a policy of each country deciding to adopt in reference to this matter just what suits its own interests. If the hon. gentlemen are not able to appreciate the distinction, I am afraid it is due to my inability to express what I feel upon the subject, in the mode in which I ought to be able to express it. It appears to me perfectly plain and simple that a policy which would be a sound, a rational and a judicious policy for a country to enter into by treaty covering all the natural products of the country is one thing, and it is another thing when one country declares it will not have a treaty or any reciprocal arrangement whatever, but will from Session to Session be entirely free to act just as its own interests require. That being the case, I view the position from that standpoint. I have never said that I decided to put everything upon our free list that I found made free in the Mills' Bill. If the Mills' Bill, or if the action of the United States Congress makes free an article which I do not consider it to be in the interest of Canada to make free, I will not put it in this clause. The articles put in this clause are put there to show what, in the judgment of the Parliament of Canada, we intend to take advantage of, should they be made free on the other side. I have put articles in this clause that are not in the Mills' Bill, but I do not confine myself to the articles mentioned in that Bill, because there are other articles which, should they be made free by the legislation of the United States, we would like to take advantage of. There are other articles that might by treaty be dealt with as a matter of deliberate arrangement, but which we would not be prepared at the moment to make free upon the action of legislation over which we have no control. I hope I have made myself intelligible. I have tried to explain everything in the fullest and frankest manner possible, and I hope hon. gentlemen will consent to review the statements I have made when they see them in print, and allow this proposition to pass.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think it is creditable on the part of the hon. the Finance Minister, after the criticisms and suggestions which have been made by hon. gentlemen on this side, to try and lead us from the argument that we have presented. It has been stated that the hon. gentleman intends to put potatoes on the free list, no doubt in the interests of the Maritime Provinces. But, on the other hand, he refuses to put corn on the free list. If there is any article at all shipped from the United States that would be compensated by the free admission of barley to the United States, it is the article of corn. The hon. gentleman well knows that the farmers of Canada paid \$20,000 during last year to get their barley into the United States. Now, there is not another item that would be more likely to be traded off for free admission of barley than corn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have had barley on our statutory offer since 1879, and barley does not appear in the Mills' Bill or the Randall Bill at all, so that we gained nothing by that. We have had both corn and barley on the offer, and neither one nor the other has been made free.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not say that barley is on, and the hon. the Minister is not going to prevent me from mak-

ing my argument by saying it is not in the Mills' Bill. I say corn is the only item that we might have to trade off in return for barley being admitted into the United States free, and the hon. gentleman has not explained why he has put potatoes on and left corn off.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So far as potatoes are concerned, there was a great doubt as to whether it was in the Mills' Bill. In fact, it was supposed at first that it did include potatoes. But it was found subsequently, by the provisions of the full and complete Bill, that it was considered potatoes would come under the head of vegetables otherwise enumerated, and, therefore, potatoes were not included, but there is a strong reason to hope that, before that Bill becomes law, potatoes will be included. We have had corn and barley on our statute since 1879, and we have had wheat and flour and other articles, and that has produced no effect whatever.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why not continue them?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The reason, as I have stated, is that we propose to deal with these questions from our own standpoint entirely.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has, over and over again, stated that he has had these articles on the statutory obligations of 1879, but he fails to answer the argument which I advanced against that, and which was referred to also by the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), that we knew that after the repeal of the Washington Treaty, a feeling had grown up in the United States, arising out of the fishery difficulties, which was hostile to any extended commercial relations between the two countries at all. That feeling has existed pretty well for seven or eight years, and, although the hon. gentleman had that statutory obligation there, the argument which I raise in reply to that is that a change is coming over the people of the United States, that their financial difficulties demand that a very large reduction shall take place on the articles coming into their country, and, judging by the Mills' Bill, a very large quantity of free goods will be admitted. My hon. friend the Finance Minister continually refers to the fact that this statutory obligation has existed since 1879, but he fails altogether to give an explanation why potatoes and coal are not in, and why cornmeal and corn and flour are taken out; he fails to realise the change which has taken place in the sentiment of the people of the United States, and so his answer is no answer at all. He is evading the question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The reason which the hon. gentleman has would be a reason for repealing the Act altogether.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He says he does not think so; then, why does he make the change in regard to these articles, and put articles there which are altogether contrary to the reason which he has given? He puts potatoes there, though he knows they are not in the Mills' Bill, with the hope, as he says, that at some future period or at some time or other the United States Congress will legislate in the direction of free trade.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is good reason to think so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then he should put corn on the list also.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that I would put corn on, even if they did.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He said he was in favor of free trade in natural products.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said, as a whole.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But he does not take power to deal with this as a whole. He deals with it piecemeal. Suppose the United States were to put the whole of the natural products on the free list to-morrow, the hon. gentleman does not take power to deal with that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would be very questionable whether you ought to. I have endeavored to explain that, as a matter of treaty, covering the whole, I would be willing to do this; but I never said that this should be done by legislation, seeing the power of the Congress of the United States to throw our whole financial arrangements into confusion by dealing with three or four articles.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has now repeated what he has said six or seven times before.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may have to repeat it five or six times yet before the hon. gentleman will understand me.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the people of the United States have reciprocity in natural products, they will not enquire whether it is under a treaty or under legislation. The effect is the same.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not the same.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say it is the same. If that advantage is obtained, it is the same to the people of this country if it is done under legislation as if it is done under a treaty.

Mr. BOWELL. The one is permanent and the other is not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman had better stand up when he wants to speak.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not talking to you.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are interrupting me.

Mr. BOWELL. Very well; I beg pardon. Go on.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says we are not to take power to throw the financial affairs of this country into confusion. He is not likely to do that without sufficient reason, and Congress would have the same reluctance to throw the financial affairs of the United States into confusion. He has not given us any valid reason for doing what he has done. He proposes to put certain articles on the free list which he admits the United States have not yet put on the free list by any Bill which is before Congress, and he has taken off some articles that are included in that Bill. He says he does not know that he would in any case put corn on the free list.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You have said that a great many times.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, it seems to be necessary to repeat it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That statement has been repeated twenty times to-night, and it is one o'clock in the morning.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Quite so, but the hon. gentleman might have concluded this debate several hours ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did my best to do so, but the hon. gentleman knows that I could not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The people of this country are in favor of putting all these articles on the free list.

Mr. HESSON. How do you know?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he is opposed to reciprocity in natural products?

Mr. HESSON. I am, in some of them, certainly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the hon. gentleman has been misstating his position this Session, and also in other Sessions, because he has voted to put that provision on the Statute-book which the Minister of Finance is now proposing to repeal. In fact the only hon. gentleman who has had the courage of his convictions, the only hon. gentleman who has spoken on this subject and has stated what he felt, is the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who says he does not believe reciprocity in natural products would be good for this country. Other hon. gentlemen are acting as if they were in favor of that reciprocity, but they are simply pretending that they are. The Finance Minister has been on each side of this question several times during this Session.

Mr. MULOCK. It may be that the law is as the Finance Minister says. I am not going to enter into any controversy with regard to that, but I hope the Finance Minister will not be offended if I ask the Minister of Justice to give us an assurance on that point. The Customs Act of 1879, section 6, declares that the articles mentioned shall be admitted into Canada free of duty whenever a proclamation issues. Now it is proposed to repeal the proclamation under that clause.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, not the proclamation.

Mr. MULOCK. No, but to repeal the clause on which the proclamation rests; and it is said that the repeal of the clause will not affect the proclamation. I do not propose to argue that point, but that is a question on which I would like the assurance of the Minister of Justice, for whilst that may be law, it is possible there is a doubt. There are certain orders that the Governor in Council can repeal, and others that he cannot repeal. A proclamation standing under that clause, resting upon the clause in question, I take it, is not repealable by the Governor in Council, but if you repeal the clause and leave the Order in Council standing, it may be that the Order in Council may be repealable under some other provision of the law. Now, I would ask the Minister of Justice whether it is quite clear in his mind that the proclamation under which green fruits, and fruit trees, and so on, articles that are not now to be renamed in the substituted clause,—whether it is perfectly clear to his mind that that proclamation cannot be repealable by any other than an Act of Parliament?

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand the position to be this: These articles had a duty imposed on them by statute, and by the same authority, that is, by a statute of this Parliament, power was given to the Governor in Council to make what was practically an enactment upon that subject for the repeal of these duties. Now, in pursuance of the powers given in section 9, the Order in Council was issued, and the proclamation went forth effecting a repeal of the duties which were imposed upon green fruits, and upon certain seeds, plants and shrubs. My view is that from that moment the enactment imposing the duty upon these articles was repealed and cannot be re-enacted except by this Parliament.

Mr. GILLMOR. I regret to discover that the Government are not disposed to place corn upon that statutory offer, because it has not been responded to in the United States. It is very important to New Brunswick and to my own constituency that corn and corn-meal should be admitted free of duty, and during the campaign of the late general election, there was an impression given currency to by my opponents that that small grievance was going to be redressed. I regret to discover that the Government are not so ready to put corn on the free list, even if the States do take duty off corn. I have not heard the Finance Minister say yet that he would respond to that, that he would meet the United States with regard to

Mr. HESSON.

the duty on corn and cornmeal. I wish he had left it, at least, on the statutory offer instead of removing it. I understand his position is that Government are going to exercise their own judgment as to how far they can accept reciprocity, as long as it is not general, and there is some force in the remarks of the hon. gentleman. But I do think that the duty on corn and cornmeal, even if it is kept on flour, ought to be removed, because you do not protect any industry that is now producing corn in Canada to any extent. I understand that there are two or three counties in Ontario that produce corn, but it is not exported to the Maritime Provinces, and we import a large quantity of corn and cornmeal. It is a matter that largely affects the poorer classes. While much of it may be used to feed horses and cattle, a very considerable quantity is also used by the poorer classes of the people as food. I think you might well have left it in your statutory offer. I do not think the people are going to have this duty removed from corn and meal quite as soon as they were led to expect by my opponents during the last campaign. If you would keep it on meal and allow corn to come in free, you would encourage our grist mills. Many of the grist mills you had before are now abandoned, but if you allowed corn to come in free, you would encourage the manufacture of grain into meal. The hon. Minister, who is a leading man in the Maritime Provinces, has intimated or hinted that he does not know whether he would meet the Americans half way, but in the interests of the people of that section of the country I would be very glad if he could meet their wishes in this respect.

Mr. MITCHELL. In relation to the duty on corn, I presume one of the objections the Minister has to its removal is the loss of duty. Now, I do not think the loss of duty would be so much as the hon. gentleman imagines, because I do not suppose any one would ask that the duty should be taken off corn that is used in the country for distilling purposes. What we ask is that it should be taken off corn when it enters into the consumption of the people and for the use of stock.

Mr. FISHER. The Finance Minister said a little while ago that he had over and over again answered the question which the member for Prince Edward Island had put to him. It is true that he has told us that he believes it is in the interests of the country to keep corn off the statutory offer in the future. Now, I would like to know why the Government think it to be in the interest of the country to do so. I would like to know whether it is that they believe that this is an industry which requires protection, or whether they believe it is a fair subject for taxation, or whether there is some particular interest to be conserved of which the Finance Minister has given us no inkling whatever. I have no objection to the Government taking the power to put upon the statutory offer such things as they think in the interests of Canada, but I want to know why they think it is in the interest of Canada that corn should not be put in such an offer. When the hon. member for Bothwell intimated that perhaps the Minister would not put corn upon the free list, even if the Mills Bill did contain it, and that he means to keep it for the sake of the duty, the hon. Minister did not say anything to the contrary. I think he is going back on his own statements that he wants to go as far as he can in the way of reciprocity in natural product.

Mr. HESSON. I confess that I cannot understand the hon. gentleman's reasoning. He has endeavored to make it appear that the exporters of barley from this country do pay the duty, and that if the Americans took the duty off we would get a higher price for barley. Now, if it will work in one instance, why would it not work in another? If the exporter pays the duty in the case of barley, may it not be possible that he will pay the duty on corn and corn-

meal? Did it ever occur to the hon. gentleman in that way?

Mr. FISHER. What do you think yourself?

Mr. HESSON. I have my opinion, and you may study the question out for yourself. But you will see how difficult it is to convince gentlemen who think that we must pay the duty in both instances. It is simply impossible. If we export barley and pay that duty, why, then, may not the Americans, in the export of cornmeal, be presumed to pay the duty? They do not produce barley and we do not produce corn. They require our barley and we require their corn. It is perfectly clear that we do not pay in both instances. I know hon. gentlemen opposite always endeavor to prove that on sending products into the American market our farmers pay the duty. It cannot be a reasonable or a logical conclusion to suppose that the people will believe that if this is true in one instance it is not also true in the other instance. I am not in favor of the Government even taking into consideration the propriety of taking the duty off grain or flour. It would be a most unwise course, and in the interests of my constituents I will never consent to the removal of the duty from wheat, oats, flour or meal and a great many other articles I could enumerate. Our market in Canada is better than that of the United States for all these articles, and our market has been better since the duty was imposed. That is perfectly certain, and our farmers and business men realise the fact, and while we export our surplus to the old country the United States is not our best market for the articles indicated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not want to be guilty of any discourtesy to the hon. gentleman, but I may say that I see no object in placing corn in the statutory offer. We have no desire to induce the United States to legislate so as to place corn on the free list. We have no object in doing so. We do not send any corn to the United States. Whenever it is the policy of Parliament to make corn free, then we can make it free, but there is no object in placing it in this offer.

Mr. FISHER. By parity of reasoning the United States might decline to put barley on the free list.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will say at once that the United States will place barley on the free list the moment they come to the conclusion that it is in the interests of their people to do so, and when they do that we shall be in a position to make barley free also.

Mr. FISHER. If the Americans do so for their advantage they do not care whether it is put on the free list or not. Under these circumstances it is no object to us to give power to the Government to put it on the free list.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand the Minister of Finance to state that it is not in the interests of the people, particularly the poorer classes, to put corn on the free list; because that is the only inference I can draw from the objection of the hon. gentleman to placing corn in the statutory offer? If he takes that position we have a distinct issue, and one the country can understand. What I contend in regard to corn is this: It is a food consumed by the poorest classes, and it is grown in only two counties in Western Canada to any moderate extent.

An hon. MEMBER. Half a dozen counties.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is only raised to any extent in about two counties. When we do not raise an article that enters into the food of the poorest class of the population, when it is used by the farmers for food and by the lumbermen and teamsters to feed their horses, it ought not to be taxed. The hon. gentleman says it is not in the interests of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I put the question: Did I understand you to say that it is not in the interest of Canada?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Whenever Parliament decides.

Mr. MITCHELL. When the Government of the day which controls Parliament decides.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; Parliament which controls the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. We hold the reins, but you show us the way to go according to the old song. I contend that the hon. gentleman by his acts, if not by his words, decides that it is not in the interest of Canada to place corn on the free list. If there is one single article discussed that should be on the free list it is corn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think my hon. friend had better make a clean breast of it before he sits down, and tell the House why the Government, of which he was a member, placed a duty on corn and cornmeal, and which they kept on while he was a member of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not necessary for the hon. gentleman to apply to one of the minor members of the Cabinet, as Sir Hugh Allan styled us, in the celebrated case which the hon. gentleman knows something about.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you acknowledge that?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; I have the honesty to acknowledge that I was a minor member. I do not know, without referring to the statute, whether the statement made by the hon. gentleman is accurate or not. I certainly did not think that the Government maintained the duty all the time I was in the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am willing to accept the fact that it was so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; it was not so.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am willing to accept the fact. It does not lie in the mouth of the Finance Minister, who occupied a more prominent and important position in that Government, to put such a question before me, which, as the letter of Sir Hugh Allan said, was one of the unimportant members of the Cabinet, who was not a person of sufficient importance to discuss important questions such as those which were discussed by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). As this is a matter of public policy I should like to be certain that I understand the statement of the Minister of Finance. I understood he was in favor of the free interchange of the natural products of the two countries.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. By treaty.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then I understood the hon. gentleman to say that in the event of the Americans placing all those articles on the free list he could not say that the Government, so long as he was a member of it, would reciprocate in all those articles, but there might be some to which he might take exception.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I endeavored to draw a broad distinction between a treaty and legislation, between making articles free by treaty and by legislation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is an evasion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You may call it an evasion, I do not. I call it a frank, statesmanlike statement.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is endeavoring to take credit elsewhere for being in favor of an exchange of the natural products of the two countries, but he is guarding himself all the time with this reservation, that

unless it comes just in the way to suit himself,—and which he says cannot be given,—he is not going to admit the natural products of the United States so far as he can control it into the Dominion of Canada, although the Congress of the United States may express their willingness and may pass an Act admitting the products of the Dominion of Canada into the United States. If that is his position I wish the hon. gentleman to distinctly understand that we shall know him for the future, because we do not intend to allow him to take advantage of both sides of the question. We shall know henceforth that although the hon. gentleman is expressing his readiness for free exchange of products he is throwing difficulties in the way.

Mr. HESSON. I hope the Finance Minister will hold the position he has always held in this country of fairness and independence, and I do not think that any threat coming from the other side of the House will very likely change his views. In reference to the imposition of duty on corn, I wish to say that there is another consideration besides that for the House. That duty has had the effect of reserving our market for oats and peas and the coarser kinds of grain. Hon. gentlemen cannot help seeing the difference between a treaty and between an Act of legislation in this House. By a treaty we can say to them: If we take off the duty on corn, will you give us an equivalent in another direction? If by an Act of legislation we remove the duty on corn, it means leaving our market exposed to the Americans and getting nothing in return.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It means getting cheaper corn.

Mr. MULOCK. We could get in our barley.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman must take the ground that we are not producing the corn and the cornmeal, and the people must pay the duty.

Mr. MULOCK. Let me ask you one question?

Mr. HESSON. I am sure there is not a gentleman in this House who does not understand the position the Minister takes on this question, as to our legislation here and by one stroke this House wiping out the tariff imposed on grain, which we have felt in the interests of the country in the past, and which I hope the people of this country will maintain, we will be leaving our markets exposed to be flooded from the other side. By a treaty we can get something in exchange. They may under a treaty give us their market for free fish if we take the duty off grain, but if you do so by an Act of this House you expose the markets of the whole country simply to gratify gentlemen who will censure the Government afterwards for acceding to their wishes and get nothing in return.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never.

Mr. HESSON. I venture to say it is so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is really a terrible thing to have such a censure pronounced by an old time supporter of the Government on the policy of the Government for the last ten years. Does not the hon. gentleman see that according to his argument nothing could be more absurd than the policy of the Government for the last ten years since this offer has been on the Statute-book?

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) if the United States produce anything that can be used in substitution for Canadian grown barley, more particularly the best kinds of bay barley.

Mr. HESSON. I think not.

Mr. MULOCK. Well that answers the question at once as to who pays the duty.

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Life is too short to settle that question now.

Mr. MULOCK. I know the party on the other side is not agreed as to that question of duty. I heard the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) insinuating and suggesting that the Canadian people are paying the duty on barley going into the United States. What does the Minister of Finance say on that question?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say anything.

Mr. MULOCK. I remember that in 1878 when the Premier was in Opposition he drew a very beautiful picture of the Canadian farmer paying the duty on barley. Does any one know what was the policy of the Administration on the question we are discussing to-night? Why will they not admit us into their secrets? A little while ago during this very Session, the Premier said that he was not going to allow the Americans to pick and choose, and they had got to go the whole hog or none. The Premier said that and all his followers said it after him, and the Conservative press in Hamilton, Toronto and Montreal, all said that the Americans must accept the whole statutory offer or nothing at all, but they had hardly finished their tune when the Premier changed his tune.

Mr. MITCHELL. He got a telegram from Washington.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes. I want to ask the Finance Minister if the policy of the party which he represents is going to be changed every day and every hour by some Bill that may be introduced into Congress, and are we to be imitators of the people of Congress, or are we to consider the interests of the people of Canada? If it is in the interests of the people of Canada that we should have enlarged and freer trade relations with the people of the United States in natural products, let us not adopt this narrow policy now proposed, which will, at all events, have the effect of preventing the farming community of Canada obtaining a free market in the United States for some of their cereals; more particularly barley. If that is not what the Minister is aiming at it is where he is going to arrive. He is preventing the American people placing on their Statute-book any offer to Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Ours is to be a sham offer.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, it is practically a sham offer, and there do not appear to be two members on the other side who have the same opinions on the question. The member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) who I suppose is on the borders of going into the Cabinet, now says he is against placing meats on the free list. If that be the case I hope he will vote against the motion.

Gen. LAURIE. I deeply regret to have heard that the Government were not prepared to take into consideration at the present time, the free importation of corn. I fully realise of course that revenue must be raised, but I do sincerely regret that there is no present indication showing of any desire to put corn on the free list.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Vote against it then.

Gen. LAURIE. With regard to voting; when the time for voting comes I shall vote as I think proper. At the same time the Minister of Finance states that it is a matter which rests with Parliament. I wish to say that I shall be most happy to support him in any resolution that he will bring forward when he considers Parliament is ready to deal with this question. I think the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) has expressed the proper view in regard to this question. I do think it is a matter of extreme importance to the people living in our Province that grain should be placed on the free list. I do not think, however, that it is necessary we should have it in those resolutions, because in placing it on those resolutions we would

have it on the free list, without any corresponding benefit for it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not at all.

Gen. LAURIE. That is my view at all events.

Mr. BORDEN. I am glad to find my hon. friend from Shelburne (General Laurie) has experienced a change of heart since 1879. In 1879 we had a colonization committee sitting in this House from day to day. That hon. gentleman did not hold the responsible position which he now holds as a representative of a constituency in this Dominion, although he held as he does now, a very high military position. At that time the committee were endeavoring to obtain evidence on which to base a National Policy, and before that committee my hon. friend was called as a witness. A number of questions were put to him as to the effect of a duty on corn and cornmeal on the farming industry of the Province of Nova Scotia, and he replied to one and all of these questions by saying that the duty on cornmeal would not at all be opposed to the interests of any class in the Maritime Provinces. I, as a member of the committee, pressed him on that point. I said that as a representative of a county in the western part of Nova Scotia. I believed that it was very important to the farmers there to have this article free for fattening, but he persisted that it was not. In fact, he said that a duty would stimulate the introduction of coarse grains, which would be quite as good for the farmers as corn. Now, Sir, I find that the hon. gentleman has changed his mind. Is it because he has become a representative of a constituency in Nova Scotia? At any rate, I am glad to find that he has changed his mind, and has come to the support of those who have been for years endeavoring to induce the Government to take the duty off cornmeal. I am glad to find that I, who brought this subject last winter to the attention of the hon. Finance Minister, who kindly promised to take it into his consideration, have in the gallant general an able ally, and I have no doubt that in the near future we shall be able to secure that change we desire, the removal of the duty from cornmeal.

Gen. LAURIE. The hon. gentleman is rather flogging a dead horse. He states that in 1879 I was prepared to advocate a duty on cornmeal. I am now speaking of taking the duty off corn, and I pointed out that the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) had expressed my view, that we might well keep the duty on cornmeal, but take the duty off corn, and so encourage the grinding of corn in our own country.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Finance Minister stated it was the confirmed policy of both parties in this House to favor reciprocity of trade in natural products. We have certain friends in the United States who are fighting strongly for more extended trade relations between that country and Canada, and I think it is exceedingly unfortunate that at this juncture the hon. Minister of Finance should have considered it his duty to give our friends there a slap in the face.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. He is doing it by taking from the free list an article that we declared to be free of duty, and he is placing us in such a position that we shall not be able to reciprocate if they put it on the free list. I think it is unfortunate that he is taking this retrograde step at such a time.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Without entering into the question of the advisability of interchanging the articles produced here with those produced in the United States, my view is that the present is about the first occasion since this Act of

ours has been on the Statute book, that the American Government have shown any disposition to reciprocate in any of these articles. The Americans, in the Bill before Congress, place a number of articles on their free list, as to which they are willing to reciprocate, and they have left out, not accidentally but by design, certain articles that to my mind, is equivalent to saying, we do not think it is to our interest that those articles should go on the free list; and if that is the American view, the passing of this Act is simply the withdrawing of the balance of those articles which they have said to us they will not reciprocate in, and I think it is the true and statesmanlike position for us to occupy to leave those articles for the further consideration of Parliament.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There is no doubt that we in the Maritime Provinces are a unit in favor of the removal of the duty on corn, and I believe our people are just about as anxious to have the duty taken off cornmeal.

Mr. GILLMOR. I said that.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). But it seems that for the purpose of protecting a small number of people in Ontario who raise corn, the rest of the Dominion should be saddled with that duty, and at the very time proposals are being made in the United States in favor of reciprocity, we withdraw these items from the standing offer. I have listened attentively to the hon. Minister of Finance as to the difference between a treaty and legislation; but in regard to natural products it seems to me that we should maintain the same position that we did before, if we expect our neighbors to meet us with legislation that may culminate in a treaty. But it seems to me that the Government are taking the present course, either for the purpose of raising a revenue or because it is part of the National Policy that reciprocity must be subordinate to it, although the party supporting that policy profess to be in favor of reciprocity in natural products.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman speaks of this duty as having been levied in the interest of Ontario. It may be that the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec expect to receive some consideration in this matter. But I would ask the hon. gentleman and all the hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces to recollect that the House in years past voted \$150,000 to aid the fishermen.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend from Lambton, deserves commendation for the interest he has taken in an article in which I have taken some interest. If there is an article in which he is deeply interested it is petroleum, and I notice that in the Mills' Bill petroleum is made free. If the Government were to take the duty off that article, they would confer a great boon on the Maritime Provinces and Eastern Canada generally.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. They would not have put it in the Mills' Bill, without good cause.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to endorse the remarks of the hon. gentleman for Prince Edward with regard to seed corn, and I trust the Finance Minister will take it into his favorable consideration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a new question and we will consider it.

Motion agreed to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved :

Section 10 of the said Act be hereby repealed and that items 592 and 781 of schedule O of an Act respecting the duties of Customs, chapter 33 Revised Statutes of Canada, 1886, be repealed, and the following substituted in lieu thereof.

592. Coffee, green, except as herein provided.

781. Tea, except as hereinbefore provided.

I may state that that change is for the purpose of dropping out what is now quite surplusage—that is section 10 of the Act which has entirely lost its force in consequence of legislation in the United States. It does not affect any change in the tariff.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). While I do not dispute the legal view of the Minister of Justice, it seems to me there would be no harm in having a provision that the proclamation continue in force. My own opinion in looking over the matter carefully, is in accord with the view of the Minister of Justice. Still there is some doubt, and it would be better by some clause just to leave that proclamation in force.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are tea and coffee free altogether?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, a duty of 10 per cent. on tea from the United States remains, but this legislation which is surplusage is removed for the purpose of taking away what has lost its significance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In what way does it lose its significance?

Mr. BOWELL. Having repealed the clause of the law which gives the Government power to impose a duty of 10 per cent. on tea from the United States, it becomes necessary to amend the items in the free list which affected coffee and tea, which read as follows:—"Tea, except as hereinbefore provided by section 10 of 49 Vic., cap. 33." The proposition is to make the items read: "Coffee, green, as hereinbefore provided." This leaves coffee, green, free, except when imported from the United States. Precisely the same remark applies to tea. These changes are necessary in order to prevent difficulty in the interpretation of these clauses.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand that coffee or tea when imported direct from the place of production are free?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. But if they come from Great Britain, France or the United States they are subject to a 10 per cent. duty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; only when they come from the United States.

Motion agreed to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved:

That the excise duty on spirits manufactured from raw or unmalted grain used in combination, in such proportions as the Department of Inland Revenue prescribes, with malted barley taken to the distillery in bond, shall be the same as that on spirits manufactured exclusively from malted barley.

That when any substitute for methylated spirits is supplied to any manufacturer in accordance with section 233 of the Inland Revenue Act, the price thereof shall not exceed the actual cost with the addition of 15 per cent.

I may state to the committee the explanation of that is this: When the Inland Revenue Act was framed only two kinds of spirits were made—first from raw grain and second from malt. The former were allowed to use up to 10 per cent. of malt, though in practice the amount barely exceeded 4 per cent. This was duty-paid malt. The latter used malt entirely and in bond. Hence to put them on a footing of equality 2 cents a gallon extra was charged as spirit duty as an offset to the malt duty levied on the grain distillers. Last year a distillery was started in Halifax, which did not come exactly under either of these definitions, as they proposed to use 15 to 25 per cent. malt and the remainder raw grain. Section 130 of the Inland Revenue Act established a duty on the raw grain spirits at \$1.30 a gallon and on the malt spirits at \$1.32 a gallon. As the distillery at Halifax used a greater percentage of malt than was allowed to the raw grain distilleries the rate

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

of \$1.32 a gallon was established by the Department as the duty on the spirits produced there and this duty has always been collected and the object of the resolution is merely to remove any doubts which may arise as to the proper duty to be collected on such spirits. There is no increase in duty. The duty remains the same, but this removes a doubt that might arise in that connection.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Why does the hon. gentleman specify barley. The spirits made in Ontario are entirely made from Indian corn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will not affect that in the least. It only removes a doubt arising from the effect of the different portions of the grain and malt duties.

Mr. MULOCK. I thought there was to be no change in the duties this year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no change in customs duties, but there are two or three in excise.

Mr. MITCHELL. Are there any changes?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend will allow me to read the resolutions, he will see.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have asked a simple question, and I want a civil answer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The last thing in my mind would be to treat my hon. friend with anything except marked courtesy.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have not had much of that lately from you.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I simply thought that, by reading the resolution, I might give him the information better than I could state it. The first resolution is:

That the excise duty on spirits manufactured from raw or unmalted grain used in combination, in such proportions as the Department of Inland Revenue prescribes, with malted barley taken to the distillery in bond shall be the same as that on spirits manufactured exclusively from malted barley.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the provision if it is made from potatoes?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It does not affect that at all. It does not touch the manufacture from potatoes or from corn.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Department of Inland Revenue issue a general declaration in reference to these preparations?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There does not seem to be any statutory provision as to the manufacture of alcohol from roots.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is another question. The second resolution is:

That when any substitute for methylated spirits is supplied to any manufacturer in accordance with section 233 of "The Inland Revenue Act," the price thereof shall not exceed the actual cost with the addition of 15 per cent.

The explanation of this resolution is that these methylated spirits have hitherto been manufactured by the bonded manufacturers, and the Department of Inland Revenue has had suspicion for a lengthened period that these spirits, the duty on which is 15 cents a gallon, have been largely used for potable and other purposes to which only pure spirits, duty \$1.30 a gallon, should be applied. It is intended to withdraw the privilege of manufacturing the methylated spirits from the bonded manufacturers and to place the supply under the control of the department, who will supply wood alcohol or wood naphtha to varnish makers and others. The 15 per cent. added to the cost is to pay for handling, and to prevent the loss which would otherwise accrue from withdrawing the duty collected on the manufacture of methylated spirits.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you going to undertake the manufacture of alcohol in the Inland Revenue Department?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The details will be fully explained when my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue introduces the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope you will not object to our discussing the matter on the Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, the fullest explanation will be given then. The third resolution is:

That the excise duty on cigarettes whether the product of foreign or of domestic leaf tobacco, weighing not more than three pounds per thousand, shall be 60 cents on every pound; and on those weighing more than three pounds per thousand, \$1.00 per pound.

The explanation of this resolution is that the present inland revenue duty upon cigarettes is the same as on cut tobacco, viz., 20 cents per pound. The duty on cigars is \$6 per thousand weighing say 12 pounds to the thousand, or say 50 cents per pound. The growth of the cigarette business has been seriously threatening the cigar revenue, while costing much more for stamping, &c. It is proposed to raise the duty to 60 cents per pound on ordinary cigarettes and to \$1 per pound on those weighing more than 3 pounds per thousand. The customs rate is \$2 per pound and 25 per cent.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does that increase the duty on cigars?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; but on cigarettes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How much revenue will you get out of it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not a great deal.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this to increase the consumption of cigars?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will have that effect. The 4th resolution is:

That the excise duty on all cigars, whether the product of foreign or of domestic raw leaf tobacco, when put up in packages containing less than 10 each, shall be \$7 per thousand.

The explanation of that is that the present duty is \$6 per thousand and the extra dollar per thousand is to pay for the increased number of stamps used upon the smaller packages.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the resolutions take effect from and after the 2nd day of May.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2.20 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 2nd May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BANK ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 119) to amend the Bank Acts, chapter one hundred and

twenty of the Revised Statutes. He said: The object of the Bill is to make a further slight change in that portion of the Act which enables certain producers and manufacturers to issue warehouse receipts which will be as security in the hands of the persons loaning money upon them. The provision of the Bank Act enumerates various manufacturers who shall have the right to issue warehouse certificates, manufacturers of timber, and various others, and I propose to add distillers. I may mention that one of the principal reasons for this change is the provision of the statute requiring the gauging of spirits, which makes it necessary that distillers should carry a very much larger stock than they otherwise would do, and it seems reasonable that such large concerns should have the right to issue warehouse receipts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURT ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 120) to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Court Acts chapter one hundred and thirty five of the Revised Statutes. He said: The object of the Bill is simply to enlarge the right of appeal in reference to British Columbia and the North West Territories. There is a provision in the present Act with reference to appeals from Maritime Provinces, giving appeals in some cases where the amount is above a certain sum, even though the action did not originate in the Superior Court. It is desired to extend that provision to British Columbia, and to provide some system of appeal in reference to the North West Territories. The provision for appeal which I propose to make with reference to the North West Territories, is that by leave of the Supreme Court, or of a judge thereof, an appeal may be allowed from the decision of the Supreme Court of the North West Territories, although the matter may not have originated in the latter Court.

RIVER ST. LAWRENCE IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. DAVIES asked, 1. What is the amount of the advances made by the Government to the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal for the Lake St. Peter and River St. Lawrence improvements, up to this date? 2. What is the total amount of interest on such advances? 3. What part of such interest has been repaid by said Commissioners to the Government? 4. What was the expenditure of the Harbor Commissioners for the calendar year 1887, apart from expenditure on capital account? 5. What was their net revenue for same year? 6. Does this expenditure include any, and what expenditure, in the harbor of Montreal? 7. What amount now remains unexpended of the sums authorized by the Act to be advanced the Harbor Commissioners for the completion of the Lake St. Peter channel, and which amount the Government, in the resolution submitted by Sir Charles Tupper, ask for authority to expend? 8. What is the estimated amount yet required to complete the widening and deepening of the channel in Lake St. Peter and the River St. Lawrence?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. 1. The amount of the advances made by the Government to the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal up to this date is \$2,725,504.10. 2. The total amount of interest on such advances to the 30th June last was \$794,028. 3. All of the interest above referred to has been paid. 4. The expenditure of the Harbor Commissioners for the calendar year 1887, apart from expenditure on capital account, was, according to the statements made by them to the Government, \$327,290. 5. Their net revenue for the same year, \$289,885. 6. They divide their expenditure as follows:—\$220,123 as applicable to the

harbor, and \$107,187 as applicable to the channel. 7. The amount unexpended of the sums authorised, which the Government asks for authority to expend on the channel, is \$279,495.90. 8. The Harbor Commissioners estimate that it will take the whole of this amount and \$20,000 additional to deepen the channel to 27½ feet at low water, and that to straighten and widen it so as to make it easier of navigation, would cost say \$200,000 more.

QUEBEC HARBOR.

Mr. DAVIES asked, 1. What amount has been advanced by the Government to the the Quebec Harbor Commissioners for the purpose of constructing the Lévis Graving Dock, up to date? 2. What is the total amount of interest accrued thereon, and how much, if any, has been repaid the Government? 3. What amount has been paid towards the sinking fund? 4. What amount has been paid out of capital by the Quebec Harbor Commissioners to the Government for interest and sinking fund on the bonds deposited with the Finance Minister as security for advances made by the Government on account of harbor improvements in Quebec and the tidal dock at the mouth of the River St. Charles? 5. What amount has been actually paid to the Government by the Quebec Harbor Commissioners for sinking fund on their bonds?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. 1. The amount advanced by the Government to the Quebec Harbor Commissioners for the purpose of constructing the Lévis Graving Docks, up to date, is \$338,000. 2. The simple interest thereon payable in advance from 17th December, 1878, to 19th April, 1888, amounts to \$204,454.32, of which no part has been paid. 3. Nothing has been paid towards the sinking fund on such advance. 4. The amount paid out as capital by the Quebec Harbor Commissioners to the Government for interest and sinking fund, on the bonds deposited by them with the Finance Minister as security for advances made by the Government on account of harbor improvements in Quebec and a tidal dock at the mouth of the River St. Charles, is estimated at \$493,706.64. 5. The amount actually paid out of their revenue by the Quebec Harbor Commissioners for sinking fund on the last mentioned bonds, is, so far as can be ascertained, \$98,621.59.

CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION AT CINCINNATI.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Is it the intention of the Government that Canada should be represented at the Centennial Exposition to be held at Cincinnati, and opened 4th July next?

Mr. CARLING. It is not the intention of the Government to be represented at the Exhibition.

THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to-morrow to consider the following resolution:—

That in addition to the sums now remaining unborrowed and negotiable of the loans authorised by Parliament by any Act heretofore passed, the Governor in Council may raise by way of loan such sum or sums of money, not to exceed, in the whole, the sum of \$25,000,000, as may be required for the purpose of paying the floating indebtedness of the Dominion of Canada, and for the carrying on of the Public Works authorised by the Parliament of Canada; such sum or sums of money to be raised in accordance with and under the provisions of that portion of chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes of Canada relating to the public debt, and the raising of loans authorised by Parliament, and the sum so raised hereunder to form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada. The rate of interest on any loans raised hereunder not to exceed four per cent. per annum.

Motion agreed to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

RETURNS AND PAPERS.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to enquire whether the papers to be placed on the Table of the House, with respect to the disallowance of railway charters in Manitoba, have been printed and will be distributed to members before the discussion on the resolutions is entered upon?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are pressing the printers to have the papers printed immediately, and no doubt they will be distributed without delay.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the Government also bring down papers with respect to disallowance in British Columbia?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Were they asked at the same time?

Mr. LAURIER. Not so far as I am aware, but they would properly belong to the discussion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will bring them down as well.

Mr. McMULLEN. Up to the present time 92 orders have passed the House for returns since we met on 26rd February. Only 27 returns have been brought down. The Government have intimated their desire to have the business of the House closed in about two weeks, and the condition of business in the meantime, as evidenced by returns brought down, is in such a state that it is impossible for the Opposition to discharge their duties efficiently if they are not supplied with the information asked. I moved a resolution asking for a return of fees paid to counsel in the case of the Queen vs. St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company, but the return has not yet been brought down. Out of eight orders I moved myself only one return has been brought down, that in connection with the Strathroy post office. Only three returns a week have been submitted. I should like to know whether the Government's intention is to furnish the Opposition with the information they have asked, or not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The returns are being brought down as rapidly as they are prepared. Some of them require a great deal of work and they cannot be brought down at an earlier period. They are brought down each day as they are ready—I do not know whether they are three, four or five a week. I know I have brought down a number, as other Ministers have done. But the hon. gentleman may rest assured that our attention is given to this matter, that the returns are brought down as rapidly as they are ready, and orders for their immediate preparation have been given in the different departments. However, if the hon. gentleman will send me a memorandum of any particular return he requires, I will make special enquiry about it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like the return in the case of the Queen vs. St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company; also the correspondence in relation to the establishment of a model farm in the North-West.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the hon. gentleman will send me a list I will notify the different departments, because the Government are as earnest as hon. members in obtaining these returns as rapidly as possible.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is a little unreasonable in the matter. I moved for a return three or four years and it took two years to bring it down—it was in relation to the Grand Trunk. The hon. gentleman may get the returns next year; he need not hurry.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 60) to amend chapter twenty-seven of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

WAYS AND MEANS.

Resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means (May 1st) were read a second time and concurred in.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 121) "An Act to amend chap. 33 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting the duty of Customs."

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 122) "An Act to amend chap. 34 of the Revised Statutes respecting Inland Revenue."

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADVERTISING COUNTERFEIT MONEY.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 108) respecting the advertising of counterfeit money. He said: It may be somewhat useful to the House that I should make a short statement explaining the reason for introducing this Bill, because it is designed to put an end to what has been a very great evil, and is a growing evil in Canada. For some years past persons in the United States who are known as "confidence men" have been in the practice of obtaining in the Mercantile Agencies lists of the names of persons who do business in different parts of Canada, and who are supposed to be of somewhat weak financial standing, and of addressing to those persons circulars in which they intimate to them that at a low price they will furnish them counterfeit notes, either of the Dominion of Canada, or of the United States, and they are accustomed to send on the requisite specimens of the "goods," as they call them, which they are willing thus to sell. Those goods which they thus offer are described by various names. Generally they are called "green goods," referring to the color of the notes, and sometimes they are called "cigars" and sometimes "green cigars." Various other quaint names and expressions are made use of which convey plainly enough to the person receiving the circular the intimation that if he sends his money he will get a supply of counterfeit notes. Although it has not been generally known that this practice prevails to any very great extent, the fact has been ascertained that every week from the city of New York thousands of those circulars are sent into Canada. The result being, that in many cases persons are induced to enter into a correspondence, and the correspondence is followed very frequently by personal negotiations on the part of our people with these confidence men. The plan which is then pursued is this: An applicant for these "green goods" goes to a place indicated in the circular and he is shown, for his inspection, a bundle of notes which are in most cases perfectly good and finds that they are of a description which can easily pass current. He pays his money for the bundle of notes which is supposed to be wrapped up or put up in a satchel, to be given to him or to be left at a place where he can call for it. He finds, after he has

paid his money and when he seeks to obtain his parcel or his satchel, that rubbish—either sawdust or blank paper—has been inserted in the parcel instead of the notes of which he saw samples. So generally has sawdust been used that the whole business is called under the name of the "sawdust circular business." Efforts have been made by the police authorities of New York to put a stop to these practices, but the ingenuity of these confidence men is shown by the dexterity with which the efforts of the police have been evaded from time to time. I may say that one of the practices by which the persons engaged in this kind of business attract attention and persuade the public that the notes which they introduce are notes that are easy of circulation, is by inserting from time to time in the American papers false accounts of bank note plates having been stolen from the Treasury, by which the public are given to understand that the production of apparently genuine notes is a very easy matter, and the "goods" as they call them are thereby advertised as being more likely to appear genuine and easy of circulation. The business which I have referred to is carried on in many places and with occasional variations, but in some cases the person to whom the circular is addressed sends his money—and generally speaking the remittances are not very large—in answer to the circular, expecting to receive in return counterfeit notes, but he generally receives no answer at all and the money is thus lost. It is a significant fact that the leading operators in this business in New York are many of them known to be worth from \$50,000 to \$100,000. It has come to our knowledge within the last two years, that the business has been taken up in Canada, and that in two or three places in this Dominion the same operations are being pursued by swindlers of this description, who have come here for that purpose from the United States. A large number of letters which have been written by persons to whom circulars were thus addressed are in my possession, and answers dated from various points in all the Provinces of the Dominion, and indicating the disposition on the part of persons to whom those circulars are addressed, to enter into the nefarious operations which the circular invites them to begin. One of these I may read as a specimen of hundreds. Many of them are from persons holding good positions, and who are supposed to be not at all likely to engage in transactions of this kind. This letter is dated February 9th, of last year, and this person says:

"DEAR SIR,—I received your letter a few days ago, and am so busy that I could not attend until to-day.

"Please send me \$25 (twenty-five dollars) worth of the goods by return mail, with instructions how to sell them. I am trading with the country people a good deal in the run of a year.

"I mean business. Send the goods as soon as possible and I will send you a post office order by return mail."

This is only one of many hundreds that are in our possession from various points in the Dominion. Some of these, I regret to say, are signed by persons holding very respectable positions, commercial and otherwise, some of them municipal officers, some of them justices of the peace, several of them public functionaries, from whom one would expect a very different answer. I may state as an illustration of the extent to which these operations are carried on in the United States, and the difficulty of detecting them, that a pamphlet has been issued in Washington on this subject, in which lists are given of the fictitious names which are used by persons engaged in this business. The way in which the letters get into the possession of the police authorities here is that the person engaged in sending these circulars, finds it necessary so often to change his address and his alias, that the letters very often miss him and go to the dead letter office, whence they are transferred to the hands of the police. At one part of this report, two pages closely printed are taken up with the

aliases and changed addresses of one man who was engaged in this business; and the writer mentions that another notorious offender had 81 names and addresses, and that another party, whose right name is unknown, now has 136 different aliases. Under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that persons in Canada are engaged in these operations of sending out circulars as well as sending and receiving bogus money, it is proposed by this Bill to make both the sending of circulars and the agreement to receive the money criminal offences.

Mr. EDGAR. Can the hon. Minister tell us whether the present criminal law is not capable of reaching this class of offenders? Has it never been put into operation against them? Is entirely new legislation required? Perhaps he will also kindly tell us, as there seems to be reciprocity in this business, at any rate between the United States and Canada, whether there is legislation on the subject on the other side.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think special legislation is required, especially to cover the offence of agreeing to receive. The Bill now before the House is very like one which is being adopted in the State of New York. I think the New York Bill does not make it an offence to agree to receive such goods, but otherwise it is similar.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 89) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, chapter 8, Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose to move a substitute for this clause, making the electoral districts of Algoma, in the Province of Ontario, and Cariboo, in the Province of British Columbia, exceptions to the provision that the nomination of candidates at a general election shall be on a particular day.

On section 2,

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose to substitute for this section the same provision that is contained in sub-section 2 of section 14 of the present Act, but limiting the provision to the electoral districts of Algoma and Cariboo. It changes the Bill in order to make exceptions of those two districts.

Mr. EDGAR. This only applies to general elections. Do the Government not think it would be well to provide that one and the same day should be fixed for bye-elections as well, when there are more than one?

Mr. THOMPSON. That suggestion, I think, is hardly applicable to the present section.

Mr. BARRON. I have an amendment to propose to the proposed amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice, and to which I referred slightly the other day. I think it is an amendment which must present itself favorably to the minds of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. I think it is hardly right or proper that it should be in the power of the Executive, whether it be composed of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House or on this, to bring on the elections when there are vacancies during a recess just when it suits their particular purpose, and perhaps in some cases bring them on rather hastily without due consideration of the interests and rights of the people in any electoral

Mr. THOMPSON.

district, or in others so slowly that for some considerable length of time the constituency may be unrepresented. Now, in the amendment I intend proposing to the House, I have endeavored, as far as possible, to follow the spirit, if not the letter, of Imperial legislation, and hon. gentlemen in this House who seek to copy the English practice will be glad to know of that. I find that the practice in England in some respects is not unlike our own. There the Speaker acts upon the receipt of a writ to the effect that a member has been promoted to the House of Lords, or upon the certificate of a judge of an election being voided, or upon the certificate of any two members of a vacancy having occurred. There, under the statute of George IV, I find that a period of fourteen days was allowed to elapse, during which time the Speaker was required to advertise in the *London Gazette* the fact of receiving notice of a vacancy having occurred in the representation of any constituency. Now, under a subsequent and amending statute, 24-25 Vic.—and to this statute I would like to draw the attention of this House, because it shows the spirit of improving legislation in England—the period of fourteen days was shortened to a period of six days; and if any hon. gentleman will look at the Act, he will see that the preamble recites the fact that it is necessary to shorten the time in order to expedite the bringing on of elections. Well, under that statute the Speaker is required, as he is required with us, on receipt of a certificate, immediately after that delay, to issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Our statute provides also that the Speaker must issue his warrant “forthwith,” but in England I find the practice is to proceed as expeditiously as possible after the warrant reaches the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. That gentleman is at once required, on receipt of the warrant, to issue the writ. In fact, so important is it that he should do so at once, that any wilful neglect or any delay in the transmission of the writ to the returning officer is made a misdemeanor. Now, there is no such law as that here. As soon as a warrant here reaches the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, then the delays begin, and very serious delays, as we know, occur, so that I think the amendment I propose must present itself to the favorable consideration of hon. gentlemen in this House, who seek to copy as closely as possible the well established practice followed in the old country. Now, I will proceed to show the serious delays that have occurred here and the undesirability of continuing the practice which has heretofore existed; and I will ask the House to bear with me for a few moments while I show them the delays which have occurred in the issuing of writs in some particular cases, and I shall not go beyond this Parliament to seek for instances. In the case of Yarmouth, the judge certified to the Speaker on the 13th of August, 1887, but the writ did not issue until the 18th of November following. There was thus a delay of three months, because I presume that when the judge certified to the Speaker, the latter complied with the provisions of the statute, which is, that he shall “forthwith”—because “forthwith” is the word used—issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I presume, therefore, that as soon as he received the judge's certificate, the Speaker acted upon it and issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. But, although the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery received the writ, as I presume he did as soon as the Speaker received the certificate from the judge, on the 13th August, 1887, the writ was not issued until the 17th October, 1887, or three months later. The delay, therefore, that took place was, no doubt, due to the Executive, in delaying the issue of the writ for a period of three months, and the election did not take place until the 15th December following. Thus, the people of the electoral district of Yarmouth were unrepresented in the Parliament for a period of four months. Now, take the

case of Dorchester. In that case, the judge certified to the Speaker in August, 1887, but the writ was not issued until the 21st December following, being a delay of four months for which the hon. gentlemen opposite have to account. How was it that this period of four months elapsed after the warrant was issued by the Speaker to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery before the writ was issued? And the election only took place on the 7th January, 1887. Thus there was a period of five months during which that constituency remained unrepresented. I think the Government should account for that delay. They should also account for the undue haste exhibited in the case of the Shelburne election. In that case, the judge certified on the 9th November, 1887, and the writ was dated on the 18th November following, so that only a period of nine days elapsed between the time when the Speaker received the certificate from the judge and the issuing of the writ. How is it there was only nine days delay in that case and a delay of five months in the case of Dorchester? The result was that the delay in the case of Shelburne, between the time the judge certified to the Speaker and the time the election took place, was only one month and six days, whereas in the other two cases the delay was four months and five months respectively. Take the case of Gloucester, which is represented by the hon. the Postmaster General. In that case, there was still greater haste displayed, the judge having certified on the 3rd October, 1887, and the writ having been issued on the 5th October, 1887, so that it took only two days for the judge's certificate to reach the Speaker and the certificate and the warrant of the Speaker to reach the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the time between the date of the judge's certificate and the election was only twenty-four days, as compared with four and five months in the first two cases I have given. Then, take the case of the county of Cumberland, in which only one month elapsed between the judge's certificate and the election. Take also the case of Haldimand. In that case the judge certified on the 15th October, 1887, and the writ was dated the 24th October, 1887, so that only nine days elapsed between the date of the judge's certificate and the issuing of the writ, and only 28 days altogether elapsed between the date of the judge's certificate and the election which took place on the 12th November following. Take the case of Victoria, N.S. The judge's certificate was dated the 17th October, 1887, and the writ was issued on the 28th October, showing a delay of only eleven days. And the election was held on the 21st November, 1887, thirty-four days thus elapsing between the date of the judge's certificate and the date of the election. Then, take the case of East Northumberland. The judge's certificate was dated on the 16th November, 1887. The writ was issued very hastily, it was issued within twelve days, on the 28th November, and the election was held on the 22nd December, 1887, only thirty-six days elapsing between the date of the judge's certificate and the day of the election. In the case of Prince Edward county, the certificate of the judge was dated the 9th February, 1888, the writ was issued on the 22nd February, 1888, thirteen days elapsing between the judge's certificate and the date of the writ, and the election was held on the 10th March, that is, thirty days after the judge's certificate. In West Middlesex, the judge's certificate was dated the 20th February, 1888, and it only took two days for that certificate to come to Ottawa by post in order to reach the Speaker's hands, and for the Speaker to issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to issue his writ for a new election; whereas, in the case of Yarmouth it took three months, and in the case of Dorchester, four months. Then, take the case of L'Assomption. The judge's certificate was dated the 3rd March, 1888, and the writ was issued on the 9th March, six days only

elapsing, and the election took place on the 3rd April, 1888, only thirty days elapsing between the date of the judge's certificate and the election. Now, in those cases where the time has been short, it is a very peculiar coincidence that they are electoral districts returning members to support the Government; but, in those cases where great and serious delays have taken place, it is another peculiar coincidence that they are constituencies which send members here to support my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). If such delay is possible in one case, and such extraordinary haste is used in another case, it is evident that there should be some amendment to the law, and the amendment which I ask the House to adopt is the following:—

In the case of a vacancy happening in the House of Commons by the death of any member, or by a member accepting any office, or by a member resigning his seat, or by reason of the seat of any member being declared void under the Dominion Controverted Elections Act (except as in the next succeeding section is provided for), then and in every such case, the day for the nomination of candidates shall, in the electoral districts of the Province of British Columbia, and in the electoral district of Algoma in the Province of Ontario, and in those of Gaspé and Chicoutimi and Saguenay in the Province of Quebec, be within thirty days after the day when the Speaker or any two members shall have, according to law, addressed his or their warrant, as the case may be, to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a new writ to fill the vacancy, and in the other electoral districts of Canada be within twenty days after the day when the Speaker or any two members shall as aforesaid have so addressed his or their warrant.

The committee will see that that section provides for the case of all vacancies arising when the House is not in Session. It provides for the two cases, where the Speaker is required to issue his warrant, or, in the case of his absence or sickness, or when there is no Speaker, for two members to address a warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. That is only in cases where the writ has to be issued by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on receipt of the Speaker's warrant, but there are cases where a writ has to be issued on the order of the House, and this amendment, if it went no further, would not deal with the cases where the writ has to be issued on the order of the House. Therefore, I have to ask the committee to adopt another section which I propose shall come immediately afterwards, in order to meet such cases as I have spoken about. Let me, for a moment, speak of the case of Russell, and the case of Kent, in order to show how delays have occurred, and how necessary it is to avoid these delays hereafter in any electoral district. In Russell, the Speaker issued his warrant before the 23rd February, 1888, and he so informed the House. The writ was issued on the 5th April. But, on the 27th March, the House ordered the writ to issue on the motion of my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). It took eight days after this House ordered the writ to issue for the writ to be issued. Why was that delay? Hon. gentlemen sometimes say that they do not know who is to be the returning officer. We could very easily get over that difficulty if the law was altered so as to have permanent returning officers, but surely, when this House orders a writ to issue, it cannot be said that it takes eight days to communicate with the candidate, because I believe that is what the present Government does, as shown by their history in the past, to find who shall be the returning officer. At all events, in Russell it took eight days to issue the writ after the House had ordered that the writ should issue. In Kent we find the same thing. On the 28th February, the House passed a resolution that the report of Mr. Justice Osler should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It took a month for that committee to report to the House, and what was done in that case? That is a delay which should not be allowed to occur again, especially when the House is sitting and the constituency, therefore, without representation in this House. However, the committee did report, and on the 27th March last, the writ was ordered to be issued; but in that case it took ten days for the writ to issue.

Kent is not so far away that the Government could not communicate with the gentleman who was running in the Conservative interest, and find out who was to be his returning officer, in less time than that, but it required ten days before that writ was issued. In the case of Russell, the order of this House was practically disobeyed for eight days, and in the case of Kent it was disobeyed for ten days. In order to meet a case of that kind, I propose to ask the committee to adopt this clause:

When a new writ for an election has to issue upon the order of the House of Commons, then and in every such case the day for the nomination of candidates shall, in the electoral districts of the Province of British Columbia, and in the electoral district of Algoma in the Province of Ontario, and in those of Gaspé and Chicoutimi and Saguenay in the Province of Quebec, be within thirty days after the day when the House of Commons shall have ordered the writ so to issue, and, in the other electoral districts of Canada, shall be within twenty days after the day when the House of Commons shall have so ordered the writ to issue.

I think, if these amendments are adopted by this committee, and by the House, they will be in the general interest of the entire country.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am not prepared to say that the hon. member's suggestions may not have a good deal of merit, and that some measure might not be devised to meet what he thinks is an uncertainty as to the time when the writ should issue and the elections should be held; but I do not think he has made out a case for the amendment which he has read. I understand his objection to be, in regard to the elections which have taken place since the general election, that undue delay has taken place in the issue of the writ and the holding of the elections, and his object is to prevent a recurrence of that delay. The hon. gentleman cited, irrespective of the two cases dealt with by the House, eleven cases of bye-elections and in nine of them he had rather to complain of precipitation than of delay. In the cases of Yarmouth and Dorchester, in both of which the vacancy occurred long before there was any probability of a Session of Parliament, he complained of the delay of four months in one case and three months in the other. In the other nine cases the hon. gentleman will remember the statement that in Shelburne there was a delay of but nine days; in Colchester, less than a month's delay; in Cumberland, a month; Haldimand, nine days; Victoria, eleven days; East Northumberland, twelve days, Prince Edward, thirteen days; West Middlesex, two days; L'Assomption, six days. If there was any other, I missed it from not hearing the hon. gentleman distinctly. But his statement to the House practically is this; that out of eleven cases with which the Government have had to deal, in nine of them they pursued a course that his amendment would direct us to pursue, and in the other two cases, the vacancies occurred at a time when there was no occasion at all for any haste in holding the elections. The hon. gentleman has stated that it seems desirable to follow the English practice upon this subject, but I think he has not quoted to the House any English statute bearing upon this subject, of the kind which he asks us to adopt. I think there are very good reasons why such a statute does not exist in England, and why it should not be adopted here. One reason appears to me to be this, that if we make the rule rigid, that the election must take place within a certain period, then the effect of such an enactment is to invalidate the election which does not take place within that period; in other words, to come down to details, that the Speaker should issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and if any misadventure should occur, or any miscarriage, through death of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, or his neglect, or his illness, or through failure of the postal connection, or through neglect of the returning officer, the election should not take place, or the nomination should not take place precisely within the twenty days which the amendment points out, then no election can take place. If the hon.

Mr. BARRON.

gentleman does not make it as rigid as that, he has to leave the matter still in the hands of the Government, subject, of course, to the responsibility which the Government has to this House. It seems to me, therefore, that it would be unwise to make the change, and that the hon. gentleman has not made out a case by the illustrations which he has cited.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman, in arguing against the proposition of my hon. friend, has also argued against the principles of the Bill. The same accidents which he says are possible in the cases referred to, in the amendment proposed by my hon. friend, might take place at a general election, and yet we do not refuse to provide for holding all the elections over the country on the same day, and the nominations on the same day, in a general election, because such misadventures may happen. The hon. gentleman says that we have not followed the plan of the English statute. Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman seems to overlook the difference between our circumstances and those of the people of England. In the United Kingdom, the Government do not appoint the returning officers, the returning officers are named in the statute; the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is not controlled or interfered with by the Government that issue the writs. There is a duty imposed upon him by law, and that duty he is called upon to discharge. The hon. gentleman, therefore, will see that the difference between the position of the matter in England and this country arises largely from the action of the Government here in repealing the law which names certain parties as returning officers. The hon. gentleman will also see that the Government have no more right to name returning officers, and to interfere with the freedom of the people in holding an election, than they have to name for the people a candidate whom they shall be called upon to elect. There was a period in the history of England when the Crown named the candidates, and called upon the electors in various parts of the United Kingdom to support the candidates so named. But that is not the law or practice in the United Kingdom at the present time, and it ought not to be the law or the practice here. The hon. gentleman says my hon. friend has not made out a case. Why, my hon. friend pointed out two cases where the writs were delayed for upwards of three months. Now he says that there are only two cases out of some ten or twelve. Why, two cases out of ten or twelve are a very large percentage, quite sufficient to influence the constitution of this House. There is no more reason for the hon. gentleman retaining the power that he possesses under the law, to perpetuate an abuse, or create an abuse which did not before exist, than there is to continue the old abuse of non-simultaneous elections. Sir, they have not simultaneous elections in England at the present time. And why not? Because no abuse has ever grown up. The writs are issued as a matter of course, after Parliament is dissolved. The Crown does not interfere, and can exercise no control over the issue of those writs. No Minister would for a moment be permitted to interfere with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in the discharge of his duties. Those writs are issued as a matter of course. The elections where the Government is likely to be successfully opposed are just as likely to come on first as those where the Government are likely to be successful in carrying the constituency. So there being no abuse, no change has taken place in the law. Why were elections made simultaneous here? Because the hon. gentleman who now leads the Government misused the powers of the Crown in this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, Sir.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says no; but I remember very well when the hon. gentleman, in a general election, held some elections in July and others

nearly as late as the 1st of October. I remember, in 1867, when some elections took place in July, and my own election took place on the 17th September, and the elections in Nova Scotia took place on the 19th, when there was no supporter of the Government—except the hon. member who is now Minister of Finance—returned from the Province. I want to know why that was not an abuse? I want to know why, in 1872, when the general election was spread over more than two months, was there nothing to complain of? I want to know whether it was not this abuse of the authority of the Crown, this interference with the liberty of the people in the choice of representatives, that did not lead to the demand for simultaneous elections? There can be no doubt whatever on that point, and the hon. gentlemen, driven from their old ground, now undertake to perpetuate an abuse, or create an abuse, of another sort. And why is it? Why, that—although the law provides that the warrant of the Speaker shall issue forthwith under certain circumstances, that a writ shall issue immediately by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the hon. gentleman undertakes to render that law nugatory and of no force by the usurpation of the power to appoint returning officers. If the hon. gentleman refuses to appoint a returning officer, of course it is impossible for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to discharge his duty. The House may order the writ to issue, but there is nobody to whom that writ can issue, for the Government have usurped control of the appointments, and it is impossible for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to discharge his duties. There has been an abuse in that respect. We have had an instance in Kent. Why did the hon. gentleman refer that matter with regard to the election in Kent, and the report of the judge, to the Committee on Privileges and Elections? It was done to secure delay, it was to prevent the writ being issued. They said: We must have the evidence published, we want to know what the case is. I told them that the evidence did not indicate the views expressed by the judge, and the Minister of Justice found it so. They said: We want to know what the evidence is, and the committee must judge. A whole month was consumed in printing the evidence. Then the hon. gentleman said: This committee has no right to examine the evidence, and criticise the decision of the judge; they would be sitting in review as an appellate court and overriding the decision of the judge, and therefore we have no right to look at the evidence and estimate the accuracy or inaccuracy of the judge's conclusion. We must accept his report, as a matter of course, as perfectly correct. So the position was taken that while a month was wasted in getting the evidence printed it was not to be looked at when printed. And then the matter came before the House. What then happened? The House ordered the writ to issue forthwith. Was that order obeyed? No. And why not? Because the First Minister and his colleagues, having repeated the law which named the returning officer, as he is named in England, usurped the power to appoint a returning officer to discharge the trust that the law had imposed on them; they failed to advise His Excellency as was their duty to do. When the House and the law says the writ shall issue forthwith, what right has the hon. gentleman to neglect to advise His Excellency to make the appointment at once? The law was set at defiance. Ten days were wasted. There was further procrastination; not until two months had elapsed from the date the vacancy was reported to the House was the writ issued. Yet the hon. gentleman says there is no abuse. Why, there were three months and a half in Yarmouth, four months in Dorchester, and six weeks in Kent, of delay. This is a monstrous condition of things. If the hon. gentleman persists in retaining the power to appoint the returning officer, he should indicate the individual for the five years, or for the continuance of

the Parliament, and should appoint a returning officer for a Parliament. If such a course were followed there would be some one to whom the writ could issue. Why should there be Government interference at every turn in every election? The hon. gentleman knows that there has been interference, that there is a meddling exercise at every election held; he knows the people are wearied and disgusted with the delay, and that the election in Kent to-day is taking place at a time when every farmer is busily occupied with his spring work. The convenience of the public interests are as nothing in the estimation of the Government, so long as they can manipulate a constituency and use the power they possess for the purpose of party interest. If the Government do not want to accept the amendment of my hon. friend, let the Minister of Justice amend the Bill so as to secure the nomination by the Government of a returning officer during the continuance of the Parliament, and then there can be no meddling interference, then the writ will issue as a matter of course in obedience to the law to the party so indicated; but the Government now set the law at defiance. The abuses committed by Charles I, for which he lost his head, were not grosser than those that are being committed by the Government of the country to-day. If the people of this country had not been degraded and debauched by the conduct of the Administration, if their political independence had not been sacrificed by the conduct of the Government, they would no more tolerate such proceedings than the people of England would tolerate the interference of the Crown in matters which concern public affairs. The First Minister knows that he has prevented the free expression of public opinion at the general election from the course taken; he knows that he has prevented the free expression of public opinion in the constituencies where elections have been held since the general elections took place, and that system is being persisted in by the Government setting the law at defiance and refusing to advise the Crown immediately in order that the law itself may be obeyed. My hon. friend made out a strong case in favor of the amendment he has proposed, and the Minister of Justice has not at all answered the objections he made to the law as it now stands. Now abuses are being perpetrated, and we seek to have such an amendment to the law as will tie the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite and prevent those abuses being repeated. The proposition is a reasonable one, and the Minister of Justice, with his sense of justice, must be satisfied that there are abuses which should be corrected, and which I do not believe he is disposed to allow if he were in the position to take his own course.

Mr. THOMPSON. I listened to the hon. gentleman's remarks with a great deal of interest and pleasure, but my pleasure would have been increased if he had spoken to the Bill. Let me offer a few words in reply to the hon. gentleman's remarks on a matter which is not referred to in the Bill, the Kent election case, in regard to which the hon. gentleman appears to have utterly forgotten the leading facts on which he based his comments. It is not a fact that the printing of the evidence for the committee occupied a month. The committee were instructed by the resolution of the House to advise the House what course ought to be pursued in view of the report which the learned judge made upon that case. I hold in my hand the evidence on which the committee were asked to advise this House. It occupies 129 closely printed pages, and when the committee met and that evidence was in the hands of the chairman, not a member of the committee had seen it. I admit the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was sagacious enough to be able to come to a resolution as to what advice should be tendered to this House, without reading the evidence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I had read it,

Mr. THOMPSON. I had not and there were several other members who were in no better position, and they desired before passing judgment to see the evidence. I asked under those circumstances that the evidence be printed, for there was no other way of getting it into the hands of the committee, and instead of the printing taking a month, I venture to say, although I am speaking from recollection, it did not take six days.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is altogether mistaken.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think one month was consumed from the time of the reference to the committee until they made their report.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Look at the date.

Mr. THOMPSON. The second observation I have to make with respect to the delay is that the decision of the committee in that case was such that delay was inevitable. The decision of the committee was, in view of the report the learned judge had made, that the time which had elapsed without representation of that constituency, to the date of the report, was sufficient disfranchisement. So that if the committee had reported earlier they would, under any circumstances, have advised a delay in the issue of the writ. The hon. gentleman's next comment on the Kent election case was that we had no right to hold the election to-day, when every farmer was busy with his crops—perhaps a very serious inconvenience, perhaps not a greater inconvenience than holding an election at a time of year when in that county not one-fifth of the voters could go to the polls on account of the condition of the roads. But in any case let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the amendment which he supports proposes a fixed date for the election, which cannot be averted or changed, notwithstanding the greatest inconvenience might arise to the constituency. The hon. gentleman's next argument in favor of the amendment was that the Government should have no right to appoint a returning officer, yet the amendment does not contain one syllable on that subject, it simply fixes the day within which the election, if an election is to take place, must take place, and it leaves the question of returning officers precisely as it is under the present law. Now, as I have said, if the election does not take place within that period we have to wait, not till after the twenty or thirty days which elapsed in some of those cases; not even for the three or four months which seems to have been an intolerable delay to some of my friends opposite; but we have to wait until Parliament shall pass a statute to meet those special cases. The hon. gentleman told me that I was arguing against my own Bill in stating the jeopardy of allowing an election to be entirely defeated by fixing a time within which delays take place. My Bill is entirely silent upon that subject. It has nothing to do with it whatever.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. It does not mention the subject from beginning to end. The Election Act which I am amending, the hon. gentleman sees, contains provisions with reference to a general election which incurs that jeopardy, but only in relation to that part of it which requires an election to take place on one and the same day throughout the Dominion. And it is only liable to the jeopardies which exist between the issue of the writ and its reaching the hands of the returning officer. Within a certain number of days after he receives the writ he is to have the election, but the amendment proposes that beside that delay and jeopardy connected with the mail, if there should be any miscarriage between the time the warrant issues and the writ issues, the election shall be defeated.

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman stated a moment ago, when he was addressing this House in answer to my friend behind me from Victoria (Mr. Barron), that he had made no case, because out of some ten or eleven bye-elections which had taken place delay had only occurred in the cases of Dorchester and Yarmouth and, that in every other instance the writ had issued without delay. But as there has been delay in two cases there might have been delay in all the other cases as well, and that is exactly what my hon. friend wants to prevent. Why should there be any delay at all in those cases and no delay in the other nine cases. At the present time there is no rule whatever. The writ may be issued at once as soon as the vacancy occurs, or it may be deferred for two or three months. There is only one rule as far as I can understand, and that rule has been put into practice, namely, the convenience of the Government. If it suits the convenience of the Government to withhold a writ it is withheld, and if it suits their convenience to issue it at once it is issued at once. Take the case of Dorchester, for instance. It is well known that they went around from door to door and knocked at this man's door and at that man's door asking if any one would be willing to sacrifice himself on the altar of his party. They found no victim; they waited two or three months and at last they had to let the election go by default and let my hon. friend the present member for Dorchester be elected by acclamation. In the county of Yarmouth they did the same thing, but they found a victim there to sacrifice himself and he was defeated. In the other cases when they found the chances were good, and the result proved their chances were good, they issued the writs immediately. My hon. friend's object is that there should not be a rule in an election for the convenience of the Government, but a rule which would act uniformly to the advantage of the Government or the Opposition, or to the detriment of one or the other. What reason can there be against this? Why not have the law declare that the writ shall issue on a reasonable delay and that there will be no undue favor on one side or the other. The hon. gentleman stated that the amendment of my hon. friend did not contemplate the appointing of returning officers, but the Government have told us again and again that they will keep in their hands the choice of the returning officers and that they will not trust the present officials, who by the nature of their office ought to be returning officers; that they will not trust the registrars or sheriff, because, as was stated some time ago by the Prime Minister, those men being appointed by a hostile Government might be hostile to the Government of the day. I think it is a very bad reason, but we cannot help it, and as it is so we must stand it. I appeal to the sense of justice (if there is any left on the other side), when they have to deal with friend and foe, why not have a uniform law? Why not declare the writ shall issue within a reasonable time? It may be that in one case it would work injuriously to the Government and that in another it would work in their favor, but at all events it would be even justice to all. You can provide for permanent returning officers, when the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery will know at once to whom he should direct his writ, and my hon. friend will be happy to withdraw his amendment if you do that. I do not see any better rule to have uniform justice than the one proposed in the amendment before the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says there is no such provision in his Bill by which accidents such as he hypothetically stated might arise, in the case of the amendment proposed by my hon. friend being adopted. Why, Sir, the very first clause of his Bill gives rise to the same possibility of misadventure. The Bill says:

"The Governor General shall fix the day for the nomination of the candidates at the election, and shall, at every general election, fix one

and the same day for the nomination of candidates in all the electoral districts."

What if the writ should go astray? What if, before the writ reaches Cariboo or some other district, it should be lost? There is the same possibility of misadventure in that case as there is in the case where the time is limited. The time always has been limited. You say all the writs shall be returned before a certain day, when the writs are issued. There is such a provision, and you can make the time long or short, as the law stands now, within which the writs may be returned. Now, the objection of the hon. gentleman in that respect is really no objection at all. Does the hon. gentleman refer to cases in which this power that the Government holds in its hands has been abused? He says there are but two instances mentioned by my hon. friend. I draw his attention to another, the case of the Kent election. The hon. gentleman says there was no delay in the Kent election. The hon. gentleman forgets that a long time elapsed from the time that election was reported and when the evidence was printed. My complaint was this, and I have said sufficient to show that the reason for asking that that evidence should be printed was not a genuine reason, and was not the reason which influenced the Government and their friends in asking that the evidence should be printed. I have stated that the hon. gentleman himself, after that evidence was printed, refused to consider the evidence because he said we were bound by the decision of the judge and we could not go into the question at all, as to whether there had or had not been such corrupt practices as the judge reported. Why, Sir, if we were not at liberty to enquire into that fact there was no object in having that evidence before us, and yet there was a delay of nearly a month in getting that evidence printed. When it was printed the hon. gentleman refused to act upon it, and refused to consider it. When the report was made to this House and it was ordered that a writ should be issued there was still a further delay of ten days, because the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery could find nobody into whose hands that writ could be delivered. The statute says that the writ shall issue forthwith, and yet the Government nullified the provisions of the statute by refusing to name the returning officer. There are two ways in which that difficulty can be got over, that is to accept the amendment of my hon. friend, or let the Government name a returning officer during the continuance of Parliament in every constituency throughout the country. They have named returning officers at last election. Why do they not say: These parties shall be the returning officers until this Parliament is dissolved, and then the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery can issue his writ to that person without the interference of the Government at all. We have pointed out again and again on this side of the House that in England the Crown never interferes with the matter of the appointment of a returning officer, or never interferes with the issue of the writ. The Clerk in England does his duty, as he has sworn to discharge his duty; and as he is not allowed to do his duty, though he has sworn to discharge it, in this country, in consequence of the improper interference or negligence of the Government in advising His Excellency to appoint the returning officer. Now let the Government name a returning officer during the continuance of a Parliament, and then the law may be complied with. Then the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery may issue the writ as the law says he shall. While you agree to such a statute, you render it unworkable by reserving to yourself a dispensing power, such a power as one King in England lost his head for pretending to. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I say it is a gross abuse of the power he possesses; I say it is contrary to the obligation into which he has entered as an adviser of His Excellency the Governor General. Did he not swear to give

His Excellency proper and true advice, to carry out the law of the land as it was intended by Parliament it should be carried out; and is it not violating the spirit of that law which says that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall issue the writ forthwith when he refuses to name the man to whom that writ can be issued? Why did you not advise His Excellency to appoint the returning officer the moment Parliament gave the order? We know very well why it was not done—because the hon. gentleman knows on whom he relies. He knows that those who assisted him to put that Act on the Statute-book are ready to wink at the misconduct of the Government on this question; and when we propose an amendment to the law to carry out the purpose of Parliament, he seeks to defeat that proposition, not because it is not reasonable or will not have the effect of securing a fair and just administration of the law, but because it will take away from him the power which he has abused, both in advising His Excellency and in disregarding the order of the House.

Mr. BARRON. The objection made by the hon. Minister of Justice to my proposed amendment is that delays might occur which would render it nugatory. That objection applies as much to his Bill as to my proposition. But the hon. gentleman could not have read the statute which he proposes to amend, for section 15 of it provides:—

"Whenever from unforeseen accident, delays, or otherwise, the proclamation hereinafter mentioned cannot be posted up so as to leave the required delay between the posting up of the proclamation and the nomination day, or whenever any candidate dies after being nominated and before the close of the polls, the returning officer may fix another day for the nomination of candidates."

That section will still be in force, and if there is any such occasion as the hon. Minister pointed out, the election can still be carried on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) improved or strengthened his argument by his violence of language. It is very remarkable that whenever we are concerned with the franchise, or the appointment of returning officers, he is so strong in his opinion that he threatens us with losing our heads; but when he speaks so strongly, I think he has lost his head already. It is a new reading of history that Charles the First lost his head because a writ was delayed twenty days. The hon. gentleman says the Government have usurped the power of appointing returning officers. Well, it happens that the Government are authorised to appoint returning officers by the law of the land; it happens that it is a duty forced upon the Government by the law of the land, and they would be guilty of breaking their oath if they did not appoint the returning officers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But you do not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We do recommend the appointment of the returning officers to His Excellency, and His Excellency has been pleased to appoint the returning officers that we recommend in carrying out the law of the land. But it seems to me that it answers no good purpose to enter into a general discussion as to whether the law was right or wrong with respect to the appointment of returning officers on this occasion, or the general principles under which elections are carried on. Now, if the hon. gentleman is anxious to alter the law, let him prepare a Bill and introduce it, and we will discuss it. It is too late this year to discuss it, but there will be four years before a general election, and the hon. gentleman who moves this amendment can make it a portion of that Bill. Meanwhile, I think the hon. gentleman should allow this Bill to go through. The hon. Minister of Justice says that he is not prepared to accept this amendment or to delay his measure for the purpose of making it a portion of it. I think the hon. gentleman, having expressed his views, had better

reserve his amendment to be a portion of an Election Act which the hon. gentleman can bring down next Session.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would the hon. gentleman explain the reason of the delay in the two cases of Kent and Russell.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it is especially my duty as First Minister to look after the election lists.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Oh, yes, it is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know whether my hon. friend interfered when he was First Minister. Perhaps my hon. friend thinks it was his duty; it is not mine.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I did not interfere; but I saw that the law was carried out. You did the reverse.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand, the law provides that the writ shall issue forthwith. Everybody knows that the writ has not issued forthwith in a great many cases, for various reasons, and therefore the law is not obeyed. It is a matter of notoriety that in the case of the city of St. John, when its representation was vacated by the decease of my friend, the late Mr. Burpee, five months were allowed to elapse before that vacancy was filled, although the law provides that when the Speaker is notified of a vacancy, the writ should be issued forthwith to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and it is after the writ is in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that these delays occur. Then, there are the cases of Haldimand and Chambly. In 1886, when it was desired to test the popular pulse, various reasons were given for delaying the election in Haldimand; it was impossible to have that election until the new voters' lists came into play, and certain serfs of the Crown should be included in it. But, although that was the case in Haldimand, the election in Chambly was hurried on before the new lists were prepared. It seems to me that where accidents of that kind occur, there is the greatest abuse—or if the hon. gentleman objects to that term, there is a remarkable irregularity, to say the least, in the course the Government have seen fit to pursue under an Act, which, as I understand it, was intended to secure the immediate filling of vacancies, and it was with the same object that my hon. friend's motion was proposed.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that this is quite an important question. The only objection the hon. Minister of Justice has offered to the amendment is that by some accident the writ might not arrive in time; but it has been pointed out that section 15 provides for such an occurrence, and, as the hon. member for Bothwell has pointed out, that may occur in the case of a general election. Now, it seems to me the spirit of the Act requires that as soon as the Speaker is notified of any vacancy, according to law, he should at once issue his warrant, so that the vacancy may be filled up. The instant the warrant passes to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery the Government take hold of it, and, under the present system, can delay the election as long as they please. My hon. friend who moved the amendment has not gone beyond the present House, but in 1885, in the case referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford, the warrant of the Speaker was in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 12th July, 1885. On the 16th July, 1885, enquiry was made in the House of the Government as to whether the writ was issued in that case, and the only answer that the hon. Minister gave was that he would enquire about it, and he was enquiring nearly three months before he decided to issue the writ. It was nearly the end of September before the writ was issued. When, however, a vacancy occurred in the city of St. John, owing to the acceptance of office

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

on the 30th October by the present Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, the writ was issued on that same day for the election in that constituency. It seems to me that the writ should issue within a certain specified time, say twenty days, as named by my hon. friend, after notice being received by the Speaker of a vacancy having occurred or of an election having been voided. Surely the Government could, without difficulty, appoint a returning officer in that time, and they would then carry out the spirit of the Act. We find that, in one case, the Government were able to name a returning officer within two days, and, therefore, it may be presumed that a delay of twenty days would be ample time for a similar purpose. In that case, there could be uniformity, whereas, to-day, the Government, when it suits them, may delay the election for an indefinite period, as they did in the two flagrant cases of Yarmouth and Dorchester. The hon. the Minister of Justice says that there was no Session of Parliament in the cases of Yarmouth and Dorchester before the elections took place, and that, therefore, the elections took place in ample time. But in the Chambly case the election was held in July, when there was no prospect of any Parliament being held until the following winter; and although the Franchise Act had been passed, the Government did not wait for the electoral list to be revised, but held the election in July, despite the fact, if the contention of the hon. the Minister of Justice is right, that there was not the slightest necessity to do so, because there was no probability of any Session of Parliament being held for some months. It seems to me that in justice to the electoral districts, and to carry out the spirit of the Act, there should be no delay on the part of the Speaker issuing his warrants and at once putting the machinery in motion for the purpose of having an election. Let a reasonable delay be given, and then the responsibility will fall on the Government, and surely, judging from past experience, there ought to be no difficulty in the Government carrying out their duty within the delay suggested by my hon. friend.

Mr. THOMPSON. The objection now is that in Chambly the writs were issued too soon.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Not so.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is really very difficult to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. In most cases, they complain of the delay being too long, but now they change their tune; and, after first taunting us with undue delay, they complain of too much haste. I would draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that this amendment would have compelled the election to be held in Chambly at once, contrary to the argument which my hon. friend has just presented that the Government ought in such a case to wait until the electoral lists were revised. I would just say a word to the hon. member for Bothwell with regard to my contention as to the effect of the evidence in the case of the county of Kent, because I am sure, had he spoken of the matter when it was fresh in his memory, he would not have said that my contention that we should wait for the printing of the evidence was insincere, in view of the fact that when the evidence was printed I held that the finding of the judge was conclusive and could not be reversed by this House. My contention was that we had no right to say from the evidence that the judge's finding was wrong, but that we were bound to read the evidence in order to be in a position to advise the House as to whether the corrupt practices which the judge said had prevailed in the election for that county were of so flagrant a nature that we should disfranchise the constituency. We did refer to the evidence for the purpose of making the report which we made to the House; and if we had not referred to it, we could not have conscientiously come to the conclusion we did.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman certainly has forgotten the discussion that took place and a portion of his own report. He proposed that we should declare that the constituency had been sufficiently punished by being deprived for a time of representation in this House. I pointed out that the evidence disclosed the fact that the constituency did not deserve to be punished at all, and the hon. gentleman's contention was that the judge having said there was reason to believe corrupt practices had extensively prevailed in that constituency, we were bound to accept that statement as true, no matter what the evidence might show. That was the position of the hon. gentleman, and that was his justification for putting that provision in the report, and refusing to accept any amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have said that was my contention, and I say again we are not at liberty to refer to the evidence in an election case for the purpose of revising the decision of the judge, but can only refer to it for the purpose of advising the House whether the corrupt practices that prevailed, prevailed to such an extent as to justify steps to be taken to disfranchise the constituency.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman does not meet my statement squarely. I do not say that we should sit in judgment and review the decision of the judge, but the hon. gentleman embraced in his report the inferential statement that the constituency was corrupt and deserved punishment, but that it had been sufficiently punished by the delay that had already occurred in its representation; and when I pointed out to him that there was not a tittle of evidence to show that the constituency deserved punishment, he said we had no right to look at the evidence in that matter, but to look only at the report of the judge. That was the position he took. Therefore, it was not the evidence that the hon. gentleman was examining in order to make his report, but it was the decision of the judge that the House had before the evidence was printed at all. The hon. gentleman says we are hard to please on this side. He says that we complain about the haste in issuing the writ in Chambly and the delay in issuing it in Haldimand. The hon. gentleman has forgotten the circumstances connected with those elections. The late member for Haldimand died while Parliament was in session, and it was proposed here that the writ should issue. The Speaker issued his warrant, if I remember rightly, and the hon. gentleman, when we asked him why the writ did not issue, declared that there was no necessity for any haste, that the new voters' lists were being prepared, and that it would be wrong to hold the election before that list was completed. Parliament he said, had by its legislation already declared that the existing voters' list was imperfect, it had altered the qualification of electors, and we must wait for the new list. That was the declaration the first Minister made on behalf of the Government. The Government set the provision of the law at defiance, and justified their course in that matter on the ground that a new voters' list was being prepared, and that, until that list was prepared, there ought not to be an election. That was the hon. gentleman's position. It was either right or it was not right. Some two or three months later there was a vacancy in Chambly, and the hon. gentleman disregarded the rule which had been laid down in the case of Haldimand, and ordered a new writ to issue at a time when the old voters' list was the only one under which it could take place. Both these cases occurred at the same period of time, and what we are now calling the attention of the Minister of Justice to is the fact that there was one rule and policy adopted in the county of Chambly and another rule and policy in the county of Haldimand. Both of these could not have been right. One or the other rule should have been adhered to, and we now propose to make such a change that the discretionary power the Government possess and have abused, as has been shown very

clearly, should no longer be left in their hands, and I think it is clear that it ought not to be left in their hands, and I think we are not very hard to please. We point out what the abuse is, and what the remedy is, and we do not want the abuse which occurred in Chambly or the abuse which occurred in Haldimand to be repeated. We wish to see the law amended and made what it ought to be, so that justice may be done and that, when elections are held, they may fairly reflect the public opinion of the constituency.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My hon. friend the Minister of Justice thought I complained in regard to the election in Chambly. He said that the reason why the elections in Yarmouth and Dorchester were delayed was that there was no Session of Parliament at the time, and there was no necessity for holding an election, but the election in Chambly was held in July, the vacancy having occurred at about the same time as that in Dorchester, but the Government issued the writ in the first case and not in the other.

Mr. THOMPSON. My argument was not that an election should not be held in summer, but that there was no ground for complaint if it was not.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Surely, if the Minister of Justice will not accept this amendment on any other grounds he will when he sees how it must distress the Finance Minister to witness this lack of fixity of purpose on the part of his colleagues.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have not seen it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely the hon. gentleman will understand that, when a certain rule was adopted in regard to Chambly, and an entirely different rule prevailed in Haldimand, we had good reason to propose a change. If there was ever any case in which the power and authority of the Government were abused for a party advantage, it was in the different treatment they accorded to Chambly and Haldimand.

Amendment of Mr. Barron negatived.

On section 7,

Mr. EDGAR. That is the section which was allowed to stand. Is it not proposed to make any alteration in that?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think not. The reason it was allowed to stand was, as I said the other day, that I thought that the substantive part of the legislation regarding the qualification of farmers' sons and owners' sons, was in the Franchise Act, and I still think it is.

On section 9,

Mr. THOMPSON. This section was allowed to stand at the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in order to make it clear that there should be no counting of the ballots by the returning officer unless the certified statements or copies cannot be obtained.

On section 13, sub-section 3,

Mr. THOMPSON. This was allowed to stand at the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition, who thought there should be a trial by the indictment.

Mr. LAURIER. I objected to that section because I thought it was leaving too great powers in the hands of the justices of the peace. As a rule, without any offence to justices of the peace, I would not be disposed to trust them with these very large powers. I believe it would be better to follow the spirit of the Act, and to make the offence punishable as all other offences are punishable under the Act.

Mr. BARRON. It is quite clear that under that section there is no right of appeal whatsoever.

Mr. THOMPSON. I was going to suggest that there is a Bill relating to summary convictions before the House, and in it I will endeavor to provide for an appeal in such cases.

Mr. AMYOT. I beg to move in amendment to this Bill the Bill which I introduced some time ago—Bill No. 2. It is as follows:—

Paragraph (b) of section nine of "*Dominion Controverted Elections Act*," is hereby amended by striking out the following words after the word "days" in the second line of the said paragraph: "after the day of publication in the *Canada Gazette* of the receipt of the return of the writ of election by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery," and substituting the following: "after the day fixed for the nomination, in case the candidate or candidates have been declared elected on that day, and in other cases thirty days after the polling day."

My object is to make uniform the delays in contestations, 30 days after nomination day, when the election is by acclamation, and 30 days after polling day when there has been an election. I do not think there can be any objection to this. I do not want to discuss the matter, as the House is fully informed of the facts.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman will see on reflection that his Bill is not a safe one. I will read paragraph (b) of section 9 which he proposes to amend:

"The petition must be presented not later than 30 days after the day of publication in the *Canada Gazette* of the receipt of the return of the writ of the election by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery."

He strikes out those words and says:

"After the day fixed for the nomination, in case the candidate or candidates have been declared elected on that day, and in other cases 30 days after polling day."

Now, it seems to me, from the examination I have given the hon. gentleman's Bill, that if the returning officer, for any reason, delays his return beyond 30 days after nomination day or polling day, he would put it beyond the power of either party to controvert the election.

Mr. AMYOT. The returning officer is bound by law to make his report within a certain delay, which delay is fixed, I think, by the statute. He is bound to do it, and we have never seen an instance where he has not done it.

Mr. THOMPSON. But if he does not do so, he does not now deprive any party of his remedy. But it is a very dangerous thing, I think, to allow him to prevent the return from being controverted by petition.

Mr. AMYOT. We can make a special proviso for that, so as, except in cases where the returning officer will not comply with the law, to fix another delay for that case. I think it is fair that the delay for contestation should be the same for all the members. It is not fair to give 40 days or 60 days to one and only 30 days to another. Let us make a uniform delay for every one, and have equal justice.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me that my hon. friend's intention in his Bill is very good, and if the working of his Bill is not such as to meet the difficulty, if any difficulty presents itself to the Minister of Justice, he can easily frame a Bill which will carry out what my hon. friend asks for, namely, that every person shall have the same time granted to him to enter a contestation or to meet a contestation. It is very easy to frame a clause to meet the difficulty, if the Minister of Justice feels there is a practical difficulty in what my hon. friend presents. He wishes to avoid the recurrence of what took place at the last general election. It is patent to everyone that gross injustice was done to some members, that some of us were not gazetted for three weeks and some for nearly four weeks, after the returns, and some of them coming in the same day were gazetted in the next *Gazette*; in other words, there was a fortnight or three weeks of opportunity for contesting the election as against some gentlemen, while most of the ministerial candidates were gazetted almost immediately. If

Mr. BARRON.

this Bill does not meet the case, the Minister of Justice can prepare a clause that will meet the difficulty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is no difficulty in carrying out the clause as proposed by my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman proposes that the period within which an election may be contested shall be thirty days counting from the day of election. It is contended, however, that it is possible the returning officer might, contrary to law, delay the returns of any particular candidate for thirty days. I do not see how it is possible. The returning officer is sworn to discharge certain duties; he must within a certain number of days declare a candidate elected, then four days are given for an appeal to the county judge for the purpose of having a recount. The whole of the proceedings taken must be taken within less than the thirty days, and, that being the case, such an abuse as the hon. gentleman suggests could hardly arise. Certainly it never could arise if the Government were to allow certain officials to act as returning officers. So far as I know, since the Union in 1867 not a single instance has occurred in which the period of thirty days elapsed before some candidate seeking election was declared elected. It may be that if the hon. gentleman wishes to take abundant security further amendment may be required by providing that in any case where the returning officer has failed to declare some candidate elected within thirty days a week or more time may be allowed for petitioning. But certainly thirty days covers a much longer period than is required by law to have one or other candidate declared elected, even where an appeal is made to the judge and a recount is had. If the hon. gentleman thinks the time is not sufficient it might be extended to thirty-five days.

Mr. O'BRIEN. My suggestion is that the time should count, not from the day of election in case of a contest, but from declaration day, when the vote is summed up and the returning officer makes his declaration. That should be the time from which the period allowed for filing a petition should be dated.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the matter requires to be very carefully considered, and several Acts, both the Election and the Controverted Elections Act, will require to be remodelled to carry out such a principle as has been advocated. I would remind the House of the proceedings after the holding of the poll. We have first of all, after polling day, the delay until declaration day, then the summing up of the votes, then the delay of six days and possibly a recount in the meantime as well. The petition is to be a petition complaining of the undue return. If we are to confine the practice to the Controverted Elections Act, we must give a fair chance to those desiring to petition, and all those proceedings, by the amendment, would have to be taken within thirty days. The return goes to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, perhaps on the twenty-eighth or twenty-ninth, or even on the thirtieth day, and there is certainly no time to prepare a petition or even to know what the return is against which the party will petition, in the short interval remaining unexpired. I stated to the House at an earlier period of the Session that, although it had been intended to introduce a Bill relating to the Controverted Elections Act and to suggest several important changes—and this is, of course, an important change, but I refer to other important changes—it was decided that it would be better for several reasons to wait until another Session, and no great harm could accrue by that delay, inasmuch as the probability was that few bye-elections would be held in the interim. I will, if the hon. gentleman concurs in the suggestion, let this matter stand until that has been done, the Acts compared and the necessary changes made, and in the meantime I assent to the principle suggested and embodied in the hon. gentleman's Bill for having a fixed time at which all returns shall take

effect irrespective of any discretion on the part of any officer whomsoever. As regards the suggestion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien); that would be quite feasible if it were not that the petition has to be against, not the declaration of the returning officer, but against the return which he makes, and which is really not made until at least six days after declaration day. That, however, could be remedied by making a provision to this effect, that on declaration day or after the six days the returning officer should make such a return, and should make it immediately so public that every person desiring to petition would have ample notice of what the return was, and from that date we might have a fixed period, and a short period too, in which the election may be protested.

Mr. EDGAR. I must congratulate the Minister of Justice on having assented to the principle of the proposed amendment. I would point out, however, that even more changes will have to be made in the law. I do not find anything in the law rendering it obligatory upon the Government to fix any particular day for the return of the writ. There are uncertainties which must be removed. If we are going to fix a day by statute within which the petition against the return must be made, we must begin by fixing a date in the statute within which the return itself must be made.

Mr. AMYOT. In view of the declaration of the Minister and his promise that he will introduce a Bill next Session, I withdraw the amendment.

Bill reported.

FORFEITURES FOR TREASON AND FELONY.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 88) to abolish forfeitures for treason and felony, and to otherwise amend the law relating thereto.

Mr. EDGAR. I surely think the Minister of Justice must see that this Bill interferes in a most marked degree with the rights of the Provinces, because it undertakes to deprive them of their property. In this Bill the Government proposes that the land which by the law to-day when it has been escheated in some cases becomes the property of the Provinces, shall not escheat and shall not become the property of the Provinces. I surely think that cannot be a proper function for this Parliament to assume. It may be said that because it is escheated on account of crime, that that would make some difference. I do not apprehend that it does. It has been decided by the Privy Council in the Mercer case that escheated land goes to the Provinces, because escheats are royalties. It cannot be contended that escheats for crime are not royalties and do not go to the Crown as royalties, and to the Provinces consequently. I know that, in the Province of Ontario at any rate, that when before the decision of the Privy Council they were legislating about escheats, they excepted escheats for crime from their legislation; perhaps, having some doubts then as to the law on the subject. I think that those who took the provincial view, thought that escheated land belonged to the Provinces by reason of the tenure of the Crown. When a failure of heirs arose the land would revert on account of the tenure to the Crown. Probably for that reason they left out in the legislation in Ontario, reference to escheats in the case of crime. But, as I said, the Privy Council has distinctly decided that escheats belong to the Provinces as royalties. Take section 2 of this Bill. It says:

"Subject to the provisions of this Act and from and after the passing thereof, no confession, verdict, inquest, conviction or judgment of or for any treason or felony or *felo de se* shall cause any attainder or corruption of blood, or any forfeiture or escheat, provided that nothing in this Act shall affect the law of forfeiture consequent upon outlawry or any forfeiture in relation to which special provision is made by any Act of the Parliament of Canada."

I surely think that is taking away the property of the Provinces, and the Act seems to interfere in another respect most distinctly with provincial rights. There is provision made in this Act for the administration of assets. Section 8 provides:

The Governor in Council may, if to him it seems fit so to do, commit, during pleasure, the custody and management of the property of any convict to an administrator to be appointed in that behalf; and upon any determination of such appointment, either by revocation or by death of any such administrator, a new administrator may, from time to time, be appointed; and every such administrator shall, upon his appointment, be and be deemed to be the successor in law of the former administrator; and all property invested in, and all powers given to such former administrator by virtue of this Act shall thereupon devolve to and become vested in such successor, who shall be bound by all acts lawfully done by such former administrator during the continuance of his office; and the provisions hereinafter contained with reference to any administrator shall, in the case of the appointment of more than one person, apply to such administrators jointly.

Now I think if there is anything that belongs to the Provincial Government at all it is the right to regulate matters of administration, and I think for that reason the Bill in those respects, at any rate, is not within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. There are portions of it which, however, are different and do not bear on the rights of the Provinces.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not propose this evening to go on with the Bill in the Committee of the Whole House. I will avail myself of the opportunity of going into committee to answer the objections which the hon. gentleman has made. They only relate to certain features of the Bill, and I think I can satisfy the hon. gentleman that the Bill is entirely within our jurisdiction—that we are dealing with the property of the Crown, after having relinquished our right to forfeit—dealing with the property of the criminal in respect to which the Crown has the right of ownership, as we can relinquish the forfeiture for crime. That property, which is of right ours, we propose to administer in a certain way for the benefit of the convict himself. That is the principle that underlies these provisions.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Can the Crown restore the forfeiture? I recollect that some years ago in New Brunswick a party was pardoned, and subsequently an Act of the Local Legislature was necessary to restore his property.

Mr. THOMPSON. By this Bill we propose to give up the property.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman, in this second section, misuses the word "escheat." Forfeitures and escheats are two different things. Mr. Blackstone, in his commentaries, points out that when there were allodial estates, and when there could not be any property except in the individual owner, there is nevertheless forfeiture. The doctrine of escheats was of very much later growth; but even in this country in cases for forfeitures for crime, they never could be more than forfeiture of the interest of the party, that is, forfeiture of the interest of the tenant in fee, not forfeiture of the property. The jurisdiction as to escheated property is necessarily in the Local Legislatures; but I think that decision of the Privy Council does include forfeitures as well as escheats. However, that matter can better be considered in Committee than in a discussion on the second reading of the Bill. I merely mention the fact that the hon. gentleman uses the word "forfeiture" properly, but the word "escheats" improperly in the Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. By another name it would smell as sweet, and we can change it if necessary. Yet, I am not willing to admit that I use the word improperly, because my authority for it is the English statute, of which this is an exact copy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But there is this difference: that in the United Kingdom the whole power is vested in one body.

Mr. THOMPSON. But the expression is there used in reference to the forfeiture which results from felony.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I think the position taken by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) would surprise most lawyers, that this Parliament, in dealing with the criminal law, has not itself power to decide what the penalties shall be, and that by the decision in the Mercer case escheats do not go to the Crown. The hon. member for Bothwell's playing upon the words escheat and forfeiture strikes us as really a mere verbal and technical criticism. These words are certainly used in the ordinary sense, as the hon. gentleman will find them in any law book.

Mr. TISDALE. I think that if this House has the power, it ought to prevent any such cases as the Mercer case occurring again. There were descendants of the man whose property was in dispute. We have a large building in Toronto, which has been erected at the expense of a private individual for the benefit of the Province. I think if this House can do anything to prevent any Province taking property in that way, it should do it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Committee rose.

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

After Recess.

UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT COMPANY.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 20) relating to the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company.

Mr. BRYSON. I desire to ask that this Bill be left over until it is reprinted. Several gentlemen who are absent to-night would like to place themselves on record in relation to this Bill, and at their suggestion I make this request.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). This Bill has been two months before the House. It was fully discussed in the committee, as were all the amendments made to it, and it seems to me that it would be unnecessarily delaying the work to have the Bill stand over.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee (Mr. Small in the Chair).

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This proceeding is irregular. The law provides that the Deputy Speaker, who is called the Chairman of the Committee, shall take the Chair whenever he is in the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Very well, I will take the Chair.

The Committee passed the several clauses and the preamble of the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER called on Mr. Small to take the Chair.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is again irregular. The Deputy Speaker must remain in the Chair; and as he cannot report to himself, the Speaker must be called in. No hon. member can be appointed Chairman of the Committee of the Whole while the Deputy Speaker is in the House, and as the Deputy Speaker cannot report to himself, the Speaker must be called in.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the Deputy Speaker is in the Chair he cannot very well act as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and then get up and report to himself.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly not, and the Speaker must be here to receive the report. The clerk says that is not the English practice, but look at our own Rules which we have made for ourselves. The Rule says that the Chairman of the Committee shall be called to the Chair whenever he is present. Now, the Chairman of the Committee is present, and is called to the Chair. He, of course, cannot report to himself, but the Speaker must be here in order that he may report to him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Rule is that the Deputy Speaker, if he is in the House, must take the Chair; and once he does so, he can call on any one else to take it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Let us send for the Speaker.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is impossible that the Deputy Speaker should report to himself, and the Speaker is not present. Therefore the Deputy Speaker must call on an hon. member to take his place as Chairman of the Committee in order that he may receive the report of the committee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The proceeding is altogether irregular, and contrary to our Rule.

Mr. SMALL then took the Chair and reported the Bill, which was read the third time and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Central Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. O'Brien.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics \$147,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to state that we propose to drop the item "for expenses in connection with Dominion Exhibition, \$10,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Why is the hon. gentleman dropping that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We thought it was not necessary to incur that expenditure this year.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) You are not going to contribute anything to that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why was it put in?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was put in the main Estimates before it had been properly considered, and it was reconsidered afterwards.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest whether it would not be just as well to apply that amount, or more if necessary, to a proper representation of Canada at the Cincinnati Exhibition. The hon. gentleman knows that there are an immense number of Canadians in the United States, and he professes to be anxious to promote trade relations between the two countries.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is only sometimes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And, if he would assist the exhibition of Canadian products at Cincinnati, it would do a great deal towards promoting more intimate commercial

relations between the two countries. Of course, if the hon. gentleman is opposed to that, such a policy would be objectionable to him, but, if he is favorable, as he professes, to more intimate trade relations, there is no way in which he could assist it better than by giving an opportunity for Canada to exhibit her products at that exhibition. Even if he or his leader is opposed to that now, they have changed their views so often this Session that, perhaps, we may expect them to be in favor of it when the time comes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is one difficulty, and that is that we have no authority from the Crown recommending such an expenditure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You were merely suggesting how we might avoid the difficulty of having this \$10,000 left on our hands.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman knows that there is no difficulty whatever in getting the authority of the Crown for this expenditure; and therefore, if he has any better objection to offer, we should know it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I see that last year, though the amount voted for the care of archives was \$6,000, hon. gentlemen expended about \$4,200 in excess of the grant. I think the House should have some information upon that.

Mr. CARLING. This amount is for collecting historical records and manuscripts, of which there are now upwards of half a million volumes arranged, bound and ready for reference. The volumes are constantly referred to for settling disputed points. The archivist reports the vote insufficient, and for this reason it is impossible to begin copying documents in Paris. Dr. W. F. Poole, president of the American Historical Society, in his report of a visit to Ottawa in September last, made officially, to the Society of Librarians of North America, describes the Canadian archives as the most valuable collection for historical purposes on the continent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not objecting to his taking this small vote, but I was objecting to the Department spending nearly double the amount that Parliament voted for a specific purpose, and when money is expended in that way, it amounts to this, that it is only a farce for us to go through the form of voting money at all. If we vote a sum of \$6,000, and they spend between \$10,000 and \$11,000, the reason for going into Committee of Supply seems to be rendered nugatory.

Mr. CARLING. I think it is the practice, if any particular vote is over-run, to take the balance from another vote. I believe the money was carefully expended, and, if necessary, I can get the particulars.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no doubt that the amount was expended, and I am not objecting to the expenditure, but I am objecting to the principle which is involved. I do not think the hon. gentleman is justified in withdrawing from another sum voted for a specific purpose, any amount to apply to this. The whole principle is wrong. I have no doubt that the money was spent, or it would not be in the Auditor General's report, as it is.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I see that C. C. Chipman is down for \$400 in connection with the archives. How does that come about?

Mr. CARLING. That is not in this year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). No, but last year it was in, and I think it was stated that there was an appropriation of \$1,000 extra for this purpose. Yet we find that C. C. Chipman has drawn \$400 out of this fund, and perhaps that

may be the reason why the expenditure of 1886-87 amounts to so much more than the sum appropriated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that the arrangement previously was that Mr. Chipman had \$400 a year in connection with the supervision of this work on the other side of the Atlantic, and the hon. gentleman will see that it disappears from the vote of this year. It had nothing to do with the \$1,000 which was voted to that gentleman, and which was for an entirely different purpose. It was for the very extraordinary duty that has been thrown upon him in connection with the exhibition in London. The \$400 was paid to him by the Department of Immigration for the supervision of and constant attention to this work in the Archives Branch.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is this Mr. Chipman the gentleman who was in the office of the High Commissioner in London?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, he is the same person.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Then he received his salary under another head as private secretary to the High Commissioner?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, he was not private secretary to the High Commissioner?

Mr. LISTER. What position did he hold?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He held the position of accountant and assistant secretary in the High Commissioner's office.

Mr. LISTER. At what salary?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At a salary of \$1,800, and this was \$400 added.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not hear what explanation was given why the vote had been \$6,000 and the expenditure \$10,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The explanation given by the Minister of Agriculture was that an unusual amount of work was thrown upon the archivist, who was extremely anxious to carry on a considerable amount of work. In fact it has been very extensive indeed. This amount was taken from the bracketed vote, as the hon. member will see, but it was thought as there was sufficient money provided in this resolution (No. 45) to cover the expenditure, it was taken so that they could go on with this work that Mr. Brymner was very anxious should be done during the year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that we have ever considered that when these votes for a distinctly different purpose were bracketed, it was right to transfer one to another. I think it is a very objectionable practice. I have always objected myself to bracketing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it would be better to avoid it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But where you state distinctly, so much for one purpose and so much for another, then it is very objectionable to remove a vote from one to the other.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt about that, and I have no doubt my hon. friend will see that it does not occur again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was any authority taken by Governor General's warrant or anything else?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. It was held by the department that there was enough in the total vote to allow for an excess in one branch, and this amount was taken; but I quite agree that it is not a good practice, and I am quite sure the Minister of Agriculture will see that it does not occur again.

Mr. CARLING. I may tell the hon. member that this was for agriculture and statistics, and I believe it has been a practice in the Department of Agriculture, not only last year, but for many years, and during the time the hon. gentleman was Finance Minister, I am told by the officers of the department that when a sufficient amount was voted and it overran, they would take it for another vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not recollect whether the hon. gentleman is right that the abuse may have prevailed before, but I think it is distinctly an abuse. I do not remember at this moment anything of the kind that the Minister of Agriculture mentions, but it may have occurred. Where such things were brought to my notice, I always insisted on a separate vote being taken, but it is possible that one or two occasions may have occurred.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No doubt the practice is contrary to the rule at the present time. The old English practice, of course, was to vote the subsidy in a lump sum. Mr. Downing was the first Chancellor of the Exchequer who introduced the present practice, and from his time down to the present, it has always been the practice, in the English House of Commons, to confine the expenditure to the appropriations made; and the sum that is asked for one purpose cannot be applied to another different purpose.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would ask the Minister of Finance whether these services were performed on the other side of the water, or here in Ottawa?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They were performed on both sides. I may explain to my hon. friend that Mr. Chipman, who was appointed to the position of accountant and assistant secretary of the High Commissioner's office in London, was necessarily required when I was called back to the position of Minister of Finance, and remained still charged with the administration of the duties of the High Commissioner's office in London. My hon. friend will see that it was almost indispensable that I should have the services of a gentleman who was thoroughly familiar with the duties in both departments, and consequently I appointed Mr. Chipman my private secretary as Minister of Finance; and it would have been almost impossible for me to carry on, as I have done, the administration of both departments if it had not been for the valuable services of Mr. Chipman. I dare say my hon. friend knows that he is a man of exceptional ability, and of unwearied industry. He has served long in the various departments of the public service, in New Brunswick first, and subsequently in the Railway Department at Moncton, then in the Finance Department, and then in the Department of Railways and Canals. There are few gentlemen better acquainted with the duties of these various services. When Mr. Dewar retired he was appointed in his place to the position of accountant and also assistant secretary in the High Commissioner's office. I may say that in that position I had no private secretary. There is no charge for a private secretary in that connection. But when it became necessary for me to return as Minister of Finance, and I was still charged with the duties of administering the office of High Commissioner on the other side, it was absolutely indispensable that I should avail myself of the services of a gentleman who was thoroughly familiar with the duties of both departments.

Mr. COCKBURN. I had happened to be in London during the time of the exhibition, and was brought into very frequent contact with Mr. Chipman, and I can assure the hon. gentlemen opposite that there was no man on that side of the Atlantic who worked harder for the interests of Canada than did Mr. Chipman. I found him early in the morning and late at night, hard at work, and I know from personal knowledge that in the management of some things entrusted to him, he was the means of saving to this coun-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

try several thousands of dollars. If hon. gentlemen knew his valuable services as well as I do, Mr. Chipman is the last man to whom they would grudge the small amount that is now being voted to him.

Mr. TROW. No doubt Mr. Chipman is a very worthy officer. I found him so. I had the pleasure of being in the office of the High Commissioner, and found him very attentive to his duties, and no doubt a very worthy man. The only fault we find is that he is being paid sums under different headings, and it is difficult to ascertain how much he has been paid. I find he has received \$1,799 in Immigration Department.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The \$1,800 is his salary as accountant and assistant secretary in the High Commissioner's office.

Mr. TROW. I also find that he has been paid travelling expenses, \$170; he received as private secretary, \$250; travelling expenses again, \$48.56; cab hire, \$8.50, and \$400 in connection with the archives, making a total of \$2,862 already discovered. There may be other items that we have not discovered.

Mr. LISTER. Do I understand the Minister to say that he acted as his secretary while the hon. gentleman has been in Canada?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Since I left the London office. He received \$600 a year as my private secretary.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. Minister has given us a very minute description of the ability and services of Mr. Chipman. I am sorry that I do not know of his services. It is quite new to me that he is such a desirable man, although I have no doubt he is a valuable man. Is that the gentleman who is brother-in-law to the present Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, Sir Leonard Tilley?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, I am sorry for that, because I would like to put in a word for him on that account. The hon. gentleman has stated that it became absolutely necessary, from the dual position he occupied as High Commissioner and Finance Minister, that he should have a confidential man as secretary. No doubt it was very desirable, that he should have a confidential man as secretary, but it is much to be regretted that my hon. friend should have attempted to occupy these dual positions, otherwise, perhaps, we would have avoided this charge of \$600. But I suppose it has been paid, and we cannot get the money back, therefore the less we say about it the better. After the testimony that has been borne to the value of Mr. Chipman's services in connection with that exhibition, no doubt according to the ideas of the hon. gentleman, they entitle him to some additional remuneration. I can only say that from the first I opposed that enormous vote, which has swollen from the moderate sum which the Finance Minister stated at first to, if I am correct, over \$100,000 for that exhibition in London. It is so much money thrown away, and I hope there will be no repetition of such squandering of the public money while the country's finances are in such a deplorable condition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman give us my information in regard to the receipts from the Patent Department?

Mr. CARLING. The receipts from that department have increased very much indeed. Last year the gross receipts for patents and trade marks were \$76,600, or \$13,000 more than the previous year.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.). Will the hon. gentleman explain the manner of obtaining criminal statistics?

Mr. CARLING. The item of \$4,000 is required for the collection of criminal statistics from every police court and magistrate in the Dominion, the remuneration being fixed by statute. The cost of the preparation of the returns for the year is included in the expenditure.

Mr. LISTER. Who make the returns ?

Mr. CARLING. The police magistrates.

Mr. LISTER. They have only cognisance of the convictions made before themselves. Is there any way of having returns sent by the clerk of the peace in each county ?

Mr. CARLING. I understand the returns are made according to a schedule in the Blake Act.

Mr. DAVIES. Partial statistics are of no use, and it is desirable to ascertain whether the present system places the hon. gentleman in a position to obtain statistics for all the Dominion.

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Have the Government given up the idea of contributing the usual amount of \$10,000 towards the Dominion Exhibition this year to be held in Halifax ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is matter for regret that the contribution should have been made by the Government year after year when the Dominion Exhibition was held at other places and that it should now be dropped. It will be a matter of considerable disappointment to the people of Halifax that the exhibition will not be held there this year. They have been making considerable preparations under the expectation that the usual grant would be made, and as it had been held in other places in previous years there was a reasonable expectation that it would be held at Halifax this year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was with extreme regret that the Government dropped the vote ; but the hon. gentleman will see that if we are to economise we must commence somewhere, and we felt this was an expenditure which we could, without any very serious injury to the country, forego this year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Perhaps the Minister would explain the working of the system in connection with health statistics, for which \$10,000 is asked. I have been unable to see that this amount is usefully expended. I observe that \$10,000 is still asked, although last year only between \$6,000 and \$7,000 was expended.

Mr. CARLING. These are returns obtained for the different cities and towns in the Dominion from health officers appointed by the municipal authorities. These returns are placed in the records of the department, and a report is issued every year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Will the Minister tell me how this health officer appointed by the municipality obtains his information ? What instructions are given to him by the Government, and what duties are imposed upon him, so that the reports may be somewhat reliable ? Are there any directions given to those health officers as to their duties ?

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman of course will find that, if he refers to the annual report and the certificates of the medical officers which are in the report issued by the department every year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Pretty nearly every municipality in the Province of Ontario has a board of health now. Have you given your officers directions to avail themselves of that information, and to get information from those various boards ?

Mr. CARLING. An Order in Council was passed some years ago limiting this information to cities and towns of 5,000 inhabitants and above, and we avail ourselves of the health officers of the cities and towns for this information.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It appears to me that we are not getting that information that we ought to, when we are asked to vote \$10,000 for this purpose. The Minister knows very well that all the duties those health officers perform are merely by their going to the sextons and copying from the sexton's book the number of deaths or burials that took place there. As far as the department is concerned they perform no other duties whatever and we are asked each year to grant \$10,000 for that.

Mr. CARLING. It is true none of those officers are appointed, except the municipality have by resolution appointed a health officer.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). All they do is to go to the sexton and obtain information as to how many were buried there. They may not obtain full information, because people who have died in a particular locality may be buried elsewhere. We might just as well not spend a single dollar, for all the reliability that can be attached to those reports. It is a waste of money, and it is evident that the Government are not making any effort whatever to have this branch made efficient. It has now gone on for a number of years. We were told at first that it was merely experimental, and that it would be in a few years of importance to the country in reference to health statistics. Many thousand dollars have been spent upon it, and I would ask the Government to-day wherein can they point to the benefits accruing from the policy of the department in this respect. I say there are no benefits whatever. The information is of no use to us, because we cannot rely upon it, on account of the manner in which those officers discharge their duties. It would be much better to strike out the item altogether.

Mr. CARLING. The information gathered from those different municipalities is published monthly, and it is very much sought after by the press and published all over the Dominion, giving the death rate of each city and town. I think it is important to have the information. It might perhaps be fuller, but the established rule has been that no place under 5,000 inhabitants could give the information because it had no health officer appointed. If a health officer is appointed in a town of less population, we have not stood strictly to the 5,000, as we are anxious to get the information. I think the amount paid those officers is not extravagant. I see in the town of St. Thomas which the hon. gentleman has the honor to represent, with a population of 10,000 or 12,000 people all that was paid to the health officer during the year was \$120. Considering this information is gathered from cities and towns all over the Dominion and that the information is most valuable to the people at large, I think it does not cost very much.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The statement of the hon. gentleman shows that what the Province of Ontario is doing for itself with tolerable completeness, the Government here are doing very imperfectly. Of course hon. gentlemen would like any information that would contribute to the general welfare of the health of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. I may say for their information that Mr. Campbell who formerly represented Kent in this House has been returned by the people of Kent by an increased majority.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I may say that whatever the health officer in St. Thomas gets, be it much or little, he gets more than he earns for the services he renders. It is a notorious fact that those officers are appointed by the muni-

cipalities and they perform the duty for the municipalities. They duplicate the information which they collect for the municipalities, and if all that he does is to send to the Government a duplicate of the information he has to render to the St. Thomas Council, I should say he is pretty well paid. I do not know what the Minister of Agriculture may think, but he may be in the habit of giving more liberally than that. Take for instance the officer in Toronto. He receives between \$300 and \$400, and you do not pretend to tell me that sending a duplicate here is worth that amount? Whether the cost be much or little the information is unreliable and it is not worth what you pay for it. Unless you organise that branch of the Department in a different way you might as well strike out the item altogether.

Mr. LISTER. Are those officers appointed by the Government?

Mr. CARLING. The Government appoint the salaried health officer of the city or town.

Mr. LISTER. I observe here that the returns are very imperfect. I find that the towns of Goderich and Sarnia are not included.

Mr. CARLING. The law provides that if a town appoints a health officer, such officer is selected by the Government for mortuary statistics.

Mr. LISTER. We have a health officer in our town.

Mr. CARLING. That has not been reported.

Mr. LISTER. I do not say that one should be appointed, because I agree with the hon. member for East Elgin that this money is thrown away, so far as the information given us is concerned. The amounts charged by the different officers for making these returns vary greatly. In some cases the amount is \$100, and in others as much as \$300. In Brantford and Woodstock it is \$56, while in smaller towns, Galt for instance, the amount is considerably more.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman must understand that it is according to population.

Mr. LISTER. The amounts are larger in some cases than in other cases where the population is smaller.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like the Minister to tell us whether there is a health officer in London.

Mr. CARLING. Dr. Hutchinson, I understand, is the health officer for that city.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the meaning of this item, "Sundry persons, for 18,012 certificates, at 15 cents each, \$2,700?" Who gives these certificates, and what do they represent?

Mr. CARLING. They are medical burial certificates. They are paid to the cemetery keepers, who get 15 cents for each medical burial certificate.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the Minister must be in error. I think he will find that the 15 cents is the amount paid by the health officer to the sexton on account of a certificate given to him. It may be that some of these sextons get the 15 cents, but I doubt it very much. This is a very large amount of money expended for that purpose, and we have no explanation to show where that \$2,700 goes.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman must have seen the report which states that the cemetery keeper get 15 cents per burial.

Mr. LISTER. As I understand, the health officer makes these returns. Why, in addition, should there be this enormous sum paid to get the certificates from the cemeteries?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

Mr. CARLING. I do not think it is an enormous sum for these certificates of burial, obtained from all the cities and towns in the Dominion.

Mr. LISTER. It is of little consequence whether it is large or small, but why should it be done?

Mr. CARLING. As a matter of policy, to get the information as accurately as possible. It has been done for fifteen or sixteen years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that represent the death rate of these various cities?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This information would be valuable, no doubt, if it represented accurately the death rate in each of these cities; but I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, who in his professional capacity is an excellent judge, whether it does so. He knows that the cemeteries adjacent to towns and cities are often made use of by a considerable section of country around. Does he know whether this death rate is that of the cities, or is it that of the cities plus a large section of country around them?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I imagine that the death rate represents all the persons buried there, whether belonging to the city or the adjacent country. But the statistics are valuable because as a rule, they present a lower death rate than is found in any other part of the world; and anything that tends to show a low death rate establishes the healthfulness of our towns, and makes them additionally attractive. In that way these statistics have a certain value. I am afraid the appropriation is too small to enable the Minister of Agriculture to obtain as thorough and full information as is desirable. No doubt there cannot be a very great deal accomplished all over the Dominion with this amount of money; but in the absence of a better and more complete system of vital statistics, it furnishes that which persons investigating the relative attractions of different countries attach a good deal of importance to, as an evidence of the healthfulness of our climate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no doubt the object is a good one, and the information if obtained would prove of some importance. What my hon. friend was asking was a small piece of information which I imagine the hon. Minister could give at once. This \$2,700 has been paid to sundry persons for what? I have not been able to gather as yet.

Mr. CARLING. It is paid to the sextons of cemeteries for burial certificates.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) What has this to do with the collection of statistics. The doctor gives statistics of the deaths and the causes of death. The sexton in charge of the cemetery has nothing to do with the causes of death. You want to get the population of a town, the number of people who died, and the different diseases of which they died, so as to see what diseases are most prevalent and what the death rate is, in order that some precautions may be taken to reduce the death rate by adopting means to prevent the inroads of any special disease that is more prevalent than others. I do not see therefore why we should pay \$2,700 a year in order to get the certificate of a sexton that a certain number of men have been buried in a cemetery.

Mr. CARLING. The certificate furnished by this officer gives the disease which each person died of.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The sexton cannot possibly be able to state the disease except from information he gets from the doctor.

Mr. CARLING. The doctor's certificate certifies the disease of which the person dies and the sexton certifies that he was buried.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Why not also get a certificate from the undertaker?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the hon. Minister is laboring under a mistake. In former years, 10 cents was paid to the municipal clerk for each death certificate, and that, in the Province of Ontario, is paid out of the local dues of the municipalities. I cannot say what may be the course pursued in the other Provinces, but it may be that the Minister pays 15 cents for a certificate from the sexton, and that the sexton, in his wisdom, certifies that the man lived to a certain age and died of a certain disease. It has been proved that these certificates are worthless as data on which to form an opinion in reference to the health of any locality.

Mr. LISTER. Will the hon. gentleman strike this out? There is no earthly use for it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It is the custom among professional men to give a certificate of death stating the age, the disease, and other facts in that connection, for which the medical man receives from the Local Government about 10 cents. Do I understand that the 18,000 deaths given in this return are the actual number of deaths that took place in the whole Dominion or only in those cities where those health officers are appointed?

Mr. CARLING. It indicates the number of deaths in those different cities and towns where there are health officers.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Then the information is of no value, as regards the death rate of the Dominion, because it is only partial information. There are a large number of villages and towns, with a population under 5,000, that have no officers of that kind. It would have been far better and less expensive, as regards Ontario, to take the returns made by the Legislature of Ontario of the births, marriages and deaths in the whole of that Province, instead of taking this return from special centres in it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events, we must have this vote, whatever may be the opinions of the House and committee as to the real value of these statistics. This system has been going on for a good many years, and the arrangement cannot now suddenly be closed. No doubt my hon. friend will consider the remarks made by some hon. gentlemen, professional men, whose opinions are worthy of all consideration.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I understood the hon. gentleman to say that these statistics were all published in his report. I have looked into it, and I have not been able to find them.

Mr. CARLING. They are in the appendix to the annual report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to point out to the hon. Minister that although it is true we have recognised the desirability of having health statistics, if they were accurate, it is worse than useless to have inaccurate statistics because they are positively misleading. Now, for several years we have been pressing from this side that some different system should be adopted. My own impression is it would be far better to select a small number of points and to work them thoroughly than to attempt to carry out the system that at present exists. For four or five years, we have been pointing out the desirability of having some new departure in this matter, so that it cannot be said this question is brought up for the first time. It does not seem, however, that we are much nearer to any solution of the difficulty than when we started.

Mr. CARLING. I think we are carrying out the very suggestion the hon. gentleman made to the House of gathering these statistics from the centres of population, and I

think the hon. gentleman will find that the information we have from these centres is correct. As the hon. the Minister of Finance has said, perhaps the vote is not large enough, but I am confident we are getting information that can be relied on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did I understand from the hon. the Minister of Finance just now that these lists of deaths do not really represent the deaths of the several places referred to?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, they do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood the hon. the Minister of Finance to say that they represented the number buried in the cemeteries in and adjacent to these several centres.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They cover all the cemeteries in each locality where there is a health officer, and a few of the cemeteries adjacent to these localities.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). The hon. gentleman will see that he had better reduce the vote for that reason. Last year he expended only \$7,800. That includes \$2,700 which was paid for certificates which are perfectly useless, and in fact, no one knows what they are for. Then, if you take the \$2,100 which you are asking more than last year and the \$2,700 you have paid for certificates, you might make a saving of \$5,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). One objection which I see to this vote is that Ontario has a complete system of health statistics, covering the whole country, while the hon. gentleman is collecting only from a few points.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is *quoad* Ontario alone.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But a large proportion of this expenditure, nearly the whole of it, is for the Province of Ontario, and in regard to that Province all you need do is to examine the reports made by the Province, which are not only in relation to these few places that the hon. gentleman obtains his statistics from, but from every locality, and then you have in a complete form what you are here obtaining in a very incomplete form. Why, then, should we expend this money to obtain imperfect statistics when we can get complete statistics without any expenditure at all? The Provincial authorities have facilities, far greater than those which you have, to get these returns; and, while it may be proper to carry on this system for those Provinces which have no such law as that which exists in Ontario, to extend it to the Province of Ontario is certainly a work of supererogation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). As has been stated by my hon. friend from Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), we do not take any exception to the vote for obtaining statistics, but we do object to the way in which the money is expended, and the unsatisfactory results obtained from it. I can see no benefit in getting these statistics from the cities alone. If it is desirable to obtain these statistics at all, they should be obtained from all parts of the country districts as well as from the cities; and, therefore, I think the Government should consider whether, in the interest of the country, we should not have some arrangement whereby the vital statistics of the country generally could be obtained and tabulated and pointed to and relied upon. At present, the information is only derived from the cities. It is imperfect. In the Province of Ontario far better information is obtained than this Government can obtain, because the information of this Government is only obtained from the cities. I think this is hardly worth the expenditure which is made upon it. If the hon. gentleman were to adopt a broader view and obtain the vital statistics from the country generally, it would be different, but, until that is done, I think this is simply a waste of money.

Mr. TROW. I think the Minister in charge of this department should make it imperative in other Provinces to have these statistics returned. In Ontario it is made imperative by the law for the clerk of the municipality to make his returns, and to give this reliable information under a penalty on those who neglect to carry out that duty. Some hon. gentlemen has referred to the sextons, but I cannot understand what knowledge the sexton can have. It is a matter of indifference to him whether the coffin is empty or full. He knows nothing about the cause of death. He knows nothing about the matter except in connection with the graveyard.

Mr. LISTER. Does this \$10,000 cover the expenditure for registration of births, deaths and marriages, which was \$871 last year?

Mr. CARLING. No, it does not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman asking for an expenditure on that account this year?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In reference to this item of outlay towards the establishment and maintenance of experimental farms—\$90,000—will the hon. gentleman give us some information as to what has been done here and in other parts of the Dominion? I should like to know something about the farm in the Maritime Provinces, where it is located, what progress has been made, and when he proposes to put it in operation?

Mr. CARLING. A site has been purchased, containing 300 acres, on the Intercolonial Railway, near the town of Nappan.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What have you paid for it?

Mr. CARLING. I think it is \$16,000 for the 300 acres.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is that in the county of Northumberland?

Mr. CARLING. It is on the line of the Intercolonial Railway, and it is a very suitable location, as Mr. Saunders reports.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is in the county of Cumberland?

Mr. CARLING. I suppose it is.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is a place in my county which is spelled Napan.

Mr. CARLING. There are two "p's" in this Nappan.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not suppose it was in my county.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the Minister tell us what progress has been made?

Mr. CARLING. None as yet. We have secured the property, and steps are being taken to construct the buildings and to put up the fencing.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Has any person been put in charge of it?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Who?

Mr. CARLING. Colonel Blair has been appointed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) From whom was the farm purchased?

Mr. CARLING. From Mr. Roach and Mr. Marshall.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many farms has the hon. gentleman now got? There is one near Ottawa, there is one in Nova Scotia, how many other farms has he purchased?

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Mr. CARLING. There is the Central Farm, the farm in the Maritime Provinces, and a site has been secured in the North-West Territories and one in Manitoba and one in British Columbia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Five in all?

Mr. CARLING. Five in all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where are the farms situated in Manitoba and the North-West Territories?

Mr. CARLING. The farm in Manitoba is in the vicinity of Brandon, the farm in the North-West Territories is near Indian Head, and the farm in British Columbia is at Agassiz.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is Indian Head?

Mr. CARLING. It is near the Qu'Appelle Valley.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In reference to the farm in the neighborhood of Brandon, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what is the extent of it, what price he has paid for it, and from whom it was purchased?

Mr. CARLING. The farm is a section of 640 acres, and I think the total cost is \$9,200.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman remember from whom it was purchased?

Mr. CARLING. I do not at this moment, but I can give him the information to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should be glad if the hon. gentlemen will also get the exact locality of this Brandon farm.

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the fencing of the Central Agricultural Farm was a matter of competition, or whether it was done by piece-work, and, if so, what it cost per rod?

Mr. CARLING. It was done by contract.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the cost?

Mr. CARLING. In the neighborhood of 15 cents a foot.

Mr. MULOCK. What kind of a fence is it?

Mr. CARLING. It is cedar posts with buckthorn wire.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that the sort of fence the hon. gentleman would recommend as a sample fence to the ordinary agriculturist of Canada?

Mr. CARLING. I do not mean to say it is. But I mean that the central farm is in the vicinity of the capital of the country, it is in a beautiful locality, and it is a permanent fence for the next 20 years. I do not think it is a very expensive fence. I know that some of the neighbors have asked the contractors to put up a similar fence around their property, and they would not do it at the same price.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think the hon. gentleman will find any farmer in Canada to adopt such an absurd style of fence, and invest such an enormous sum of money in the construction of such a useless article. I venture to say it will not be two or three years before the whole structure will have to be pulled down and built on a different plan.

Mr. CARLING. I am quite sure the hon. gentleman does not understand the subject in hand, because the matter was very carefully considered, and I am sure that there is not a more solid or permanent fence in Canada than that. It was said by others that the frost would heave the fence and throw out the posts, but if the hon. gentleman inspects the fence now, just after the winter, he will find it just as solid and substantial as it was when first put up.

Mr. MULOCK. I mean to say that it is an utter waste of money to go on and invest such a large sum—did I understand 40 cents a foot or 15?

Mr. CARLING. 15 cents a foot.

Mr. MULOCK. For the erection of such a fence as this. It was not at all necessary. The farm is not situated within three or four miles of this city, and a much less expensive fence would have answered just as well. I again repeat, without referring to the character of the work—for I do not wish to do any injury to the patentee of the wire used—but I venture to predict that the wire used will, in a very short time, be condemned as absolutely unsuitable, the frost will destroy it. Any one knows, after an examination of the material used, that it will not be at all durable. It is a real waste of money, in my opinion.

Aid to Agriculture Societies in the North-West Territories. \$10,000

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see an item of \$6,425 for labor I would like to know how much of this was spent for fencing, and how much for drainage. In a lump sum, we have no idea what each class of work has cost. Then, I see there are three superintendents besides the workmen. What are they employed in doing?

Mr. CARLING. The chief director of the farm is Professor Saunders, and he has a horticulturist employed to look after the planting of trees, and the management of the fruit and garden department. I think these were the only two that were employed last year, excepting the laborers. And also a chemist whose salary did not commence until late in the fall. But he is now occupying his time in making chemical examinations of different seeds, and other things in connection with the farm.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see here the name of Mr. McKay, superintendent, the name of Mr. Bedford, superintendent, and William Blair, superintendent, besides a foreman, and a Mr. Hurlburt, as horticulturist. What are they superintending?

Mr. CARLING. Colonel Blair, as I said before, has been appointed superintendent of the Maritime Province farm, and we utilised his services in the summer time for two or three months at the central farm until he took charge of the farm in Nova Scotia, having in view to make him acquainted with the system pursued. He is a practical farmer, and is to get \$1,200. Mr. McKay has been appointed to take charge of the farms in the North West Territories at Indian Head. He is a very superior man, and we utilised his services for two or three months in the same way. He is now at Indian Head and Colonel Blair is in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). My question is not yet answered. I see there is \$6,425 for labor. How much of that goes for clearing and draining the land?

Mr. CARLING. I should be very glad to furnish the hon. gentleman with that information to-morrow, but I cannot give it to him at this moment. To-morrow we will tell him exactly how much has been expended for the purposes he speaks of.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the Minister state, roughly, how he proposes to dispose of this large amount of \$90,000—what division he is going to make among the several farms?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see there is an item of \$1,076.25 for manure and \$606.31 for freight. Now, in this section of country, it may be necessary for the farmer to purchase a certain amount of manure, and as this farm is to serve as a model for the people of Canada, we should know how it is conducted. We all know that in order to manage the farm successfully the manure must be made upon the farm, and

used upon the farm, because we cannot make a great deal of profit if we spend a large sum of money in buying manure. There is an opportunity in this farm of ascertaining by experiment what can be done with land that was run down in the direction of renewing its fertility without the aid of manure. Such experiments would be of benefit to the farmers. Unless, however, these experiments are carried out on a proper system they will mean money thrown away. There is just one thing I regret, and that is that there is on the central farm very little, if any, of heavy clay land, such as prevails throughout Ontario, which requires the most scientific farming. A great many of our farmers do not succeed with land of that description, yet if properly farmed it is perhaps the most profitable land we have in the Province. If a large amount of manure is to be brought on the farm, the experiments will be of no benefit to the farmers in the direction of showing what can be done with the land.

Mr. CARLING. The Government selected the farm with a view to obtaining different varieties of soil, and it contains about 35 acres of heavy clay land, such as the hon. gentleman refers to, as well as other different varieties of soil. With respect to manure, we found it necessary to purchase a certain quantity in order to conduct our experiments with seeds and grains. Mr. Booth, a very extensive farmer adjoining the Government farm, purchased last year more manure than we did, and it cost him as much. The farm is only two and a half miles from the centre of the city and it is not very difficult to get manure; of course when we have a large quantity of stock we shall not require to purchase manure. This is not so much a model farm as a farm where experiments are made, and the results are published for the information of farmers throughout the Dominion, especially results as to what can be produced on particular kinds of soil and particular kinds of manure and certain quantities of it. As to the general expenditure I may say that it is expected that this amount, together with the sum in the estimates of the Department of Public Works will complete the purchase and the fencing and building, and leave a small amount for the purchase of stock for the central and branch farms. This money will be devoted to completing the central farm and the farm in the Lower Provinces, Manitoba, North-West Territories and British Columbia.

Census and statistics. \$7,500

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman explain this item?

Mr. CARLING. We are collecting statistics all the time, and a statistical record is published by the department each year, which has proved of very great use to members of Parliament and to the people of the country.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is it necessary?

Mr. CARLING. It is a work very much in demand and it contains information that can be relied on.

Mr. LISTER. It contains a great many inaccuracies.

Mr. CARLING. If so, we shall only be too glad to have them remedied if the hon. gentleman can point them out.

Immigration..... \$116,389

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture may recollect that a few days ago I put several questions to him with reference to the policy of the Government in regard to necessitous and unfit persons coming to this country. The hon. gentleman at that time gave me to understand that in the judgment of his department there was very little occasion to make any special provisions or take any special precautions against this class of persons. The information which

has reached me from various part of the country is this, that a very large number of utterly unfit persons are being dumped on our shores from time to time, and that there is at the present moment something which might be fairly described as a sort of movement on the part of the authorities in the British Islands to dispose of a considerable number of paupers or persons who are only one remove from paupers, by sending them to this country. The hon. gentleman knows that in other countries a great many of these people have been sent back, but I have never heard of any being sent back from Canada. I do know that such cities as Toronto, Kingston and other cities throughout Ontario, and I believe Montreal and other places have a yearly increasing number of such persons who become a charge on public charity. I have received from a gentleman in Toronto a resolution passed by the City Council, and I will read an extract or two from it that may convince the hon. gentleman that, in the opinion of the civic authorities of the largest city in Ontario, there is a good deal of need that the Government should exercise some care in this matter. The resolution is as follows:—

"Whereas during the last winter season, and to a great extent for a number of years past, the demands on the various charitable institutions and of the city authorities for assistance to destitute immigrants have been so great and of such a character that the resources of the civic authorities and others interested in the question of providing relief for the destitute have been seriously overtaxed, and the causes which have led to this state of affairs require our most serious consideration; and whereas according to reliable information received from various sources, and from information received in some cases from the applicants themselves, a great many destitute persons have been sent over to this country by the Poor Law Guardians of Great Britain and the various charitable institutions of that country in order to relieve themselves of the further support of persons who are unable to provide for themselves in their own country; and, whereas we believe that continued efforts are being made by the parties aforesaid to ship to this country during the coming season this very undesirable class of immigrants, to the great injury of this city and the country; therefore be it resolved, That the council of the corporation of the city of Toronto enters its most emphatic protest against the continuance of this practice of shipping to this country a class of people so very undesirable, and who, being unable to provide for themselves in the old country, necessarily become a burden on the charitable institutions of this country, and help to swell the number of inmates in our gaols and asylums."

There is danger here. If the statements made by those gentlemen—and I believe a copy of the resolution was communicated to the Minister of Agriculture—have any foundation in fact, and from what has come under my own observation in other places I am inclined to believe they have a great deal of foundation in fact, there is need that a good deal of care be taken on the part of Government officials to prevent the number of such persons swelling. If the authorities who control English and Irish poor houses are allowed to do this they will scruple very little at sending several thousands of most undesirable emigrants to this country. I am not now speaking of the other question of the desirability of putting an end to assisted passages, because I understand that at last the policy of the Government is to do so, but I am speaking of the necessity of preventing our country from being made a place of deposit for persons who are not able to earn their own living in the mother country. I can tell the hon. gentleman he will find a very considerable degree of danger that unless the strictest precautions be taken many persons of that sort will come here.

Mr. CARLING. I think the statements made in the country through the press in reference to pauper immigration have been very much exaggerated. I am quite sure from the statements I possess from our agents in Liverpool, Halifax, Quebec and other parts of the country, the percentage of pauper immigration is very small indeed. I think it will be found that these statements that have been made through the city council of Toronto that there is a very large number of paupers coming into the country are incorrect, and that many of those who have had to be supported have been people who were not immigrants but

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

worthless people who flock to the cities from different parts of the country. From all the information I have obtained from the officers of the department as to the parties leaving the old country to come here, the number of unfit persons arriving in this country has been very few indeed. I think the hon. gentleman will find that every precaution has been taken that can be taken to prevent any such class of people from coming into the country and becoming a burden upon the people.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hardly think that is at all a satisfactory answer to the resolution of the corporation of the city of Toronto. I understand this resolution was carried unanimously.

Mr. CARLING. That statement, I may say to the hon. gentleman, is a general statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It says that during the last winter, and to a great extent for a number of years past this has been going on. I am not speaking only with reference to what the Toronto corporation say. I have observed myself, in other places, that a very considerable number of persons have been brought into this country substantially by false representations. Not, it may be, made by authorised agents of the Government, but representations made to them by persons in the employ of various steamship companies, who did not care two straws whether the people were fit to be emigrants or not, but who simply wanted to get a commission on the passage money and swell the receipts of the various steamship lines. That was a great and serious evil, and it was all the more so because we know from our own returns that those people who are brought out, do not stay here but that a great part of them find their way to the States. A residuum of them stays here and that residuum, in other places as well as in Toronto, are neither more nor less than burdens on the charity of the people of Canada. I am not at all satisfied that any efficient precautions are being taken, and the hon. gentleman the other day stated, if I recollect rightly, that nobody had ever been sent back. I say that this kind of people ought to be sent back. I say there is neither rhyme nor reason in allowing paupers from England, Ireland, Scotland or elsewhere to be made a charge on Canada. Of course it is not necessary to require that every healthy, industrious man who comes here should be provided with capital. We cannot do that, but it is necessary to see that decrepid, infirm and unfit persons are not allowed to come here.

Mr. CARLING. A departmental letter has been written to the mayor of the city of Toronto in answer to that circular, asking him to give us the particulars and let us know when those people arrived, and where they came from, so that we can trace them and know if those people were really brought from the old country and dumped upon our shores. I can assure the hon. gentleman that everything that possibly can be done by this Government will be done to prevent any such immigration as he has reference to.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I really do not think that the Minister of Agriculture has given that information which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was entitled to. In reply to the charges made by the corporation of Toronto, a respectable body, a body who had an opportunity of thoroughly investigating the whole facts in connection with the charges they had made, they are coolly told by the Minister: Oh let them make a detailed statement of where those parties came from, how long they have been in the city of Toronto, what are the circumstances in connection with their former habits, and whether they be emigrants or whether they be somebody from the surrounding country? That is hardly treating a respectable corporation like that of the city of Toronto in a fair way. I cannot see how the members representing the city of Toronto should sit here and allow that corpo-

ration to receive a slap in the face from a Minister, who as much as says, that they sent false representations to the Government in reference to the city of Toronto. I think the Minister should be a little fairer than that. He should bear in mind that he has three representatives from the city of Toronto, but it might be perhaps that the Minister of Agriculture will say: "Oh, the city of Toronto is not as true and loyally Conservative as it was before in the city council, and therefore a large proportion of the aldermen of the city of Toronto being Reformers we cannot depend upon their statement. When we find one of the first cities in the Dominion of Canada coming here with a memorial of that kind, it is right and fair that the Minister of Agriculture should treat their representations in a different way.

Mr. CARLING. How have I treated them?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). He asks me how has he treated them. I appeal to the House as to how he has treated them. He says let them make a detailed statement, let them give us in detail the whole facts so that we may examine into the affair. Is the city of Toronto the only place where complaints have come to the Government in reference to the kind of immigrants brought from the old country? It is the same report from every city and municipality almost, from one end of the country to the other. We have been told that there is every precaution used to prevent undesirable immigrants coming here, but the facts belie the statements made by the Government. The facts show that a very large number of those who come out here are not suited in any way for the requirements of Canada, and, therefore, if the Government exercised every precaution they could exercise, I say their manner of conducting the affairs is not successful and they had better adopt some other means. The hon. gentleman says that many of those immigrants in the city of Toronto likely come from the surrounding country. I guarantee that his experience, and the experience of every individual member in this House in the locality in which he resides has been that the greater proportion of those who require aid and assistance are those who have been brought out as immigrants from the old country within the last few years. I have no hesitation in saying, that there are a good many useful citizens who are immigrants, but I do say that the method and the manner in which the hon. gentleman and his predecessors have managed the affairs in reference to immigration has resulted in a class of immigrants coming here that are not suitable. When we find the labor market is entirely overstocked, and that the demand for labor has been decreasing rapidly for some length of time, it is the duty of the Government to come forward and reduce still more the expenditure on this item. Is it necessary that you should keep your large staff of agents in Europe and in Canada, when you now find the city of Toronto petitioning you not to proceed with it any further, because of the enormous number of unsuitable immigrants and the superabundance of labor in the market, why do you not take this item out altogether? It may be said that it is necessary to keep up the same staff in Europe, but we have a High Commissioner there, and we were told that he would perform some of those duties. When we were called upon to grant millions of money to the Canadian Pacific Railway the Government said: Give us the money, let the Canadian Pacific Railway proceed and we will have the best immigration agents that can be had in Europe and we will not be called upon to spend money for emigration purposes. We liberally passed a measure appointing a High Commissioner for Canada in London, and we have made liberal grants to this railroad; and yet we find the Minister of Agriculture bringing from the old country a number of immigrants unsuited in every way to the requirements of the country, and paying large amounts of money for bringing them out.

Yet the Government still asks this House to continue to vote large sums of money for this purpose. I say it is a great mistake, and the amount they are now asking ought to be reduced at least one-half. If it is necessary to keep up the High Commissioner's office, well and good. He will not be very comfortable in staying here, and let us use him as an immigration agent in London; he is capable of being a good one. We have no objection to his staying there altogether, at any rate as long as his friends remain in power. Let the money we vote be used in bringing out a better class of immigrants, those who have small means and who will not be a burden on the country.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman tried to make out that I said something derogatory of the city of Toronto. I believe the hon. member is a member of the Committee on Immigration, and if I am not misinformed, that committee passed a unanimous resolution to-day asking the city of Toronto to give particulars as to the pauper immigrants sent to that city last year. I believe that is correct.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It is quite correct. The chairman thought he should have the information.

Mr. CARLING. My department has asked for the same information that the Committee on Immigration authorised the chairman to obtain from the City of Toronto. I think the hon. gentleman has made a statement that he should not make in this House. He says we have the same reports from other cities as we have from Toronto with regard to pauper immigration. Well, I happen to be the head of the Department of Agriculture, and I can state that the one sent from Toronto, which is a very indefinite one, is the only resolution the Department has received that I am aware of, petitioning against pauper immigration.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I suppose the hon. Minister will remember that he had a report from Montreal.

Mr. CARLING. I think that was merely a newspaper report. We had nothing official, so far as I am aware, from the city of Montreal; and I think that the hon. member will find that when the city of Toronto and the different cities look into the matter, they will see that the Government has taken every precaution to prevent anything like pauper immigration, and that the percentage of paupers coming into the country is very small indeed. I am sure this matter has been very much exaggerated, and I am afraid it has been done in some places for purposes other than the general welfare of the country.

Mr. McNEILL. I will just state that I am a member of the Immigration Committee, and was present in the committee to-day when the communication from the city of Toronto was discussed by members of the committee belonging to both political parties. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) was present when it was decided unanimously, he being a consenting party himself, that this communication should be sent to the authorities of the city of Toronto, asking for information on this subject. If there was any insult offered to the city of Toronto the hon. gentleman was a party to it; but there was no insult intended or thought of. There was a statement made to the effect that a number of people were out of employment in Toronto, and the opinion was expressed that the Department of Agriculture should see that unsuitable immigrants were not brought to the country. After the matter had been discussed for some time, it was decided that nothing could be done until we ascertained something of the numbers of those people out of employment, and where they came from. Therefore it was determined that the authorities of Toronto, who had sent this communication, should be asked to furnish that information; and the hon. member was present at the time consenting to that which he says was an insult. I am astonished at the observations of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am not going to say anything of the character of the immigrants who come to the country, because I am not in a position to express an opinion upon that subject. What I wish to call attention to is that the money voted by Parliament year after year seems to be wasted, or distributed in a manner not calculated to bring any great advantage to the country at large, but seems to be considered as a fund from which the Government may reward some of the papers supporting them throughout the country. If you take up the Auditor General's report, and look at page 112, you will find that payments have been made to almost every Conservative paper, in the Upper Provinces at least, for pamphlets on all imaginary subjects. One is called, "The Immigrant," another "Facts and Figures," another "Across Canada," another, "The Fisheries of Canada," and so on through the list. The payments made in these ways amount to the very large sum of \$49,418 which, with \$20,000 for paper, makes \$69,418 expended in that way. Now that does seem to me to be an expenditure which is unnecessary to such an enormous extent. It would seem that the Government have so much money to dispose of that it is almost too much to ask any employé who draws a handsome salary from the Government to hand these pamphlets to the immigrants as they are coming into the country. I see on page 116 that the sum of \$800 was paid to the marine mail clerks for distributing mail pamphlets, or \$100 each. It is absurd that these postal clerks on the steamers who are paid by the Government, and whose time is at the disposal of the Government, should require to be paid \$100 each for handling a few Government pamphlets to the emigrants on board. This is a sample of the utter recklessness with which the Government disbursed the emigration money. Go through the whole expenditure on immigration, and you will find it consists solely of paying out large sums of money to supporters of the Government for purposes useless, so far as immigration is concerned.

Mr. CARLING. I am sorry the hon. gentleman, when he was in office, did not do away with this grant to the mail clerks on ocean steamers; and I may say that this expenditure has been discontinued. There are no mail clerks now on the ocean steamers.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman has discovered this was an unnecessary expense, and I will be glad to see him do away with the other expenditure which appears to be a waste of public money. Here is the Hon. Hector Fabre receiving for the *Paris-Canada* \$1,739, and T. Skinner for copies of *Canadian Gazette* and advertising \$2,769. Then there is the income tax on the salaries of the High Commissioner's staff. Well, we have voted in this House the income tax on the salary of the High Commissioner—and these gentlemen, I believe, are in the employ of the High Commissioner in London. Mr. C. C. Chipman, I think, is the private secretary of the hon. the Minister of Finance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And Mr. Colmer, I think, is also in the Department of the High Commissioner in England?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Well, these gentlemen are paid salaries for their work, and I have no doubt they do it well; but if they are entitled to anything more, it should be added to their salaries and not slipped in in this way as an income tax. It is not a very large amount, I admit, but every dollar than can be placed in the way of these people, who compose the hon. gentleman's staff, and seems to think the country belongs to them, and that they must be rewarded for their political allegiance, is given to them.

Mr. McNEILL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The salaries paid to-day to the entire staff in the High Commissioner's office is less than it was in 1883 when I took charge of that department.

Mr. COCKBURN. As the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), has challenged the members for Toronto to stand up and say something to save that city from the supposed aspersions cast upon it by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, I am very glad indeed to accept the challenge. It seemed to me that the half hour he devoted to attacking the policy and the action of the Minister of Agriculture was devoted to attacking the Minister for doing precisely what the hon. gentleman himself, twelve short hours ago, had been instrumental in doing. It is to be regretted that in a matter so important to all of us as emigration, hon. gentlemen should be so far led astray by party feeling as to make it a party question. I ask the members of this House, in discussing a business matter of this kind, to put aside, if possible, for one short night, their strong political proclivities, and see if we cannot together discuss a question of this kind on its own merits. The speech of the hon. member for East Elgin is not new to us, for we had almost verbatim the same speech last year. The only little point in it that is novel is the attempt to foist on the Minister of Agriculture the charge of dealing harshly with the representations made by the city council of Toronto. Now, while I am quite prepared to stand up for the city of Toronto on all occasions, and especially for two noble wards in that city, at the same time I must say that I see nothing in the action of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture which could lead the member for East Elgin to make the attack he did. What are the facts of the case according to the hon. gentleman's own statement? The city council of Toronto sent to the Minister of Agriculture a certain statement with reference to the character of emigrants who arrived in that city. Like a courteous gentleman he acknowledged the receipt of their communication and courteously said to them: Your statements may be all correct; will you aid me in my tracing the source of this evil, if such evil there be? Will you give me all the information in your power, and let us see if we cannot get at the facts. As far as I can make out, that is the whole gravamen of the charge brought by the hon. gentleman. If the Minister of Agriculture is to be challenged in this House for simply discharging, in a courteous and gentlemanly way, the duties of his office, I do now know how any Government is to be carried on. I trust that hon. gentlemen in future will try to regard this question of emigration, with which the future of our country is so intimately connected, in a plain, simple, impartial spirit, and, for the time being, lay aside those feelings of hostility which are, perhaps, apt to creep up in other questions of a more partisan character.

Mr. TROW. I do not think it lies with the hon. member for Toronto to lecture my hon. for Elgin on what he said, for my hon. friend merely asked to be informed of the true state of the affairs in Toronto. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture, we are aware, took proper steps, and I do not know of any plan which he could have adopted better than the one he did adopt to ascertain at once the actual state of affairs in the city of Toronto, and find out whether really an undesirable class of emigrants has been dumped out there by the charitable institutions, or whether they have been brought out by the Immigration Department. At all events, during the winter season, improvident people from many parts of the country, in the rural districts, where work is then scarce, find their way to the towns and cities, where the bowels of compassion of the people are more likely to be moved than in the country sections. Now, if we get proper statistics of the class of which the city council of Toronto has complained, we will then be able to judge what remedy should be applied. I know sometimes these rumors are very much exaggerated. I recollect when

the Mackenzie Administration was in power that it was said there were hundreds in this city in need of employment and on the verge of starvation; and on that occasion, whether hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House aided in the gathering of the large community that met in the railway room or not, 200 or 300 were drummed up and found their way there, demanding bread and soup, and we were accused of having soup kitchens all over the country. Well, the Mackenzie Administration took the step then that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture is now taking, to ascertain the facts of the case, and instead of 200 or 300 being at the point of starvation, there were only 13. Well, the case in Toronto may turn out, as I hope it will, similarly.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Of course I receive with due submission the remarks made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). I know he is in the habit of punishing delinquents. He followed that practice for a long time, and I suppose he thinks I am one of those delinquents and that he can use the rod for my punishment. An hon. gentleman near me says that he is an old school-master, and that might account for the punishment he imagined he was to give me. I did not complain of the Minister of Agriculture obtaining his information from the city council of Toronto. What I complained of was—and that is what the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) withheld in order to make a point against me—that the Minister should get up in his place here and make an assertion, without having the information he desired, that very probably the report was not reliable because it may have been wrong in some points. Was I wrong in saying that? Will the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) say that the city council of Toronto made a report which was not reliable? He said that I condemned him for obtaining that information. I did nothing of the kind. If the hon. gentleman would remain in this House and pay attention to what takes place, he would know better, and he would not make that kind of mistake. He says that the speech I made was the same as made a year ago. He has a good memory. He is a wonderful man. I venture to say that he has not looked at a single speech that I made a year ago or six years ago, but he is a wonderful man, he has a wonderful memory, and yet he does not remember what I said a year ago, but, while he has a long memory, what he fails in memory he makes up in assertion. My hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said that I supported a certain matter in the committee which I did not in the House. I may say to my hon. friend, for his information, that it is not right to say anything about what took place in a committee until the report has been presented to the House. However, I will not object to that. I think it is right that the Chairman of the Committee should send and obtain full proofs, but I complained of the Minister of Agriculture making unfair assertions against the city council of Toronto without proper ground. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) said that I could not rise above partisanship. Those hon. gentlemen say they are only going to take half the money for immigration purposes this year that they did last year; but, if you run your eye from top to bottom over the various agencies which they have, you will find the same amount of money voted for them as there was before, as there was at the time when they proposed to spend double the amount of money. What is this for? It is, as everyone knows to keep a large number of these servants employed, and also to give an opportunity to the various presses from one end to the other of this country to print immigration pamphlets, and charge the cost to the Government. No doubt they can come down handsomely at election times, and they should get a consideration for that. No doubt the Minister

of Agriculture has received a handsome return in that way from the London *Free Press*, and we have only to look at that item to find that that paper received nearly \$6,000 during the year 1886-87. What was that for? Did that conduce to immigration to any great extent? I do not think it did, at all events to the extent of \$16,000. No doubt my hon. friend will say that this was for the purpose of engraving and printing pamphlets, and advertising, and so on. Very likely they did print some pamphlets, but I should think the principal part of the printing would be the enormous profits the proprietors received, and I think the Minister of Agriculture benefited in his election by the assistance which the *Free Press* has had. You may go over nearly every Conservative paper from one end of the country to the other, and you will find that they have been employed in printing immigration pamphlets. It is a very nice thing. It gets the good will of all those Tory papers. I advise my friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) to consider that immigration is a matter of more importance than to retain the present Government in power, and that the money which is given for immigration purposes is not given for electioneering purposes. If that hon. gentleman would exercise more ingenuity in that matter and would read fewer lectures to me, he might become of more use in this House than he is now. If the Government are candid and sincere, if they desire to retrench, they will commence by reducing the expenditure upon these various offices. How can you explain, when you are taking only half the money, how you require to expend the same amount in each of the offices? Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture could induce the *Free Press* to print only \$8,000 worth next year instead of \$16,000. I know it would be hard on the *Free Press*. It is a good Conservative organ. It was a Reform organ at one time, but it was bought over, and now it is to have \$16,000 as a substantial inducement to support the Government every year. I have only to repeat that I do not think this money has been in the past expended in the interest of immigration. Judging from the appearance of the various agencies, I do not think that it is intended to expend this money for that purpose in the future. I think it is intended to keep civil servants outside in positions which they have occupied for some time past, and the Government do not desire to remove them; but the country demands a larger retrenchment at their hands in reference to immigration at this time, and I think, when an opportunity occurs, the people will give this Government to understand that they intend to enforce that view upon them.

Mr. McNEILL. As a matter of explanation, I want to say that what I referred to was the fact that the hon. gentleman had accused the Minister of Agriculture of deliberately insulting the city of Toronto while he had spoken of the communication from the city council of Toronto in exactly the terms, or in words in the same sense as those which were used by the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to-day. There was a consensus of opinion in that committee to the effect which has been expressed by the Minister here to-day, and I said that I was astonished at an hon. member, who had been one of those who held that opinion, coming here a few hours afterwards, and endeavoring to make party capital out of the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, who had stated exactly what the Committee had stated a few hours before. I must say that I was astonished at that, and that I think it is degrading to this House that any hon. member should do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is extremely unfortunate that any hon. gentleman like the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) should so far forget the Rules of the House as to bring before the House what has passed in a committee, and it is still more unfortunate, if he wants to promote the business of the House, that he should tell another hon. gentleman, like my

hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson) that he has used language which is degrading to the House. Such remarks as that will not facilitate the progress of the Estimates in the slightest degree. They only lead to disagreeable altercations, and draw our attention away from the point before us. And I am certain that his friends on the Treasury benches will not thank him for taking the conduct of the Estimates out of their hands. Now, I want to call attention to what appears to me an extraordinary charge, one of the items my hon. friend referred to. There is in the Auditor General's report for last year a charge of \$15,807 for the London *Free Press*, and in that there was an item of 322,000 colored posters at 4½ cents. They cannot have been works of art at 4½ cents. It appears to me that that was just another instance of what I must call a most gross waste of public money, for all these 300,000 or 400,000 colored posters amount to just so much rubbish, and nothing else, flung broadcast across the country, for no earthly purpose except to enable a particular newspaper to make a good thing out of the job.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman should not make that statement without knowing —

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I saw one of the colored posters.

Mr. CARLING. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the London *Free Press* has a large lithographic establishment, and it is the only newspaper in Canada, I believe, that has one. The posters were published in English, French, German and Norwegian, and distributed all over Great Britain and Europe, and we have statements from our agents in Europe, and from the different steamboat agents, that they were most valuable in drawing the attention of the people to Canada. I am satisfied that nothing has been done that has tended more to attract people towards Canada. Such is the information we have from our agents, and from the agents of the steamboat companies, who have been pressing us to give them further supply. The price paid to the *Free Press* for these posters was certified by the Queen's Printer as a fair and reasonable price.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I saw one of these posters, and I am bound to say that if it is a fair sample of the 322,000 I will not qualify or withdraw what I stated. I think a most gross waste of public money was committed. But with respect to the whole of this, I am glad to see that the Ministers have cut down the expenditure. I believe that no worse use of public money has been made for many years than to expend it in bringing people to this country whom our own returns show we have not been able to keep here, who have been brought here largely by false pretences—I won't say in all cases on the part of the Minister's agents; but the men who brought these unfortunates here, not for the purpose of doing any good to Canada, but for the purpose of swelling their own commissions. Now, we find in the returns for Manitoba what this amounts to. We found that hundreds of thousands of people were stated, on the authority of the department the hon. gentleman now presides over, to have gone to Manitoba, and when we took the actual census there we found that not one in five of those who were alleged to have gone there, had settled there, or remained there. Now, the danger and the mischief is this: You bring people here by false pretences, and they leave Canada and go to other countries and become, to all intents and purposes, anti-immigration agents. It is a great error and blunder to bring people here who are not wanted here, and that has been done for a long time.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Before that passes —

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Let us get on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). If my hon. friend was as ready to call the attention of his supporter to the fact that he was discussing a matter not pertinent to the question—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think he has been answered by the hon. member.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Then, all I have to say is, that as to my remarks being degrading to this House, the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), having so long existed in such an atmosphere as that, is a good judge of degradation. I will therefore allow the matter to pass.

Immigration Agent at Victoria, B.C. \$1,000

Mr. BAKER. I desire to ask the Minister of Agriculture the same this year that I did last year—if he cannot see his way clear to increasing the salary of the agent at Victoria, B.C. For the last two or three years he has got only \$1,000 a year, and I see no reason why he should not get the same salary as is given in other places where the agents get \$1,200 or \$1,400. I undertake to say that the duties performed by that officer are as onerous, if not more so, than those performed at Calgary and Medicine Hat.

Mr. CARLING. The agent at London is only receiving \$1,000, and the same is given at Halifax and St. John. We are paying no more than \$1,000 at Medicine Hat and Calgary. We have not been able to see our way clear to make any change in the salary.

Mr. BAKER. The hon. gentleman will remember that the reason given for paying higher salaries at Brandon, Calgary and other places in the North West, was on account of the high cost of living. The same reason should induce the Minister to increase the salary paid at Victoria, B. C.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Perhaps the better way would be to reconsider the whole list. At Quebec there is an agent, an assistant, and a clerk, receiving altogether \$3,800, and there are in addition an interpreter and a messenger. Now, I notice there are eight immigration agents in the North-West. I do not know how far they are necessary, but it appears to me rather an unnecessary expense to have eight agents and four interpreters engaged in the North-West, when we hear of so few people settling in that country. I presume the distance is considerable between the various points, but now the railway is running I should imagine the necessity no longer exists for having an agent at each one of those various points.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has overlooked the fact that Quebec is the great central point where the people focus. We have thousands of emigrants coming there, and we must have persons able to communicate with them and give them the needful information at the point where they touch the country. That accounts for the number of officers and the larger charge for Quebec. When we come to the question of the North-West I may say this: These agencies are widely separated, and hon. gentlemen can hardly imagine the vital importance it is to strangers coming into the country to have persons take them by the hand on their arrival giving them information as to how to locate themselves and assist them to settle. There is a reduction of \$100,000 in the item, but we could not dispense with the services of these officers if we are going to have immigrants come into the country and hope to keep them here and settle them in a satisfactory way. We must have persons who possess the information and knowledge of the country to take them by the hand on arriving here. I do not think these amounts are too large, nor do I think there are too many of those officers for the purposes for which they are really required.

Mr. TROW. I agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) in the statements he has just made. I would

not press the giving up of agents in the older Provinces. I can, however, see no use for an agent at Port Arthur, for there is no land adapted for settlement in that locality.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Port Arthur is the landing point for the steamers. These immigrants will mainly go across the lake by steamer, and this vote is for the purpose of providing officers who will receive them on their arrival there, care for them and give them proper advice and assistance. They come here strangers, and I do not think that any person who has had any experience can over-estimate the importance to persons coming into a strange country, of having some one to whom they can apply for advice and assistance, and protect them against being misinformed and misled by interested parties.

Mr. TROW. I may still further say that there may probably be use for an agent at Brandon, as there is a good section of country both north and south, but I think the Government might do away with the agent at Qu'Appelle. As to the agent at Medicine Hat, very little land is taken up there or is likely to be taken up.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Medicine Hat is a place to which miners will naturally resort.

Mr. TROW. Coal miners?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman will find that some years ago buildings were erected at Brandon, Qu'Appelle, Medicine Hat and Calgary. A number of immigrants have gone in at those different points and they took advantage of the immigration buildings for shelter. Of course there must be some officer in charge of each building to look after it and also to see that the immigrants obtain information as to the advantages of each particular section and, in addition to their other duties, act as land guides to assist them in securing land for settlement. So far we have found it necessary to have these officers. If later on it is found to be unnecessary I shall be very glad to consider the question of doing away with them; at present, however, we do not see our way clear to do so.

Mr. TROW. I have seen large buildings at those places. I know there was no immigrant agent at Medicine Hat last fall. In regard to Calgary I do not know of any great quantity of land there except what was adapted for grazing.

Mr. CARLING. There is very good land north of Calgary, in the Red Deer district. A large number of settlers went there last year and a number are going this year. When immigrants reach Calgary we have an agent there to give them information in regard to the district, and of course to the country north of Calgary.

Mr. TROW. There is some force in the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Baker) in regard to the expense of living in that city. I observe that the agent at Victoria receives \$1,000 while others receive \$1,300. It strikes me from the little experience I had there that a man can live cheaper in either Manitoba or the North-West than in Victoria and that provisions are much higher there than in the North-West or Manitoba. The argument of the hon. gentleman is therefore quite reasonable.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I quite agree with the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture with regard to the agencies established at different parts of the North-West. People go there entirely unacquainted with the country and it is necessary to have some officer there to provide accommodation for the new arrivals for the time and assist them in locating on suitable land. Otherwise they would have to obtain the services of some one who might take great advantage of them, while the immigration agent possesses full knowledge of the country and is enabled to give them valuable information in regard to

locating. In regard to doing away with the officers, I may say that I have had different applications from sections for officers to be appointed to assist settlers coming in.

Mr. LISTER. New offices?

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). Yes. I have had an application from Whitewood asking that an immigration shed should be built there, and stating that a large number of immigrants had been obliged to lodge in the railway station, and had been entirely at the mercy of the operator for accommodation. In place of doing away with any of the offices already existing, there should be more established for the accommodation of the people. The land is good and our whole country only requires to be known, and it is a very important matter to strangers to have some one to guide them and to look after their interests.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). To keep them in the country.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). You want to give proper information in regard to location. Strangers do not know where to go when they have to engage in land hunting. The land has to be mapped off, and unless you have somebody to guide you, how are you to make a proper selection? So far as doing away with them is concerned, I think it would be much better for the country to increase the staff.

Mr. LISTER. By how many?

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). In my district by about two more. I only speak for my own district.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says there are not a sufficient number of immigration agents in the North-West and that immigrants are going in now.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). Yes, Sir.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And more immigration agents are required.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is a Mr. Adam J. Baker at Qu'Appelle. I suppose that is an important point at which to have an immigration agent. Will the hon. gentleman abolish that as an immigration agency?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Baker is not an agent at Qu'Appelle.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is he not?

Mr. CARLING. Yes; I have been informed now that he is.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has discovered that he is. Mr. Baker is down here. He has been engaged in canvassing in the county of Russell for the Government candidate, and I suppose his salary is going on and that he is paid travelling expenses from the North-West down here. The House will now see the importance of having immigration agents, and they will understand the importance of the hon. gentleman's suggestion that the Government wants more immigration agents. Of course you could not have got on in those by-elections if you did not have more of those immigration agents.

Mr. MITCHELL. They will want more of them now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Perley) says there are more of them required in the North-West, but when you appoint them in those districts they are like the non-resident clergy in Ireland, they do not happen to reside in the place for which they have been appointed. Here is Mr. Baker, an immigration agent, drawing his salary, and whose salary has to be provided for next year in the appropriation the hon. gentleman now asks the committee to vote. His travelling expenses will have to be provided, as were the expenses of the private secretary of the Finance Minister, who is sometimes on the other

side of the Atlantic and sometimes on this. Those travelling expenses will be very large, but not larger than is necessary, because how could Mr. Baker be engaged in canvassing for Mr. Mackintosh in Russell, when he was appointed for the North-West, if a sufficient appropriation was not allowed to cover his expenses coming from the North-West down here. According to the hon. gentleman's statement there are immigrants going in there and there is no person to guide them. The shepherd has gone and the sheep are being scattered, and they are in danger of being taken over to Dakota, where the wolves will devour the sheep of the hon. the First Minister. The country of course will understand now why it is necessary to make this liberal appropriation, and why although we have scarcely anybody in the North-West now, we should have more immigration agents. The hon. the Minister and his predecessors in office informed us that 155,000 people had gone to that country during the past five years, and when the hon. gentleman looked at the census he could only find 43,000 of them remained. Here are 112,000 of the hon. gentleman's sheep lost, and lost because those shepherds who are so well paid for locking after the sheep, are not there to take care of their flocks. They are down in Russell and they are down in Kent. One of those shepherds received \$1,890 for looking after these sheep in Dakota.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that Mr. Smyth.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, that is the shepherd named Smyth. I do not know whether he found any stray sheep down there or not, but at all events he was down in Kent, and he was a candidate and I am glad to know that he was not a very successful candidate. The country will understand the importance now of voting the hon. gentleman's appropriation without further question. I am surprised that the Minister did not ask for more, as is suggested by the hon. gentleman behind him. Why did he not propose to appoint two or three more immigration agents for the North-West, who will not reside there and no doubt the hon. gentleman's supporters on that side would without question have voted the necessary appropriation? Why, Sir, this Government never could have got on unless this committee deals more liberally with them. They cannot keep their flocks in the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Let us go on.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman promise to reform?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, yes; I will promise it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will he perform it though. If we have reached the hon. gentleman's conscience—

An hon. MEMBER. Where is that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It may be like the man in Richard III that it is a troublesome thing, and that every man who wishes to get on in the world with convenience and comfort to himself ought to get rid of it. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has come to that conclusion, but I think the country will come to the conclusion that this appropriation is unnecessary to the extent that the hon. gentleman has asked for. When he pays out of the public treasury a man who can be taken 1,500 miles away from the place he is supposed to be serving, to engage as a political hack in an election contest, I think the appropriation could be dispensed with.

Mr. LISTER. There is one thing I would like to say to the hon. gentleman, I suppose Mr. O'Donohue was in the service of this department also. I do not know whether he is an immigration agent or not but I think he is in the pay of the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

An hon. MEMBER. He is an extra clerk.

Mr. LISTER. I thought he was in the Immigration Department. Mr. O'Donohue was down in Russell too, and he is canvassing from house to house for the Government candidate. I do not know how that can be, because, if I recollect, last year he spoke in the kindest terms of the First Minister. Probably it is because of what he said about the First Minister last year that he is engaged in this occupation now.

Mr. MITCHELL. What did he say?

Mr. LISTER. I do not like to repeat it. This shows the way that the Government hacks in this country are being paid by the people's money to support this corrupt Administration. They are being paid a salary day after day, and they are employed as Tory hacks throughout this country serving in the interest of the Tory party. Only the other day three respectable young men as ever found a position in this House were dismissed for taking a part in an election against the Government, and yet this honest, honorable, upright Government, which has found so much fault with these translators, permit those miserable, wretched hacks to receive the money of the Government to malign the Opposition, and to misrepresent the position of the Government for the purpose of defeating Opposition candidates. So far as their influence is concerned, the Government has had a lesson to-day, and I think on next Wednesday they will have another lesson. When another general election comes around those gentlemen will find that they will be right here in these benches, and that better men will be occupying their positions of to-day.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This is no joking matter at all. It shows to what extent public opinion has been debauched in this country, when the Government would dare,—dare I say,—to bring one of their public officers from the North-West to take part in an election in this part of the country. Imagine for one moment the Prime Minister or a member of the English Government doing this. Would they be able to stand 24 hours against the indignation of the people of Great Britain if an hon. member on the opposite side of the House should bring such a charge against them as is being made by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) against the Administration here to-night. I say no matter whether it was a man of the standing of the present leader of the Government, or Mr. Gladstone, or any other, there would be such a howl of indignation from one end of the country to another, that the party which permitted such things would be swept out of office. There was a time in the history of this country when the hon. gentleman would not have dared to do this either. There was a time, at the commencement of Confederation, when the public opinion of this House and country would not permit the hon. gentlemen to sit there and laugh at the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). When he states that the Government have brought one of their own officers, whom the taxpayers of this country are paying to take immigrants by the hand and locate them on the lands of the North-West, and have sent him to be a party hack in an election, I repeat that the public opinion of this country must have descended low indeed, when the hon. gentleman and the Government dare to sit there and treat the observations of the hon. member for Bothwell as they have done. I say no man can look for much from the future of this country if that thing is going to be permitted. If this country is going to occupy as high a place in the world as other countries, there must be a wholesome tone in the public opinion of the country. We are sometimes directed across the border for instances of corruption; but if an act of this kind were committed there, you would find every paper in the country ringing with it. But here we find a Government, which is safe for the

present, ready to outrage every sentiment of public principle and honor, and send their officers to interfere in by-elections from one end of the country to the other. I repeat that it is a melancholy fact to the world, and it will be known abroad, that we have descended to such a condition of affairs. Therefore, the Government should now understand that this is no joking matter, that we are not going to sit here and quietly permit the Government to appropriate the funds of this country for the employment of immigration agents or any other agents for political purposes.

Mr. CARLING. The statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell is not correct. Mr. Baker has not been brought down from Qu'Appelle by the Government or offered his expenses. He came here of his own accord. He lived in this county, and his friends live in this county, and he asked the Department to give him what is given to all other officers of the Government, leave of absence.

Mr. LISTER. A singular coincidence.

Mr. CARLING. If the agent at Qu'Appelle asks the department for leave of absence, we give it as a matter of course. The officers of my department or any other department are entitled by the law to three weeks holidays each year; and if Mr. Baker asks for holidays and pays his own expenses, I think I would be remiss if I refused to him the privilege that I allow to other officers of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know whether the hon. Minister denies that Mr. Baker, an official of the Government, is now taking part in the Russell election.

Mr. CARLING. I am not aware whether he is or not.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sorry to have to differ from the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow). I think he is wrong about there being no necessity for an agent at Port Arther, and I agree entirely with the hon. Finance Minister about the importance of having an agent there. It is the place where the immigrants land from the boats and go on the railway on their way to the North-West. More than that, I have been informed by Mr. Conmee, the local member for that district, that within twelve miles of Port Arthur there is just as fine land as can be found in any part of the country; and we know, from the reports of the commissioner sent out by the *Globe* Company, that in the Rainy River district there is as fine land as can be found in the Dominion of Canada, and it is of the utmost importance that attention should be drawn to it. With regard to the immigration agents in the North-West and Manitoba, I cannot see why there should be such differences in the salaries paid there compared with those paid in British Columbia. The hon. Minister says that the larger salaries are necessary because the duties there are very onerous. I can understand that in certain seasons of the year it is absolutely necessary that those men should be there. I can understand, from the reports that I have received, that it is absolutely necessary that the immigration agents should be on hand at the present time to meet the immigrants and direct them to the best localities. With regard to the immigration agent at Qu'Appelle, I think his agency is one of the most important, and the most important duty he has to perform is to tell the poor immigrants who are coming in not to go one mile further west in search of farming lands on the Canadian Pacific Railway. With regard to his being absent at the present time, it is a strange thing that he did not take his holidays when there were no immigrants going into the country. Any one can understand that just now, when the busy season is coming on and immigrants are going in, it is of the greatest importance to have a man there to locate the immigrants.

Mr. CARLING. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the agent at Qu'Appelle has provided a substitute at his own expense during his absence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well, last year we had a general election, and I know from the very best authority that last year and every year that there has been an election in Russell, that gentleman has been there.

Mr. MITCHELL. He got leave of absence perhaps.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No doubt he got leave of absence. But it is a strange fact that gentleman always lands down in the county of Russell when an election is coming on. He is said to be one of the best manipulators in the country. Another fact I want to draw attention to is that last year when he was down there, and no doubt paying a substitute at his own expense, the Auditor General's report shows that he received every cent of his salary, \$1,400. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has called attention to the fact, that not only he, but other civil servants are out stumping the country in the interest of the Government. I met Mr. O'Donohue in the county of Russell. It may be said that these gentlemen are not paid while they are there, and I am the last man who will stand up and question the right of any man to express his opinion, whether he is a public servant or not; but what I contend is that something like even-handed justice should be shown—that the law on one side of the House should be the law on the other side of the House too. It is only a few days since two men who hurt the feelings of the Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Welfe were dismissed summarily for the part they took in the elections. What I say is that British fair play and honorable dealing demand that the same law should be meted out to one side of the House as well as to the other, and that men should be dealt with on the same basis on both sides.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. the Minister of Agriculture does not deny that Mr. Baker is the Government immigration agent at Qu'Appelle. He does not deny that Mr. Baker is not in Qu'Appelle, where he said an immigration agent is particularly required at this season. He does not deny that Mr. Baker is here in Russell, engaged in canvassing on behalf of the Government candidate.

Mr. CARLING. I do not know that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Ignorance sometimes is convenient.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He knows it now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman does not know it, but that does not alter the fact that Mr. Baker is in Russell county, aiding in the canvass for Mr. Mackintosh and doing what he can to secure that gentleman's election. The hon. gentleman nods his head; he approves of that. Well, Mr. Baker cannot be in Russell helping Mr. Mackintosh and in Qu'Appelle at the same time. The hon. gentleman says Mr. Baker has paid an agent to act in his place. Has the Government entrusted Mr. Baker with the power of appointing an immigration agent? Is this the new doctrine that an agent may delegate his powers to another party with the consent of the Government? Is that the rule now?

Mr. CARLING. That is the rule. If an officer at Qu'Appelle or Calgary or Medicine Hat requires leave for a week or two, a substitute is appointed, or he selects one to take his place, but the substitute must be a responsible man.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it the practice for agents during their absence to appoint and to pay substitutes?

Mr. CARLING. If an agent makes application at any one of those points for leave of absence, and a good man is recommended to fill his place, we will allow him to have his leave of absence.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). At election time.

Mr. CARLING. At any time at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says at all times. When did this practice of appointing agents and paying them at the expense of the regular agents arise? So far as I know, the practice is that when you give a man his holidays you do not charge him for carrying on the work of his office during his absence; and when the hon. gentleman informs the committee that Mr. Baker has employed and paid an agent to act in his behalf, he is stating a fact which shows that he has adopted a different rule from the one which usually applied in the public service. The hon. the First Minister informed the House a few days ago that the Government did not authorise Mr. O'Donohue to go or did not send him to Russell county. Well, the Government did not by Order in Council say that Mr. O'Donohue should go to Russell. The Government, as a Government, did not take any action in that sense; but Mr. O'Donohue is a clerk in the public service and he is not in Russell without the consent of his chief. Mr. O'Donohue is paid as a clerk in the Government service while in Russell, and Mr. Baker is paid as a Government agent while he is also in Russell, both engaged in the same election contest; and both these men are being paid out of moneys to which the Reformers of this country contribute as well as hon. gentlemen on that side. When hon. gentlemen wish to appoint election agents or ask parties to support their friends, they should do it at their own expense and keep their hands out of the public treasury. There is no difference between a misappropriation of public funds on the part of a clerk for which he is tried and sentenced to penitentiary and the action of the Government, when they put their hands into the public treasury and pay an officer who is employed in the public service and who should be giving his time to the public service while, he is, instead, doing electioneering work. I say that this whole proceeding is in the last degree discreditable to the Government. I say it is in the last degree discreditable to them that, under the pretence of appointing an immigration agent to look after the interests of the immigrants in a part of the North West, they should pay a man for working in an electioneering contest 1,500 miles away from where his public duties as immigration agent should be discharged were he fulfilling the duties of the office to which he has been appointed. I say that condition of things is intolerable. I say it is impossible that hon. gentlemen opposite should be permitted to go on this way, and if they desire to have the Session brought to an end, as we all desire it should, let them take the public moneys and honestly devote them to the purposes for which they are voted. They are not doing that when they employ a man as an immigration agent in the North-West and then send him down to the county of Russell to aid in an election contest, or permit him to go down there for that purpose. In so doing they are misappropriating the public moneys; in so doing they are obtaining moneys from the people and the Parliament of this country under false pretences.

Mr. MULLOCK. I am surprised to learn that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture has permitted these abuses to occur in connection with the administration of his department. Of him I had expected something different, but I cannot say as much for his colleagues, and I can only look upon the conduct of the Minister of Agriculture as one of the effects of the company the hon. gentleman is keeping. I quite endorse all that has been said by the hon. member for Bothwell. This is certainly a misapplication

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

of public money; it is certainly a breach of trust on the part of the Minister who is responsible. It is a breach of trust which if it occurred between the hon. gentleman—if he is the Minister who is responsible—in his individual capacity and any one for whom he might be a trustee, would render him liable in his person and estate in any court of competent jurisdiction. That he should, because he happens in this case to be judge as well as a trustee, abuse the position of trust which he occupies, as a trustee of the funds and the law and honor of the country, is discreditable to himself and to the Administration of which he is a member. I will just remind the hon. gentleman of another transaction in connection with his department. I had expected that the Minister of Agriculture, at all events, would have had a due regard for the public funds and for what is right and proper, but when I look over some of his ways of spending the money entrusted to him, I find ground for the opposite opinion. I see that he is now spreading broadcast over the country a pamphlet entitled "The experience and observations of Mr. Webster," who poses as a farmer from Gananoque. I suppose that pamphlet has been ordered by the hon. gentleman and paid for out of his department. This Mr. Webster, I am informed, is also an election agent, although he is in the pay of the Government, and from time to time he is sent out as such. I had the honor of meeting him on several occasions, when he posed as a farmer, and I find his name scattered through the public accounts. The hon. Minister who has evidently taken him under his wing, pays him for his pamphlets, and uses him as an agent of the Government. What must be the position of an Administration which is obliged to fortify itself in this way by misapplying the moneys and abusing the power they are entrusted with. The Government must feel their position very precarious when they resort to practices of this kind. No wonder the voice of the country is loud against them; no wonder that election after election is going against them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! Oh!

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to know what election there has been lately, since this House has been in Session, which has not gone against the Administration. Although we hear of many hon. gentlemen seeking portfolios, I doubt very much if there is a member of the Cabinet to-day who will resign his seat, for fear that it may not be filled by a supporter of the Administration.

Mr. CARLING. How about West Middlesex? That has been since the general election.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What about the post office in Strathroy?

Mr. MULLOCK. West Middlesex did render a temporary verdict, but we will see how it turns out when it is adjudicated upon. The member for West Middlesex was returned to this House by about the same majority as he had before. The very same day an election was held in Prince Edward, and the candidate who was defeated in 1878, who was elected in 1882, who was elected by a small majority in 1887, was returned to this House by a majority about 200 per cent. larger than that which he received in 1887.

Mr. MITCHELL. What about Missisquoi?

Mr. MULLOCK. Yes, what about Missisquoi, and Hochelega, and Maskinongé? Are not these indications of what the public think of this practice; and what about Kent? Of course Kent is present in the minds of those hon. gentlemen to-night, and I hope the result there will warn them that these practices can only have the same result. When a candidate was proposed in Kent, who had the nomination of the party practically in his pocket, while the protest was undetermined, he was appointed to a nominal office, and was

given \$1,800 of the public money, to do what? To go out of the country at a convenient time. These are scandals that the public are becoming familiar with, but I think the country will soon resent them, and then hon. gentlemen will feel regret that they have not had more regard for the welfare of the country as custodians of the public money and custodians of the public honor.

Mr. MITCHELL. In looking over the details of the expense, I find that C. C. Chipman is put down for \$316 in addition to the \$2,000 referred to two hours ago, and I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if that gentleman is employed in his department.

Mr. LISTER. \$3,200.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, if it was \$3,200, here is \$316 in addition, which makes \$3,516. Is that the same man?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Probably the hon. gentleman does not understand that Mr. Chipman's office is under the Department of Agriculture. All the staff of the High Commissioner's office are under that department.

Mr. MITCHELL. But how does he come to draw over \$3,500? That is an enormous salary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no such salary.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will say that this statement on page 119 of the Auditor General's report is not correct? There we find, under the head of travelling expenses, C. C. Chipman, \$170.33. Farther down we find, C. C. Chipman, advance on account of contingencies, \$146, making \$316.33. I do not know how many more items there are for C. C. Chipman. On page 112 of the Auditor General's report, I find that the Quebec *Canadian* received for publishing 20,000 "North-West of Canada," \$727.49; the Brockville *Times*, 50,000 British Columbia pamphlets, \$573.28; the Burland Lithographic Company of Montreal, for maps, and so on, \$5,907.26; the Montreal *Gazette*, 28,000 pamphlets with maps, \$746.23; the *Scandinavian National Union* of Winnipeg, 20,000 Scandinavian pamphlets, \$382.50; the Canada Bank Note Company, Montreal, for maps, &c., \$847.80—that may be right enough, I dare say—the Quebec *Courrier du Canada*, 5,000 British Columbia pamphlets, \$512.28; the Quebec *Cultivateur*, 3,000 "Esquisse de la Gaspésie" and "Notes on Gaspé," \$1,033.33; Three Rivers *La Liberté*, "Esquisse Générale du Nord-Ouest," \$1,704.70; Notman & Son, Montreal, views of Charlottetown, and so on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The view of Charlottetown is only 50 cents.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is so, but there is J. H. Brownlee, of Winnipeg, 8,000 maps of Manitoba, \$200. Then we have J. Wilson & Co., of Ottawa, stretching and binding 1,000 chromo posters, stretching chromo posters with zinc ends, stretching maps, binding, framing, and so on, \$905.20; Quebec *Chronicle*, 50,000 "Information for settlers in B. C."—which, I presume, means British Columbia, and that appears to be a pretty expensive place—\$744.92; Morrisburg *Courier*, 50,000 "Canada, its extent and resources," \$644.77. This is touching the resources of Canada pretty well. Then there is the Montreal *Colonisateur Canadien*, \$1,520; the Montreal *Monde*, \$981.51; Montreal *Minerve*, 50,000 pamphlets, "Rapport Agostini," \$1,784.93; Toronto *Mail*—I suppose this was before the *Mail* learned to speak the truth—

Mr. CARLING. How much did the *Herald* get?

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not see anything here about the *Herald*.

Mr. CARLING. But the previous year?

Mr. MITCHELL. We got something to do in a previous year, but, as we had independence enough to

speaking what we thought, we were mighty soon stopped. Toronto *Mail*, \$10,088.78. Then we have Richardson of Winnipeg, 13,000; "Facts and figures," \$624; Mortimer & Co. of Ottawa, lithographing and printing 10,000 maps, and another 10,000 maps, \$484.44; S. B. Foote, advertising in *Canada*, \$50; J. A. Carman, of Winnipeg, \$75; Toronto *Irish Canadian*, 100,000 "Across Canada," \$718.98; Quebec *Journal*, 50,000 "To Canada," \$949.50; Pembroke *Standard*, on account of work completed in September, 1887, \$262; Ottawa *Le Canada*, 1,000 Hungarian circulars and translation, \$22.50; Berlin *Gospel Banner*, 50,000 German pamphlets, \$751.60, and then we have the London *Free Press*, the only instance in the whole lot that I find of a Liberal paper, which receives \$15,807.32.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It gets a liberal supply, at any rate.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is not that your paper, Mr. Mills?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, it is on the other side.

Mr. MITCHELL. He gets \$15,807; Welland *Telegraph*, \$50,000; German pamphlets, folding, covering, &c., \$351; Arthur Buies \$200, "Sur le parcours du chemin de fer du Lac St. Jean, \$20." I do not object to the hon. gentleman publishing pamphlets and books to inform the public of England and Europe of the advantages of Canada as a country to settle in, but it appears to me that the distribution of the public money in the way of printing is very badly administered. I think it is a little selfish of them to keep it all among the Tory press, and I think there is an amount of trash published in some of these pamphlets that is perfectly worthless. We know the object. It is to subsidise them, and we know that the sum that is paid in advertising, to say nothing of other expenses connected with the Department of Agriculture, is utterly out of proportion to the amount of the benefit received. Sir, I am glad to see the Government have dropped out \$100,000 on account of assisted passages. I think we have been spending money most recklessly in that way, and we have no corresponding advantages to the communities in which we live. I think now the Government ought to go on and to a large extent cut off the expenses for these useless publications. I do not mean to imply that all the persons who write pamphlets do not render some service, but there is a great deal of trash circulated in connection with this department that is outrageous.

Mr. LISTER. So far as these pamphlets are concerned, with the exception of one, that of Mr. Lynch, on dairying, the rest are simply trash. They are prepared simply for the purpose of giving money to the friends of the Government; and so far as the newspapers are concerned, they are simply subsidised in the interest of the Government. I challenge the Minister to point out a single Tory newspaper from Prince Edward Island to British Columbia that is not subsidised by this Government. Why, Sir, if they want coal away down in Prince Edward Island, they advertise it in the British Columbia papers, and in the *Regina Leader*. Why, Sir, a gentleman who sits in this House as member for one of the Assinaboias, appears in the Public Accounts as having received something like \$5,000 last year. No wonder he could take a trip on the continent. He says he went to the continent, and he told us that he was at some university. He has travelled on the continent at the expense of the people of this country, for which he is giving them nothing at all. Now, the hon. gentleman talks about the election. I think he had better have said nothing about the West Middlesex election. Does he not know that they dangled a post office before the people of Strathroy for months before the elections? Does he not know that every Tom, Dick and Harry who had a lot of land in Strathroy were promised that the Government were going to buy their lot at an enormous price? Does he not know that

every contractor in the town was led to believe that he was going to get a contract for this building, and that everybody who had anything to do in the village, was going to be appointed clerk of works. No wonder that West Middlesex went against the Liberals this time, but wait until the next election comes, and we will show you a trick or two. Does anybody suppose that these two men, O'Donohue and Baker, who have worked for the Government in Russell, if they were Liberals, and had worked against the Government, would have remained in its service a single day? No, Sir, they would have been dismissed like the French translators. The Premier and one or two of his friends go round and say to the Speaker, dismiss that man without trial. That is British justice and fair play for you! But as long as a man is working for the Government he can go home and leave his business when he ought to be at his post in the department, and go back and forth pursuing his nefarious work in promoting the election of the Government candidate. There may be a day of reckoning for this gentleman, who may find that the position he has held, under these circumstances, at all events, is not a very safe position. How differently hon. gentlemen treat Liberals. I had occasion only the other day to bring to the attention of the Postmaster General the case of an honorable and responsible citizen who was postmaster down in Arkona in my county, and because they wanted to have his place for a political hack and supporter of theirs they dismissed him without a trial. They preferred no charge, they had no investigation, there was nothing wrong with the office, and that man was summarily dismissed, and his crime was the crime of being a member of the Liberal party of this country. They tell us that his books were in disorder. But he denies it in his letter to me. He says there was nothing against him; no charge ever made, no wrong ever took place in the office, and the statement made by the Government that he was dismissed for cause is falsified by the fact that the man who has received his position was promised the appointment of postmaster for months before the dismissal of Mr. Evarist. That is the way Liberal officeholders in this country are treated by this Government. That is the way that worthy officeholders are treated by hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, they must not be surprised if, when a change of Administration takes place, these wrongs are righted. There will be a fearful day of reckoning for these men who have violated the position they occupy, who have proved themselves to be unfit to be in the public service. They must not be surprised if they are slaughtered right and left when a change of Government takes place. The public service of this country cannot be kept in the position it ought to be, unless all public servants cease to be partisans, and cease to interfere in elections.

Mr. BAKER. I still wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture if I may have any reason to hope that the agent at Victoria will have his salary increased.

Mr. CARLING. I can only say that if I find that the duties of that office have been very much increased, I will take an increase of his salary into favorable consideration.

Salaries of the London Office in England \$7,554

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is this to be voted again this year? The hon. gentleman is not accepting any salary?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It has nothing to do with my salary.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad to have an opportunity of saying a good word for an official of this House. I wish to offer my testimony to the manner in which Mr. Colmer, of the High Commissioner's Office in London, has discharged his duties. I have had an opportunity of knowing

Mr. LISTER.

personally how he treated the people from Canada, and I have found his conduct in that regard entirely satisfactory.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may take this opportunity of saying that it would be impossible to find in any department of the public service, a more energetic, industrious, and painstaking officer than Mr. Colmer. The total salary paid with this increased vote is less than it was in 1883 when I first took charge of the office.

Mr. McMILLAN. I see there are three different officials who are paid the same salaries, the agents at Liverpool, Dublin and Glasgow, but each pay a different amount of income tax, namely, \$137, \$86.62 and \$30.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The income tax is so much per cent. upon the salary, and when the salary is larger of course the income tax is greater. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the salaries are not alike.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it necessary, now that we have decreased assisted immigration expenditure by over \$100,000, or about two-fifths of the whole expenditure, that all these officials in Europe and Great Britain should be maintained?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is impossible to immediately change the staff. These officers have been placed in those positions, and they will have to discharge the duties to the office precisely the same as before. I may say with regard to the Liverpool office that Mr. Dyke, who is an extremely able and assiduous officer, is charged with a large amount of work in connection with continental immigration. Persons on his staff are corresponding in different languages with persons in Germany, Norway, and Switzerland, and other countries, and, therefore, so far as regards the Liverpool office, which is the principal point of departure for European emigrants to this country, must be maintained. You cannot dispense with it, because you have reduced the amount of assisted passages; in fact we would rather require to increase the efforts of the agencies in Liverpool, Glasgow and Dublin with a view to attract agriculturists with capital to this country. I do not think if the hon. gentleman will give the subject his attention he will come to the conclusion that it would be wise that, because we are effecting a saving of \$100,000 a year in assisted passages, we should do away with our officers, but on the other hand we should rather increase our efforts to obtain such immigrants as will not be able to pay their own passages, but will possess sufficient capital to enable them to become useful and valuable settlers in developing our country.

Mr. MITCHELL. The explanation given by the hon. gentleman is a very reasonable one.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I find that Mr. Dyke's salary is \$2,100, Mr. Graham's salary \$1,300, Mr. Connolly's \$1,000, instead of all the salaries being equal, as has been alleged. The hon. gentleman was looking at the amounts for travelling expenses, which is a different matter. The income tax is so much per cent. on the salary, and the statement of the Minister of Finance was therefore perfectly correct.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) What agencies does the hon. gentleman propose to retain?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Dyke at Liverpool, \$2,100; Mr. Graham at Glasgow, \$1,300; the agent at Belfast, \$1,000; Mr. Connolly at Dublin, \$1,000; agent at Bristol, \$500, and an agent at Switzerland, \$800.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I find the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) is quite mistaken in regard to the income tax payments. The same amount of income tax has not been paid by officers with the same salaries, the difference in one case being 86 to 27, and in another case 50 to 28.

Mr. CARLING. There is a receipt for each of the items certified by the Auditor General.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will bring the Auditor General's statement which will show that the amounts stated are perfectly correct.

Mr. MULOCK. Are the agents in Europe remunerated for their actual time while travelling?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are \$4 a day allowed for travelling expenses.

Mr. LISTER. Whether they travel or not?

Mr. MULOCK. This agent has his fixed salary, and \$1,460 are allowed him for travelling expenses, as we see by reference to the Auditor General's report, that is \$4 a day for the 365 days in the year. I suppose that during the most of his time he is engaged in his office at Liverpool.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not exactly so. He frequently makes trips to Norway and Sweden and parts of the continent of Europe to see the various agents and persons with whom he is in constant correspondence.

Mr. MULOCK. I hardly think that is a good way to remunerate him. He receives a certain amount as salary and he receives \$1,460 more in order to keep him from loss in case he travels. You are remunerating him in a way that conflicts with the public interest. If it is in the public interest that he should travel, he should be paid for travelling, but by the way in which you are remunerating him now you make it to his interest not to travel. I presume that it is more expensive for him to travel than to remain in Liverpool and if he receives \$1,460 whether he travels or not, and it is more expensive to travel than to remain in Liverpool, he will stay in Liverpool. I think he should be paid his expenses when he travels, and then only.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is something in the remarks of the hon. gentleman. This practice was established several years ago and when a practice is established in remunerating a public officer hon. gentlemen well know how difficult it is to change it.

Mr. DAVIES. There is a great difference between the travelling expenses of some of the agents. The agents at Liverpool and Glasgow are allowed \$4 a day as travelling expenses and Mr. Connolly in Dublin is only allowed \$2.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is in relation to the importance of the position he occupies.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.). The man in Dublin would seem to be just as important as the man in Glasgow.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I see that in another part of the accounts, Mr. Dyke gets \$450 more for travelling expenses.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Finance seems to admit that this is not a sound way of paying those travelling expenses, but he does not hold out any hope that he will correct it. What has fallen from the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) shows the necessity of establishing a proper basis by paying a fixed salary, and if he travels by paying him for travelling.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt but this is a subject worthy of careful consideration.

Mr. MITCHELL. I see Christmas gratuities in Mr. Dyke's items, \$12.54. It is a small item, but it is a strange principle to establish to give gratuities and charge it in the public accounts.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.). What is the saving made in the item for contingencies for Canadian agencies? I see that you saved \$9,000 on this year's grant.

Mr. CARLING. The amount last year was \$30,000. This report is based on the actual expenditure for last year.

Gen. LAURIE. While on the item for immigration expenses I should like to ask is it probable that any better accommodation will be afforded at Halifax to immigrants waiting there before they are taken out west? I do not know whether it comes under the Department of Agriculture or of Railways, but the immigrants have no other accommodation at present than a freight shed, and it is very severe on women and children coming in an inclement season of the year that they have no place to obtain warmth and food. It does seem to me that accommodation should be provided for them rather than leave them as they are now among the sheds.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have been in a place there which is to accommodate the immigrants and which is at the head of the wharf. It is not very spacious it is true, but at the same time it must not be forgotten that there is no object in having arrangements made to keep immigrants there a long time. We do not want to have them there an hour if we can help it. The trains come down on the spot and they are on their way, after a short time. The accommodation is not very ample, but there is a house at the head of the wharf to give them temporary shelter while the trains are being got in readiness to take them away.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. friend the member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) is slightly in error. There is a room there which communicates with the shed in which the emigrants land, but inasmuch as last year, I think, some 13,000 immigrants were landed in Halifax, I do not believe the accommodation is sufficient for this large and increasing number. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will take that matter into consideration, whilst there is some accommodation there it is quite insufficient for the growing traffic.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if any portion of this \$30,000 is to be applied towards assisting immigrants who come to Canada?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, not any.

Mr. MULOCK. No public money is to be expended in that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. At present the question has not been finally decided with reference to children who are brought out by charitable institutions; by Dr. Barnardo and other persons, who have established with their own money homes in this country, in which the children are cared for until they are finally placed in a satisfactory position. The country has had no other charge and there has been a small assistance, I think I am right in saying of \$2, given for each of those children.

Mr. CARLING. Over 1,000 were brought out last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Two or three thousand dollars is the entire expense and that has not been withdrawn.

Mr. MULOCK. Am I correct in understanding from the Minister of Finance that the Government have decided that they will not in any way contribute towards paying for immigrants.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not a shilling.

Mr. MULOCK. The only question in point is the question of \$2 for each of those children?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. While this subject is before the House I wish to give an expression of opinion about the allowance for those children. I entirely approve of an allowance to a moderate extent to assist those people who bring out those children. I do not think because we condemn aid being given to those immigrants generally that the same applies

to benevolent societies or individuals who at their own expense bring out children. I do not think this country would object to a small contribution such as this for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) It depends on the children they bring out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say as to that that the investigation has been most satisfactory. I believe it has been found that 95 per cent have been well selected and are all that could possibly be desired.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the hon. Minister of Finance was right in his statement that the immigrants remain only a short time at Halifax when they land there. My firm being agents for the Dominion line, by which a large number of immigrants come during the winter months, I have been able to watch the *modus operandi*, and he is quite correct in saying that we always endeavor to get them away as soon as possible, and they seldom remain there more than a few hours, in fact only long enough to have their baggage examined. There is a room there for their accommodation, but at times it is hardly sufficient for them, and we sometimes have to obviate the difficulty by keeping them on the steamers until the trains are ready. There is a house opposite the depot for the accommodation of immigrants. I do not know anything about it, and would not be understood as saying a word against it; but some of the clergymen in Halifax, who had an idea that liquor was sold in that house, started an immigrants' home opposite the deep water terminus, where the immigrants would be under the charge of people belonging to the different churches, and would be carefully looked after. I understand that the people in charge of this home have made an application to the Minister, and if the Government would make an arrangement with them, they could rely on the immigrants being carefully looked after, and kept away from temptation. The accommodation we have we manage to get along with, but it would be better if we had a little more.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the hon. the Finance Minister stated that the Government had not yet decided whether they would give any assistance to those societies which are bringing out children. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said he thought it was right and proper that aid should be rendered to them. I think the Government should seriously consider whether it would be in the best interest of the people of Canada to assist the majority of those children who are brought here. I have had frequent opportunities for a number of years of seeing and examining those who have been brought out by various institutions, and I have no hesitation in saying that they are not a desirable class out of whom to make citizens of this Dominion. I think the Minister stated that careful inspection was made to see that only proper children were brought out. I should like to know what arrangements are made for doing that. I do not know of any regulations of the department providing for any proper inspection of these children before they leave the old country. Many of these children are the offspring of a class of people whom we would not like to become citizens amongst us; many of them are diseased, and I think it should be seriously considered whether it would be wise to allow them to be scattered throughout the country, to mingle and associate with the children of our own people. I certainly think that the Government ought to decide either to exercise every diligence in the selection of these children or else not to render any further aid to that class.

Mr. TROW. I dissent entirely from the view expressed by my hon. friend. In the town of Stratford there is an institution, established by Miss Macpherson, to which she

Mr. MITCHELL.

has brought hundreds of children, and they are not there twenty-four hours until they are placed in good, comfortable positions for life among the farmers in the neighborhood, and thus far I have not heard of more than two out of the thousands she has brought who have not proved to be respectable citizens. I think these children from 12 to 14 years of age are the most desirable class of immigrants we can get. We have been freed from the expense of raising them until they are prepared to take positions in life for themselves, and the farmers are always anxious to obtain them.

Gen. LAURIE. It fell to my lot to place about 500 of these children, and I think the best proof that they gave satisfaction is the fact that as successive parties came out the applications for them increased so much that I had four or five applications for each one that came out, for I inferred that the people would not apply for them unless they were a desirable class. I watched over them and inspected them for a certain number of years, and while a certain number were not satisfactory, the great mass of them were satisfactory. I have watched the careers of many of them since and they have become valuable citizens.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Notwithstanding what my hon. friend from South Perth has said, I have seen many of these children as they grow up, and I consider that they are not such a class as we ought to have in our midst. They are a class brought frequently from the poorhouses and the slums of the cities of the old country.

Mr. TROW. No.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). My hon. friend says no, but he knows nothing about it; he has had no opportunity of witnessing the diseases that are prevalent among many of those brought from the old country. If we wish to sow the seeds of disease among the people of this country, we will continue bringing that class. My hon. friend desires that we should do so. I have no objection as far as he is concerned, but I desire to protect the rest of the community; and I say that my experience has been that many of those brought here should not have been permitted to remain in this country. These children, of course, are not to blame. Their diseases are inherited from their parents; but the Government would be justified if they would devise some means by which a selection would be made and we would be spared the infliction of the immigration of poorhouse children.

Mr. TROW. The experience of my hon. friend must be very limited, for the simple reason that there is not an institution for the reception of these children probably within 100 miles from where he resides, and he would not have an opportunity of considering their character in the isolated constituency he represents.

Mr. MITCHELL. I notice that a considerable amount has been expended for the examination of these children. I find eight items on page 117 and two items on page 118.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman state this, because the hon. member for East Elgin will find there is a careful examination made.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Perhaps if the hon. the Finance Minister would take an opportunity to see many of those children, he would have the same opinion with regard to them as I have. It is not my desire to make any attack or to misrepresent things in the least. But I have had the opportunity of examining into the condition of those children, and I know what I am speaking. As regards the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Trow) to the effect that there is no institution for these waifs within 100 miles of where I reside, that statement comes fittingly from one who speaks of mountains thousands of miles high, and I do not pay much attention to it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I remember speaking last year on this subject with a police magistrate in Chatham, where a considerable number of these children, principally girls, were left; and I think he told me that in the course of six months, there was not one of them that had not been before his court. I think, therefore, the subject is one that ought to receive the careful consideration of the Government.

Mr. MULOCK. Before this resolution is carried, I would ask the Finance Minister if he would call an early meeting of the Public Accounts Committee to examine into the cases of Mr. Baker and Mr. O'Donohue, and find out the exact circumstances under which they absented themselves from duty to take part in an election contest. Perhaps Friday would suit the convenience of the hon. gentleman. This is a matter which we cannot pass over in silence. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture has given a very unsatisfactory explanation, and we are bound to find out how it is these public servants have been allowed to desert their posts in order to perform other duties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That has nothing to do with Public Accounts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It has a great deal to do with them. This Mr. Baker left an important post to canvass in Russell, and a most unsatisfactory explanation has been given by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. CARLING. In what way?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Either he is absent on leave or he is not. If absent on leave for the purpose of electioneering, his action is most disgraceful to all the parties concerned. If the hon. gentleman has been deceived by Mr. Baker—

Mr. CARLING. I have not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There can be no more important enquiry before the Public Accounts Committee than the enquiry into the circumstances under which a man receiving public pay is neglecting his duty and engaging in an electioneering contest. If this kind of thing is to go on and there should be a change of Government, none of these men can hope to retain their places longer.

An hon. MEMBER. That will be a long time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps so. But even if this Government continues in office, I am sure the better men supporting it do not wish to see public servants neglecting their duties to take part in a political contest. As far as we are concerned on this side, we are prepared to enter our protest against it, and will make that protest very effective, if it ever falls in our power to do so. I desire these public servants to know that if they choose to make themselves political hacks and canvass for Government supporters in an electioneering contest, they must do it at their own risk, and I desire to know how far the Minister of Agriculture has lent himself to such conduct.

Gen. LAURIE. If a public servant happened to be canvassing in behalf of a supporter of the Government, I would like to know what position the hon. gentleman would take?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman surely did not hear the debate which took place the other day on the dismissal of some gentlemen who were not even officers of the Government, but were officers of the House, because they ventured to take part in an electioneering contest against the Government, while those who took part on the Government side were retained.

Gen. LAURIE. I regret to say that I know of a great many public servants who worked very hard in favor of an opponent of the Government in a late contest in which I was engaged.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman had the advantage of the Government steamer to carry his voters all along the coast.

Gen. LAURIE. I have already stated that is not the fact.

Mr. GILLMOR. I have sat here for two or three years listening to this discussion. I think that the question which is now occupying the attention of the committee is a serious one. Of course, the salary is not a very large one, but I would have been glad to have heard some of the members of the Government express an opinion with reference to this small matter. If it is their policy to encourage officials who are paid out of the public Treasury to leave their post of duty in order to assist in elections, and to run throughout the Dominion, they should announce it. I do not think they can approve of it. I have listened to the charges which have been made. There is very little political capital to be made out of that sort of thing, but there is a principle involved, and I would be pleased to hear members of the Government disclaim any intention of using their officials, who are paid out of the taxes of the people, who are paid out of the public purse, in this way. I think it is wrong, and I would be glad to hear some members of the Government disclaim this sort of thing. It ought not to be, no matter what party is in power. I could occupy the time of the committee much longer, but I do think it is important for this country that we should have at least as much political morality as it is possible to have, and I think this is political immorality and ought not to be encouraged, and I do not think the Government can approve of this sort of thing. It would please me to hear them say it is wrong and should be discontinued, and to hear them say they will discontinue this sort of thing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It occurs to me that the question put by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) comes at the wrong time and in the wrong place. We are at present discussing the Estimates and not the conduct of the Government. If hon. gentlemen opposite choose to bring up a charge against the Government, let them do it at the right time, and we will be prepared to meet it. As to the question of my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) I may say, in reference to this Mr. Baker, whose case I never heard of until to-night, that I think the statement of the Minister of Agriculture ought to be perfectly satisfactory. He says that Mr. Baker applied for leave of absence and obtained it, that he got the same leave of absence which was given to other officers, that he found a substitute to do his work, that substitute being satisfactory to the department for the performance of his duties during his leave of absence; and the Minister of Agriculture says that how Mr. Baker was employing his time he does not know. That was the answer of the Minister of Agriculture, and no other answer could be given. He did not know any more in reference to Mr. Baker.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then he cannot read the papers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I read the papers, and I never heard Mr. Baker's name until it was mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. MULOCK. We are now engaged in voting a sum of money to pay Mr. Baker's salary for the ensuing year, and I think it is very pertinent to that question to decide whether he has been discharging his duties in such a way as to move this committee to continue their payments.

There are some four or five thousand civil servants in the service of this Government, and perhaps this kind of action might go a little further, because we have seen some interference with civil servants in certain cases. Sometimes we have seen them removed from their positions, and in others we have seen them compelled to take part in elections on behalf of the Government. If the First Minister does not regard this inquiry as being limited, let him go a little further. I am not at all satisfied as to the circumstances under which some of these men have been dismissed. For instance, there were those three Irishmen who were dismissed from the canal at the instance of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). I believe he is blameable for not protecting them if he is not for obtaining their dismissal. That, perhaps, is a matter which is not germane to this point, but it ought to be cleared up. In regard to the matter now before us, if the Minister takes the ground that, as a committee, we are not entitled to do this, surely as a committee we can make a representation to the House, and that should be that A. G. Baker, or whatever his name is, was employed as immigration agent at Qu'Appelle, that he was stationed at Qu'Appelle, that at the present time the immigration business is very brisk at Qu'Appelle, that he has had some experience in managing that business, and that his business there ought to call upon him to discharge the duties of his office, and that the interests of the country imperatively demand that the duties attaching to that office should be attended to, and that they will not admit of delay or of being performed by a person incompetent to perform them; and therefore no person should be allowed to vacate that office at such a critical moment, except under the greatest possible urgency. I ask the hon. the Minister of Agriculture whether this civil servant submitted to him the name of his successor who was supposed to be able to perform these duties.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He did not know that he was the agent.

Mr. MULLOCK. The First Minister says he did know, but he says the Minister of Agriculture passed upon the qualifications of the substitute.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I did not. What I said was that the appointment of the substitute was satisfactory to the department. I do not know whether it was satisfactory to the Minister or not.

Mr. MULLOCK. I do not know whether the Minister runs the department or the department runs the Minister, but I assume that any hon. Minister ought to understand his own business, and I do not think that even the First Minister, who has had great experience as head of a department, will admit that he was not responsible for everything that took place in his department. I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he knew what were the qualifications of this substitute of Mr. Baker before he granted leave of absence to that agent. Did he consider for a moment that this was not the time to grant leave of absence, and that it should only be granted under great urgency, such as a family bereavement or something of that kind, which would justify the Minister, if he were willing to do so, in recommending a change in the Department at that time. If that is not so, the Minister of Agriculture has been derelict in his duty. If everything is satisfactory, the committee will, of course, disclose it, but, if the hon. gentleman gives out that the only excuse was to enable this gentleman to go to some constituency and manipulate votes there and secure the Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues in office, that would not be a sufficient ground for the leave being granted. I think we must first find out whether this officer has discharged his duty properly, whether he was justified in leaving his office, either by the circumstances or by per-

Mr. MULLOCK.

mission; and not till then should we vote money to continue him in office.

Mr. CURRAN. With reference to the statement made by the last speaker in connection with this matter, and which he has just taken the opportunity for the third time to repeat in this House, although I stated that the allegations he had made on two former occasions were untrue, as he has again repeated to-night the statement about three Irishmen being discharged from the public service in Montreal, whose discharge I might have prevented, I may as well make, once for all, a formal statement with regard to that subject. The report originated with a young man who was employed on the *Montreal Herald*, and was utterly without foundation. In the first place, there were no men discharged, either Englishmen, Irishmen, Scotchmen, Frenchmen, or men of any other nationality, from any public service in the city of Montreal, and I had nothing to do with such discharge, if it took place, and I know it did not. On the contrary, when this statement appeared in the newspapers and was copied into one or two other papers in this city and elsewhere, I stood up in my place and stated that if any such discharge had taken place, it was without my knowledge or consent, and that I would give the papers in question an opportunity of proving their assertion. I went to Montreal, and I there enquired from the superintendent of the canal what had taken place. These three men were alleged to have been discharged from the canal works because they had taken part in an election against me. I found that no such men were in the employ of the canal office at all. There are a certain number of laborers employed in the canal office every year to take charge of the locks. The superintendent of the canal informed me that certain parties had told him that during the course of the election three men who were in the habit of being engaged in the spring, were taking a very active part in the election against me, and that he had gone and told them that it was very much better for them, as they did not know what Government would be in power, to give their votes as they thought proper, but to take no other part in the election canvass. It appears that the three men whom he had thus notified applied for work at the opening of the season, and he told them to come to me and get a letter of recommendation, and he would give them work. That was all that was said. Two of these men come to me and asked for letters of recommendation, which I immediately gave them, and he immediately gave them work. The third man never applied to me for a letter, and I confess I never ran after him to give him one. If he had come to me he would have had the letter just the same as the others. Now, I will read what the papers which had published this statement about me said afterwards. In the first place the *Montreal Herald*, in a very manly way, came out in the following language:—

"Some time ago, before the animosities of the late general election had subsided there appeared in the *Herald* an article in which Mr. J. J. Curran, member for Montreal Centre, was alluded to as the enemy of Irish Home Rule and a coercionist. He is represented as having made use of his political position to oppress a number of Irish laborers in this city. We deem it our duty to state how much we regret that the article in question should have found its way into our columns, and lest its publication may have in any degree injured that gentleman in the esteem of his fellow-countrymen, we desire to add that the charges were unfounded, in so far as they related to Mr. Curran. We differ from Mr. Curran on many questions of Dominion politics, yet we willingly acknowledge that he is a sincere friend of the Irish cause and an upright Canadian politician."

That was published on the 14th September, 1887, and I think disposed of the question in so far as I was concerned. I have stated exactly how far the superintendent of the canal was concerned, also. Then the *Montreal Post*, which had been most bitter against me all along, copied the article of the *Herald* and published a very strong article on its own account, in which it stated:

"The article of the *Herald* which occasioned the above apology having been reproduced in the *Post* and *True Witness*, it is only fair that the management of those papers should publish the disavowal. On the other hand, they also published strictures on the member for Montreal Centre, and to end if possible all causes of dispute with that gentleman they deem it proper to make the following statement: The *Herald* says that Mr. Curran is an upright Canadian politician. The management agree with that paper. He is an honorable and an honest man. The charges made against him in this paper relative to coercing poor laboring men were, they now believe, unfounded and the management regret any such allegations having been made.

"The management of the *Post* are therefore prepared to admit that when a difference of opinion comes it is possible to advocate the views of either side without having recourse to epithets. The management of this paper feel that some of the language made use of by their writers gave Mr. Curran good cause of complaint and they desire to make the *amende honorable* in this connection."

This was published both in the *Post* and *True Witness*, on September 29, 1887. Another paper published in this city also apologised for having reproduced the statement in question. Now, all these things must have been known to the hon. member who has just spoken. When I stood up in the House, on a former occasion, I gave the most emphatic denial to the allegations that he had made. Still, he persisted in them. He was requested to withdraw this statement, but he would not withdraw it. Now, I have only one thing to add, that any man who says that I have ever, on any occasion, oppressed public servants, or sought to deprive them of any position which they hold under the Government, or might hope to hold under it, because any man or men had opposed me in an election, is a liar, in the plainest language.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CURRAN. I say any man who says so, is a liar.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CURRAN. What is the order about? I say so here, and I will say so anywhere else. Now, I hope that this thing has come up for the last time, because I shall consider it a personal insult if it is again hurled against me, after the manner in which I have disproved the allegation. As I said, the papers in question came out in a most manly way and exonerated me in every respect, and from that day to this I have been well treated by them, I believe. But certainly there is no excuse for such reiterated attacks upon me in a matter that is utterly without foundation; and if all the other allegations made here with reference to public employes are of the same nature, this House can judge of their value.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is the second time the hon. member for Montreal has chosen to read that article in the *Herald*.

Mr. CURRAN. I never read it before in the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. You referred to it, then, last Session.

Mr. CURRAN. No, I could not refer to it last Session, because it had not been written then.

Mr. MITCHELL. In the beginning of the Session, you did.

Mr. CURRAN. Not at all.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, I certainly understood so.

Mr. CURRAN. I stated in answer to the hon. member who spoke a moment ago, that this article had appeared in the *Herald*, but I had not the article about me just then to read.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know you referred to it, at all events.

Mr. CURRAN. Yes, I did.

Mr. MITCHELL. As the hon. gentleman has made a statement, I may just as well make one too. This article was written without my knowledge, and the first I saw of

it was in the press. It was written by a gentleman who then managed my paper, and when I saw the article I at once asked that gentleman—I need not mention his name, gentlemen on the other side know who it is.

An hon. MEMBER. The *Empire*?

Mr. MITCHELL. The *Empire*, if you like. I asked him what the meaning of the article was, what was the foundation for making such statement against a man of Mr. Curran's position and standing. He said he had the best authority for it, that he had sent down to verify the statements of the men—the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) spoke of three, to the best of my recollection the number was six. My manager told me they had been not exactly discharged, but had been refused employment on the canal. They had been employed from season to season, some of them for years, and when they went to get employment at the opening of this season they were informed that before they could be employed they would have to get permission from Mr. Curran. My manager informed me that he had verified the facts, and the men had come to the office and asserted it over and over again and they were prepared to prove it. When Mr. Curran brought an action against the *Herald* I said: If those facts can be established I will defend it, and I did defend the action, till I got an intimation that the matter could be very easily settled. I believed there was very grave doubt as to whether, under the libel law of Quebec, the proof of the truth of the statement was always a defence, and when I came to consult my lawyer, who was a very prominent Conservative, I discovered that there were very grave doubts whether, even if every fact be proved as stated in the paper, I would not still be mulcted in damages. Mr. Curran having very handsomely offered to settle the matter if an acknowledgment was made, my lawyer said I had better do it and get rid of it. I at once said to my lawyer: If that is the case I will do it. I will say this, that Mr. Curran said more than that, namely, that he would not even charge the costs against the *Herald* if he had not a partner who was entitled to have his costs in the matter, when he found that it was done without my knowledge or information. I said to my lawyer under these circumstances: We will pay Mr. Curran his costs and make such an acknowledgment of error as you think desirable—and Mr. Curran prepared it himself, he will acknowledge it. And that at the time I said to my lawyer: Well, it is going pretty far, but we have done him some injury and I am willing to make the utmost recompense to him for it. Under those circumstances I gave Mr. Curran that explanation for publication, if he chose to use it. It was objectionable to me somewhat, expressing as it did an opinion about his private character, but at the same time I felt that, when I was doing it, it was better not to do it half way but to go the whole length and satisfy Mr. Curran. I want to say this to Mr. Curran, that every man connected with the editorial staff, and there are several of them, was indignant to think, with a case which they thought clear, I should have been so foolish as to settle it. I have had some little experience with actions for libel since I became connected with a newspaper. I know what the troubles are. I got into an action in which there were ten different allegations of defence, each of which would have laid me open for an action for damages. The partner of our worthy Speaker brought an action against the *Herald* in that case, brought us into court, and one of the allegations was of rather a serious character, the case being in connection with a young immigrant woman. She subsequently emigrated to Vermont. I had to send to Vermont for her, and although I proved every one of the ten allegations except one, which had to be proved by that young woman, the old woman who brought the action hurried her away and I was never able to get sight of her again. Judge Jetté, who presided at the

court, postponed the final evidence for several days, knowing we had brought this young woman there and that she had disappeared, but the result was that because we were not able to prove the tenth allegation, although we had proved nine, I had to pay \$100 damages and over \$300 costs to the worthy Speaker's partner. That was a little experience for me. My lawyer told me, as I have said, that even if I proved the facts to be as stated it was very questionable under the Quebec law whether that would free the *Herald* from damages; I said I did not believe any such thing in regard to the law. I happened to have another suit in the court, of a political character, and I got out of it on appeal on account of the declaration not having been properly drawn. I have thus had some experience of the effect of the libel law in the Province of Quebec. I made up my mind that it was better to eat a little crow than to pay large lawyers bills, and when I did make up my mind to eat the leek I did not go half way in the matter; and as Mr. Curran knows, when he prepared the letter and submitted it to my lawyer and my lawyer submitted it to me, I said: It goes rather too far, but I will sign it and pay the bill and the hon. member and myself have been friends ever since. I merely state these facts in order to explain how Peter Mitchell came to eat the leek, for he does not very often do it.

Mr. CURRAN. It is perfectly true that the apology was prepared by Mr. McMaster and myself.

Mr. MITCHELL. By yourself chiefly.

Mr. CURRAN. On the other hand I do not wish the hon. gentleman to be under a false impression, and I may say here that whatever may be the defects in the Quebec law, if the hon. gentleman is sure of what he has stated I am perfectly prepared to waive the whole question as to damages. If he imagines he can prove any one part of the statement made against me as true, I state in the presence of this House that I am prepared to say that he shall not be mulcted in any damages, and let him go on with the suit. I am prepared to establish that I had nothing to do with this matter, and that the statement I have made is true in every respect.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not say you had.

Mr. CURRAN. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that it was because he was afraid he might not be able to prove it on some one or other point.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, I did not say that. I had given my experience as to what had been done in another case.

Mr. CURRAN. That seems to have led the hon. gentleman to adopt the course he did adopt, as I thought in a very manly way, in this matter. As I have said, there was no man discharged. It may have been a very tyrannical thing on the part of the superintendent of the canal to say to those men go and get a letter of recommendation from Mr. Curran. I do not think it is, because a great many come to me for letters, and although I give them, I cannot always get them work. I gave the letters the very moment the men came and I would have given it to the third man if he had come also.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Curran may have misunderstood me. What I did wish to convey to him and to this House, was that I knew nothing of the facts myself. The libel, if it was a libel, was committed before I knew anything about it. As to the facts I endeavored to get them verified after the event, as my manager had verified them, as he said before. I told him to verify them again, and he assured me that the facts which he was prepared to prove were, that those six men, not three if my recollection serves me right, who were in the habit of going as a matter of course in the spring of the year and getting employment as they had employment before, when they did apply they were told

Mr. MITCHELL.

by the manager of the canal that they would have to get a letter from Mr. Curran before they could get employment. That is what those men told my manager, as my manager told me, and he was prepared to verify that and he was very indignant with me for taking the course I did.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think it is quite germane to the whole debate that the suggestion of my hon. friend should be entertained, because this discussion places the hon. the Minister of Agriculture in a very equivocal position. The hon. the Minister says that Mr. Baker recommended to him or to the department a person to look to his office during his absence and that this was satisfactory to the department. The hon. gentleman forgot that when Mr. Baker's name was mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) at the commencement of the discussion, he did not remember that Mr. Baker was an officer of his department at all. I would ask him how he can state now that Mr. Baker could have made this satisfactory arrangement for the conduct of his business?

Mr. CARLING. I did not say that I did not remember that he was an officer of the department. I said that I thought he was the agent at Brandon and not Qu'Appelle.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he was not aware that he was an officer at all, and when he consulted with his deputy he found that he was. However this is just a part of the programme that has been played for a long time. It was played in Halifax during the local election when an officer of the Customs Department who had enjoyed a summer holiday, on his return from his holiday and when the local election was going on, the collector received orders from the department here at Ottawa to give him leave of absence during the election and he was despatched to Isidore with fishing bounty cheques, to be distributed so as to influence the electors to vote against the provincial secretary. That gentleman's name is Mr. Morris. His salary has since been advanced, and he was used during the whole of that election with the fishing bounty cheques in his pocket, working by orders of the Department of Ottawa. It is part of the same system that Mr. Baker is carrying on in the county of Russell.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know Mr. Morris' trip to Nova Scotia, to which the hon. gentleman refers, but when he makes the statement as broadly as he has done, that Mr. Morris was sent down there to work against the Local Government by the department at Ottawa, he tells what is not correct and what it is impossible for him to prove.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I can prove it.

Mr. BOWELL. I say you cannot prove it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I say I can.

Mr. BOWELL. I give no opinion as to the gentleman to whom he refers obtaining leave at that time. I am not in a position at this moment to state whether it is correct or not, but I do deny that that gentleman or any other gentleman was sent down by the department at Ottawa to electioneer against any local candidate or any Dominion candidate either.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I say he was, and I know it.

Mr. BOWELL. I say he was not, and I know better.

Mr. MULOCK. The member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) says that no men were discharged from the canal service. That is, of course, a technical way of getting out of the difficulty. The facts are, as I understand, that the men in question had been appointed from year to year, and while they only worked during the season of navigation, yet their appointments were considered as permanent as that of any other person in the public service. To say,

therefore, that they were not discharged, if when the season was about to come round again they were refused to be allowed to proceed with their work as usual, is trifling with the real substance of the question. However, the member from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) admits that an employé of this Government, the superintendent of the canal, chose to resort to the extraordinary course of intimidating three of the electors of Montreal Centre.

Mr. CURRAN. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. MULLOCK. And that the superintendent of the canal informed those three men that if they took a prominent part in the elections they would be dismissed, or, what is the same thing, that their services would be discontinued. Now, the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) can settle this matter between himself and the canal superintendent. I presume the superintendent knew there was an election on, when he said that, and I presume he was concerned very much in promoting the election of the member for Montreal Centre, and I very much doubt if there was not some hint or other given to the superintendent about the promotion of the election in Montreal Centre. I would, under these circumstances, attach very little importance to the withdrawal and the apology that appeared in the *Montreal Herald*. I admit that to the sentiments expressed in the *Montreal Herald* should attach very great weight as disclosing very fully the gentlemanly demeanor and the principle of the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), because no one knows those better than the member for Montreal Centre himself who wrote it. But the circumstances under which they were prepared as has been stated here and under which they were published in the *Herald* I hardly think can be cited as good evidence for the member for Montreal Centre. We come right back to the fact that three men, three Irish Catholics—perhaps six, but at all events three—were driven from the public service because they chose to exercise the rights of freemen. That is the transaction. The member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) when he knew that wrong was done and when two of those men, perhaps from their necessities, were humiliated and compelled to come to him to ask him to get justice, knew that there was another suffering, but he had not the courage or the manliness to go to that independent man and see that he was reinstated in his office. He knew that man was unjustly treated, and I charge him with the whole responsibility. I say he is trifling with the facts when he endeavors to escape from the dilemma and when he says: I the representative of the Irish Catholic people of this country in this House chose to stand on my high position as representative of Montreal Centre, and when two of those men came and humbled themselves before me and begged for food I did not refuse them; but one other who was manly enough, courageous enough, and Irish enough to refuse to humble himself before me, I from my high pedestal refused to step down and extend a hand to him. That is the attitude of the representative of the Irish people of Canada in the House of Commons of Canada. I hold him responsible for every bit of it. I do not take back one word of it. I charge him with the guilt of it, and no apology will come from me, let him use all the dignified and classical terms he may choose to apply to me. I say he is responsible for it.

Mr. TROW. I rise to order. What has this to do with the item under consideration?

The CHAIRMAN. I think this is irregular. I would have stopped it before if my attention had been called to it.

Mr. CURRAN. I will refrain from saying anything, as I do not think the gentleman is worthy of any answer.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.20 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 3rd May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 123) to amend the Criminal Procedure Act, chap. 174 of the Revised Statutes. He said: The object of this Bill is to make two changes in the procedure relating to criminal libel. In the first place, it is proposed to enact that the place of trial in criminal prosecutions for libel against the publisher of a newspaper, shall be within the Province in which the newspaper is published—the publishing office of the paper. In the second place, it is proposed to establish that the crime of libel shall be like that of perjury and two or three other offences, in respect of which it is provided in the Criminal Procedure Act that proceedings by indictment must be preceded by a preliminary investigation before a magistrate, unless the indictment is on the *fiat* of the Attorney General of the Province, or approved by the judge before whom the indictment is preferred.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand, from the hon. gentleman's explanation of the Bill, that he does not propose to include any clause to have reference to the exercise by courts of arbitrary power of imprisonment for constructive contempt?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I rise merely for the purpose of giving the hon. gentleman notice that it is my intention, at an early and convenient opportunity, to bring before the House for discussion the proceedings arising out of the imprisonment of John J. Hawke, editor of the *Moncton Transcript*, for alleged constructive contempt of the New Brunswick Court; and probably before that discussion is disposed of, the hon. gentleman, if he sees the feeling of the House is in that direction, may make up his mind that it is desirable to enlarge the scope of the present Bill by making it refer to proceedings of that kind, and limiting, if such is the wisdom of the House, the arbitrary power which seems to be vested in the judges, as seen in the action of those gentlemen in question. I do not propose to discuss the matter now, but merely to give the hon. gentleman notice that I will bring forward the matter.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the hon. gentleman for giving me notice, but I shall esteem it a greater favor if he informs me at a subsequent time when he proposes to bring the matter forward, because I shall have to make enquiries at a distance.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COPYRIGHT ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 124) to amend the Copyright Act, chap. 62 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: The effect of this Bill will be to adopt in Canada the provisions of the Berne convention relating to copyright.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. WATSON asked, What amount of lands retained by the Dominion Government as provided for in 49 Victoria, chapter 9, is situated within the Province of Manitoba? Also, what amount of said lands have been retained west of the boundary of the Province of Manitoba and east of 3rd Meridian?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the defining of the lands which are to be retained under the Act mentioned have been proceeding, and they will be completed as soon as possible after the passing of the resolution respecting the company's land grant now before Parliament.

Mr. WATSON asked, 1. Whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has made a selection of all lands granted to it under clause 11 of Canadian Pacific Railway contract? 2. What amount of said lands have been selected within the boundary of the Province of Manitoba? 3. What amount of said lands have been selected between the western boundary of the Province of Manitoba and 3rd Meridian?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 1. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have selected nearly 7,000,000 acres of the lands granted under clause 11 of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. 2. The area of lands selected within the boundaries of Manitoba is, in acres 1,818,330. 3. The area of lands selected between the western boundary of Manitoba and the 3rd Initial Meridian is, in acres, 2,939,440.

Mr. LAURIER asked, 1. What number of acres is there of unsold lands which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company propose to receive by deed of bargain and sale to trustees under sub-section c of the Resolutions now before the House? 2. What portions of such lands lie within the Railway Belt? 3. How many acres of those lands are there in Manitoba, and how many in the Territories, east of the 3rd Meridian? 4. How many acres have been sold by the company, paid for, and the deeds completed? 5. How many acres have been sold, but the sales are still incomplete? How much paid on the same, and how much remains due, and when and how payable?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am able to answer one of these questions, but not the whole satisfactorily, as the information must be obtained from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I have asked the company to provide the information and I expect it any moment.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps you will answer the questions to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If you please.

LIGHTHOUSE ON STAG ISLAND.

Mr. MONCRIEFF asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to construct and establish a lighthouse on Stag Island, in the River St. Clair?

Mr. FOSTER. The department has been gathering information and making enquiries with respect to the necessity of establishing a lighthouse on Stag Island, and the matter is now under consideration. At the time the Supplementary Estimates come down I shall be able to answer the hon. gentleman definitely.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT STRATHROY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Has a site been selected for the proposed public buildings at Strathroy? If so, where is the location? Has any, and what progress been made towards the erection of such public buildings?

Mr. THOMPSON.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The site has not yet been selected.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee, to-morrow, to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that there shall be payable, in respect of his attendance at each Session of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories, to each elected member thereof, an indemnity of \$500, and to each legal expert, for the like attendance, an indemnity of \$250, in addition in each case to his actual travelling expenses, subject to a proportionate reduction for each day's absence from a sitting of the Assembly, the amount of such reduction and of such travelling expenses to be ascertained in such manner as the Governor in Council prescribes; that there shall be payable to the Speaker of the said Legislative Assembly an annual salary of \$500, and to the Clerk of the said Assembly, acting also as Secretary to the Lieutenant Governor, an annual salary of \$2,000; and that all such payments shall be made out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This, of course, relates to the House of Assembly in the North-West Territory. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he has considered the propriety of placing at the disposal of the Governor and Legislature of the North-West Territory the same grant as that which the Provinces receive in proportion to their population; leaving to them to appoint their own clerk, regulate their own affairs, and to spend the money so given, in the way that they think best in the public service. The hon. gentleman knows at the present time that this assembly has really no funds with which to carry on the business of legislation, except such as the Government here may place at its disposal. If there was an account opened with the Territory, the moment a Legislature is established and money placed at their disposal, when they come to be admitted as a Province of course the whole sum so received by that means could be taken into consideration. It always seemed to me, that that would be the rational way to deal with them whenever they had a legislative assembly. I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman has considered the subject, and whether he proposes to invite parliamentary action in the matter? It will be perceived that it would be a little more reasonable, in conferring on them the power of legislation and representation, that they should have funds with which to carry on their operations.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This discussion will arise more properly on the second reading of the Bill. I will say to my hon. friend that we do not propose to put in any such vote for this year. The territories are not quite without revenue, as the hon. gentleman knows, and I have no doubt they dispose of that revenue to the best advantage of the territories. Those revenues are very small, certainly, and I am quite ready to admit the merits of the suggestion of the hon. gentleman. The idea is to make as little change as possible until they have a purely elective assembly representing the people. They will be obliged, after the elections, to meet very soon, and to consider what the wants of the country and what administrative action here they think would be most satisfactory for that country. The measure before the House is intended merely to carry out the principle, with all due respect to their suggestions for the future. From time to time we have had a series of resolutions passed by the mingled council, in which parties were nominated and parties elected. Those are contradictory in themselves and cannot be supposed really to represent the feelings of the people. We propose to make no appropriation of a sum to be disposed of by the Governor there, including the Legislature, until they have really a Local Legislature and ascertain what their own ideas are on the subject.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course I do not propose to enter into a discussion, and I am making only a suggestion now. Those people are contributing their proportion to the taxes of the country at the present time. In all the

Provinces a certain portion of the revenue, so much *per capita*, is paid over to the Provinces as provincial revenue for provincial purposes. My remarks had reference to the intention of the Government when the hon. gentleman's Bill is adopted, and the Legislature made completely elective. It does not seem to me, and I do not say it with a view to provoking controversy, that it is not a matter of negotiation to know how much they are entitled to. As a matter of right they should be entitled to the same amount *per capita*, revenue for local purposes, as in the Provinces, and which should be accounted for at the time of Union.

Motion agreed to.

THE RAILWAY ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 24) to amend and consolidate the Railway Act.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2, sub-section *p*,

Mr. MULOCK. This clause, defining the word "near," refers to the proximity of one railway to another. Would it not be advisable to define the word with reference to some point as well? In Acts of incorporation the word "near" is used to define the route taken; but I do not know how any court could determine whether any railway was exceeding its powers when it is authorized to go to or near a point. In this vast continent that might mean many miles away. While I do not wish to embarrass any company, I think it would be well to give some statutory definition of the word "near" under such circumstances.

Mr. TISDALE. It is easy to define the word, having regard to the relation of one railway to another; but if we try to define it in relation to the routes of railroads, it seems to me we should define the object the hon. gentleman has in view, because "at or near" any point, describing a route, will depend on all the circumstances. No difficulty has arisen from the want of such a definition, that I am aware of. Sometimes a court would hold that a quarter of a mile was near, and in other cases they might hold that two miles was near.

Mr. MULOCK. Or fifty miles.

Mr. TISDALE. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Where will you draw the line?

Mr. TISDALE. The courts will always draw the line according to the circumstances, and give a reasonable construction to the word, as they do in other cases. But I think if we define the word in a railroad Act, we would create greater difficulties than now exist.

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose a railway was incorporated to build to or near a certain town which may be near a certain other town. It might be within five or ten miles of the other town, and the engineering difficulties might be precisely the same in both cases. There might be no such circumstances as the hon. gentleman suggests to enable the court to determine how the word "near" should be construed. I do not think it is right to incorporate a railway company, giving it the utmost freedom in the choice of a particular route, thus causing one municipality to compete with another, and perhaps obliging it, by force of circumstances, to give a large bonus to bring the line within its neighborhood. If the route is not defined by the Act of incorporation, you give the company practically a roving commission, enabling it not only to commit the abuse I speak of, but perhaps to affect existing rights. Therefore I am satisfied that it is in the public interest that we should not incorporate these companies at large. I would suggest this. Every railway company under the general Act, has power to build branches six

miles in length, and I think the word "near" might be defined here to mean not more than six miles. In the North-West, where there is a vast prairie country, engineering difficulties would not arise to aid the court in determining the meaning of the word. Suppose a company were incorporated to build a road in the North West near to a certain town. In that vast country fifty miles are equivalent to not more than five or ten miles in the older Provinces. Surely a company should not have the power to choose a location as wide as fifty miles; but what would enable a court to determine whether it was exceeding its powers or not?

Mr. EDGAR. I think it is just as easy for a court to determine when one railway comes near another as it is when a railway comes near a point; and I think it is quite as necessary to define the meaning of the word "near" in the latter as in the former. Not a Session passes in which a number of Bills are not put through the Railway Committee saying that the railway shall commence at or near a town or city or a certain point. This certainly leaves a great deal of doubt as to the distance intended, and I think that both for the general purposes of a public railway and for the legal effect of such a provision, some definition of distance, say four, five or six miles, should be covered by the words "at or near." I would suggest to add to this clause as it stands, "and near to a point or municipality when some part of it is within five or six miles thereof."

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think it is quite so easy to define the word "near," in relation to the construction of a railway, as it is in relation to its operation. The definition would have to be of an entirely different character. When we are defining the word "near" in this sub-section, we are dealing with the interchange of traffic and matters of that kind, in relation to which proximity must be pretty close, but when we come to deal with the word "near" in relation to the termini of a railway, as the hon. member for York mentioned, a very much larger limit must be given. Then, take a charter in which it is provided that a railway shall be built from a point beginning at or near a certain town. There would also be a good deal of practical difficulty in defining that word, because we would be giving a material limitation to a large number of charters which Parliament has already passed.

Mr. MULOCK. It would not be retroactive.

Mr. THOMPSON. In relation to those railways which have not been commenced, it probably would. The limitation of six miles in some cases would hardly do. Some of the statutes, for instance, are for lines not six miles in length, and it would defeat the limitation in the charter altogether if we were to apply so lax a limit to such lines. The whole thing depends on the kind of country through which a line passes and the kind of termini it has. The hon. gentleman's suggestion, however, deals with a separate subject, which we can consider later, if he thinks the matter is of sufficient importance.

On sub-section *r*,

Mr. THOMPSON. In this section I do not think there is any change in the law; it is only a little more full.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would suggest to add the words "or other erection" after "railway bridge."

Mr. THOMPSON. I will add those words.

Mr. BARRON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if it would not be well to define the meaning of the word "railway," as including the lessees of a railway. I have found in my professional practice that the Grand Trunk Railway, as lessee of the Midland Railway, have escaped all liability

ties from injuries resulting from overhead bridges, by reason of not being met by this particular Railway Act. I find that the sections referring to overhead bridges in this new Bill are almost similar to the sections in the old Railway Act. The word "operate," however, if new, may cover this objection. The hon. gentleman will remember that the other night we discussed the necessity of providing that all railways leasing other roads should be liable for damages resulting from overhead bridges, such as did result in the case of the Niagara Central.

Mr. THOMPSON. I did consider this question. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to show me the case, and it seemed to me that provision ought to be made, and if we find it is not clear in the Bill that such provision is made, we will attend to that suggestion.

Mr. MULLOCK. Why except Government railways? Are they not held liable as common carriers?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, but we have a special Act for them.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does that Act provide in the same way as this?

Mr. THOMPSON. It regulates the liability of the Government as a common carrier.

On section 4,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Can we compel local railways, built under local charters, to come under this Act? They are not works at all under the control of the Government of Canada, but they are entirely under the control of the Local Legislatures, and are subject to such provisions as the Local Legislatures may pass. This Act, however, brings them in for certain purposes under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament, and, if they can be brought in for one purpose, they can for all. Unless these are for the general advantage of Canada, they are altogether without the purview of this Legislature.

Mr. THOMPSON. That clause is the same as the other, excepting that the other is contained in two provisions, owing to the Bill being in two parts, and this is merely throwing the two provisions into one, but, if the hon. gentleman thinks that it is of any importance, we will let that section stand.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. gentleman knows that only the other day an information was filed against a railway in New Brunswick, and my attention was called to this matter in that way, and it struck me that it was a question whether we had any power to make any work which was within the control of the Local Legislature of the Province, liable to this Act, because, if you can do that in one case, you may make them liable to the whole of the provisions of the Consolidated Railway Act. I think that, as long as these railways are under local legislation, the Local Legislature is paramount in dealing with them.

Mr. THOMPSON. The intention is only to bring them under our jurisdiction in regard to matters in which we certainly have jurisdiction, such as offences, penalties and statistics. However, we will let it stand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No doubt we can bring these railways under the jurisdiction of this Legislature in certain matters, but I think we have gone far beyond our jurisdiction already in declaring certain railways to be for the general advantage of Canada, though they have been constructed under local authority. I think that there is no doubt that, when these questions are argued in the courts, our action will be declared to have been *ultra vires*, and I do not think we should go any further in that direction.

On section 8,

Mr. THOMPSON. This is simply to provide that certain members of Council shall be members of the Railway Com-
Mr. BARRON.

mittee *ex officio*. The present law provides in section 58 that the Governor General may appoint such members as he thinks fit to be members of the Railway Committee, but this clause declares that the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Justice shall be *ex officio* members of the Railway Committee of Council.

Mr. TISDALE. I think that when the quorum is only two one should be the Minister of Justice. Of course, if the whole of the members are there, it is all right, but we ought to have the Minister of Justice always there.

Mr. THOMPSON. We may go back to that question hereafter.

On section 10,

Mr. MULLOCK. I would call the attention of the Minister to sub-section c of this clause. It appears to give the Railway Committee power to fix the liabilities of companies transgressing the provisions of sub-sections a and b, section a dealing with the rate of speed at which railway trains may be run. Now, it might be held that was the only liability the railway company incurred. Of course the Minister does not intend it should have such a meaning as that. A railway running its train beyond this speed, through a thickly-populated section, might cause damage far in excess of anything for which section c provides a remuneration. Therefore I think it would be well to qualify section c, so that shall not interfere in any way with the liability of the company in any court for damages for which it might be liable.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no objection to that. It is a mere copy, however. I propose this as a sub-section:

"The imposition of any such penalty shall not lessen or affect any other liability which any company may have incurred."

On section 11,

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to that clause, which seems to be largely new, perhaps the Minister can point out what provisions are based upon the recommendation of the Railway Committee?

Mr. THOMPSON. No, I cannot, from any memorandum I have here. If the hon. gentleman desires, we will let that clause stand for the present.

Mr. MULLOCK. I would like to recall the attention of the Minister to the amendment we have just made in section 10. I think we should use the word "person," instead of the word "company," so as, for instance, to meet the case of an engine-driver abusing his power and disobeying orders, resulting in loss of life or damage, for which he might be personally liable.

Mr. THOMPSON. Very well; I accept the suggestion.

On section 20,

Mr. MITCHELL. Will not this section be required to be amended so as to make it consistent with section 17?

Mr. THOMPSON. No, I think not, as construed together. They will have a right to review their own order, but no other tribunal would.

Mr. MULLOCK. When does it become final?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is final as soon as it is made.

Mr. EDGAR. There is no appeal except to itself.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no objection to making a change. I propose that it read: "shall, subject to the provisions of sub-section 17, be final."

Mr. EDGAR. It is a question whether four weeks public notice of the regular annual meeting is not more than is necessary. Special general meetings should be well notified, but general annual meetings are fixed by statute.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are not those the provisions of the Model Bill?

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think so.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think so.

Mr. TISDALE. Under the Model Bill it was found this Session that there was no power to call a special meeting, and the idea is to have one class of notice for all classes of meetings.

Mr. EDGAR. I think four weeks is too much notice for an ordinary annual meeting.

Mr. THOMPSON. Let it stand, please, and I will consider it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it better to have a uniform rule with regard to giving notice of those meetings, and I should be in favor of having this clause passed.

Mr. TISDALE. Four weeks is not too much for important meetings, such as the issue of bonds. All the large companies give that notice, and many of them six weeks. I think it is better to have the clause adopted.

On section 44,

Mr. MITCHELL. I think that there should be a rule that the proxies at meetings should be held by shareholders only.

Mr. TISDALE. Why?

Mr. MITCHELL. Because I do not think that outsiders should be allowed to come in and discuss questions.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In banks outsiders are now allowed to hold proxies.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think it is usual for proxies to be put in the hands of anybody but shareholders, but if a shareholder wishes to appoint his counsel, I do not see why he should not be allowed to do it.

Mr. TISDALE. It has always been the law and it has always worked well. The people may not notice those little changes and some company may hold a meeting which might be illegal on account of this.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there anything in the Act saying that the head of a municipality should be admitted as a shareholder? Suppose a municipality took stock, the municipality of course could not all be present, but it might be represented by its head.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will look into that question and see.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will you enquire as to whether the proxies should be held by shareholders or not?

Mr. THOMPSON. I would like to take the opinion of the House on that matter.

Mr. MITCHELL. You might consider it when you are amending the Act.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will.

On section 49,

Mr. CHARLTON. Why is it necessary to exclude stockholders holding less than twenty shares from the board of directors?

Mr. TISDALE. Twenty shares is the qualification adopted by the Railway Committee in the Model Bill. The committee thought that anyone who was not interested to that extent should not fill so important a position.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose that this section only applies to cases where no provision is made in a special Act for a similar sum.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). I think a provision should be introduced which would prevent a director acting as security for a contractor. In many cases the security is the real contractor.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will insert that provision.

On section 60,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Are those words "absence or illness" not too general? What do they mean?

Mr. THOMPSON. They mean that when the president is away, the vice-president shall act in his place.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The question might be raised as to the authority of the vice-president, as to whether the president was really absent or not. I would suggest to leave those words out.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then you would give the vice-president authority to act even when the president is there, and difficulty might ensue.

Mr. TISDALE. This is the wording of the old law, and no difficulty has arisen under it. The president is head, and in his absence the vice-president. It simply means that when the head is there he must do the work, but that when absent the vice-president has his powers.

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose to add the words "or in case of a vacancy in the office of the president."

On section 62,

Mr. HALL. I do not see any necessity for making the date of the annual balancing of accounts the 30th day of June, because there are many companies whose books are balanced, under their charters, on other dates.

Mr. THOMPSON. The object is to have the accounts closed at such a time that we can get the statistics in time for the meeting of Parliament.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me the object is very desirable, because it is well to have uniformity.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It will cause a great deal of inconvenience and difficulty to many companies if they should be compelled to change the date at which their financial year closes. Many of them make their annual statements on the 31st December.

Mr. MITCHELL. It will cause inconvenience only for one year, and will enable us to receive the statistics in proper time, and create uniformity.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Some of the companies, by their special Acts, are obliged to make up their accounts at a different date. Many of them must hold their annual meeting in May and make their accounts up to the 31st December. You might as well compel insurance companies to change the date of their annual meetings and statements of account.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We have done that.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Not with every insurance company.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think this provision could apply to any company which has a special provision in its Act, and it is impossible to get the returns in time for Parliament, unless we have a uniform date. One of the recommendations of the Commission was that there should be a uniform date, and it is impossible to fix that uniform date at a better one than the 30th June.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the statement has to be made up to the 31st December, it makes only the difference of half a year, and that will not entail any serious inconvenience.

On section 69,

Mr. HALL. It is a very unusual thing that dividends should be declared by the shareholders. As a rule, the dividends are declared by the directors. I suppose the object of this is that the dividends should only be declared from the profits that might be made, and I think it might be provided that the directors should only declare dividends on the clear profits of the undertaking.

Mr. THOMPSON. This is the exact section which was in the old Act, but I will consider the matter.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that the word "clear" should be struck out, and the word "net" should be substituted.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me that that clause goes a little too far. It says:

"At the annual meeting of the shareholders of the company, a dividend shall be declared out of the clear profits of the undertaking, unless such meeting decides otherwise."

Why should the power be given to the meeting to decide otherwise? Surely we are not going to give power to the meeting of the shareholders to declare a dividend out of capital?

Mr. THOMPSON. It simply gives them power to refuse to declare a dividend.

Mr. MITCHELL. This section really gives them power to provide for a dividend out of the capital.

Mr. TISDALE. Section 71 provides for that case.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think this clause should be amended so as to read that the dividend may be declared out of the net profits, and leaving out all after the word "unless."

Mr. WELDON (St. John). According to this, they can only declare a dividend once a year, while some companies declare a dividend every six months.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That is true.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would it not be well to insert the word "only" after the word "shall"?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the intention of the Act is to prevent the directors making a dividend from funds arising out of fortuitous circumstances, and to prevent the irregular declaration of dividends, and to prevent the directors, without consulting the shareholders as to what dividend shall be declared, making such a dividend.

Mr. HALL. Why are these more applicable to railway companies than to banks or any other joint stock companies? In those companies, the directors always declare the dividend.

Mr. THOMPSON. The operations of railway companies are more expensive than others, such as banks, but, of course, I am in the hands of the committee in regard to this matter.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I see that this clause provides only for an annual dividend, and, supposing the annual meeting fails, no dividend can be declared that year.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The Grand Trunk has a semi-annual meeting at which it declares dividends.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Why should you not say that a dividend might be declared at an annual or special general meeting of shareholders?

Mr. TISDALE. It seems to be the policy that directors shall not declare dividends without the consent of the shareholders. That has been the law, and I cannot see any reason for changing it. The Grand Trunk Railway Company has special legislation for that purpose, but I think it

Mr. MITCHELL.

would be a mistake to do the same thing in regard to other railway companies. If that is done, you must authorise semi-annual meetings instead of annual meetings. I think we should be careful to see that these companies have money in the banks out of which to pay for labor, and for accidents, and all that sort of thing, and, as a rule, with regard to most of our railway companies, there is no occasion for semi-annual meetings to declare dividends, because there are no dividends to declare.

Mr. MITCHELL. The only instance I know of where semi-annual dividends are declared is the Grand Trunk Railway. The other railways are only authorised to declare dividends annually. I do not see that it is necessary to declare semi-annual dividends on any of these railways. I would suggest that the section should be so amended as to read that:

"At the annual meeting of the shareholders of the company, a dividend shall be declared only out of the net profits of the undertaking."

And leave out the words "unless such meeting decides otherwise." I think that would meet the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The way in which the clause now reads is:

"At the annual meeting of the shareholders of the company, a dividend may be declared out of the net profits of the undertaking."

Mr. MITCHELL. That will do.

On section 71,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I do not know whether there is any penalty for the infringement of this clause. If there is not, it will be nugatory.

Mr. THOMPSON. This makes it illegal, but it would be very difficult to inflict a penalty when it is the act of the whole company at an annual meeting of the shareholders.

Mr. MULOCK. Would it not be possible to provide some means of enforcing this section? It says that the directors shall not pay a dividend on the stock until the undertaking has been completed and opened to the public, and then they may pay interest at the rate of 6 per cent. Supposing the directors violate this provision of the law, what will you do? The clause says:

"The directors may, in their discretion, until the railway is completed and opened to the public, pay interest at any rate not exceeding 6 per cent. per annum."

If the proprietors pay more than 6 per cent., they should be held liable, and I suggest that they should be made liable for any excess, without any prejudice to the right to recover from the parties receiving the same.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will make a note of that.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. We also ought to have the time specified when the railway is to be completed. I do not think any railway in Canada is really completed, and therefore there is no definite time specified.

On section 73,

Mr. MULOCK. Would it not be proper to provide restrictions against shareholders disposing of stock which they have not paid up, where good shareholders may rid themselves of liability by transferring their stock to men of straw? Under the Joint Stock Companies' Act, there is a provision to meet such a case as that. Under that Act, if I remember rightly, the directors are not allowed to permit the transfer of stock that is not paid up in full, to other than substantial persons, or persons who are generally reputed to be substantial persons; and if they violate the provisions of that Act, they are liable. I would suggest that provision of the Act might be well incorporated here.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would it not restrict the transfer of shares very much?

Mr. MULOCK. I mean to say that when a man subscribes for stock and pays up, say, 10 per cent. upon it, and owes 90 per cent., he ought not to be at liberty to transfer that stock to a man of straw and leave other persons, who were induced to come in on the faith of his transaction, to meet the whole liability. I think there should be a limitation of transfer.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman will look at section 75—I think that meets the case.

Mr. MULOCK. That only deals with the transfer of stock on which there is no arrears.

Mr. THOMPSON. But suppose an individual takes 50 shares in a railway company, on which there is a call of 80 per cent., the rest may never be called up, and would the hon. gentleman make these shares never transferable?

Mr. MULOCK. No; you must not quarrel with me, but with Parliament that has laid down the principle under the Joint Stock Companies' Act. It is one thing for them to be in arrears, that is, to be overdue, and it is another thing to have liability that has not been called up at all. Now, the Joint Stock Companies' Act provides that a shareholder cannot rid himself of his contingent liability, however remote it may be, except with the consent of the directors, and the directorate must not give that consent. I ask that the same safeguard be put in here for the protection of the honest shareholder.

Mr. THOMPSON. Very well, we will let that stand for the present.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not think we need to waste any sympathies over the railway companies. I think the shareholders are in much more danger of being induced to take stock than are the railway companies to suffer. I think any gentleman who has any knowledge of the way railway companies are organised in this country, knows that there is much more danger of the shareholder being victimised, than of the company being imposed upon by allowing the shareholder freely to transfer his share. The Joint Stock Companies' Act, and the subjects it covers, are entirely different matters from railway companies. I think the hon. gentleman's grievance is entirely theoretical. It would certainly be a very inconvenient law to limit the transfer of shares. The ordinary law is that you must pay your calls in order that a company may go into effect. Now, the Joint Stock Companies' Act deals with a different class of subjects, small companies of all sorts, engaged in mercantile transactions, where business men carry on business for themselves. When railway companies are organised the general public are invited to subscribe, and they do subscribe, and they cannot transfer their shares unless they pay calls. You subscribe to stock, and the law says that if the company impose a call, that shall be paid, otherwise the shares are free to be transferred. I think it would be a great mistake in the interests of the construction of railways, and it would rather be putting the boot on the wrong leg, to give railway companies more power over people subscribing stock than they have now.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not seeking to protect railway companies particularly, but to prevent injustice. We are now on the eve of a great boom in railway building, particularly of short lines in the North-West, and these railways incur liabilities particularly to creditors, and the provision I suggest would be, in the first instance, in the protection of creditors. We have no right to allow partners to escape their liability. These shareholders are limited partners by virtue of the Act, and the general law of partnership applies, that partners are liable to pay the creditors of the concern. In this case they are only liable to the extent of their shares. They undertake to pay at some time or other a certain sum of money. The shareholders

may not choose to make calls, there may be arrears in regard to the liability, but the liabilities exist, and if unpaid the creditors can proceed against the shareholders and recover payment. To allow solvent shareholders to transfer stock and escape liability renders it possible to commit a fraud upon creditors. Then again it would leave shareholders, who perhaps did not have the consent of the directors, liable to pay in full, whereas other shareholders might be allowed to escape. I think it is proper that such a provision as I have suggested should be introduced.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If you put such a clause in the Act you will very soon have few stockholders.

On section 75,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). This section should be struck out, as it is infringing on the powers of the Local Legislatures. We have no right to determine what is personal and what is real estate; that is a question of property and civil rights.

Mr. THOMPSON. All property and civil rights in railways under our control may be regulated by this Parliament. As regards railways, we have a right to legislate over property and civil rights, as being within our jurisdiction and not within the jurisdiction of any other Legislature. We can absolutely forfeit or do anything we please with railways under our control, and it is only as to them this Act applies.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). This section has nothing to do with the railway itself. It is more than doubtful if we have the right to determine that certain property with which we have power to deal is real or personal property. It is of great consequence, not at this moment perhaps, because I think the law is the same in all the Provinces of the Dominion. We have in the civil code of Quebec a declaration that shares in railways are personal property; but supposing the Legislature of Quebec thought proper to change that, I think it would apply to railways as well as to anything else. This question is of great consequence, on account of the law concerning marriage settlement. Under our law there is a community of property between the parties, and in that community is included every kind of personal property. It would raise a very serious question, supposing the Legislature of Quebec should make a law declaring that railway shares are real property.

Mr. THOMPSON. I admit, of course, that we should not interfere with the rights of property unnecessarily, but it must be remembered that all the other seventy-two sections have dealt with the question of property and civil rights. If we hesitate as to our power on that subject we surely must reconsider our position as to the transfer of shares and the declaration of dividends, and everything of the kind. But the hon. gentleman will see the consequences that will ensue. If the doctrine can be sustained that it is only for the Provincial Legislatures to say whether these shares are real or personal property, this result would follow, that the Provincial Legislature might declare them to be real estate, or interest in real estate, and then they would not be transmissible in the way prescribed, and every provision of the Bill as to the rights of shareholders would have to be altered. It is inevitable that the power must rest entirely here, and that we should deal with railway shares as being personal property.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I do not dispute that question of civil rights necessarily incident to railways can be dealt with by this Legislature. I do not, however, see the bearing of this determination of the nature of railway property as regards the building of a railway. What necessity is there, when we are legislating on railways, to say what the nature of railway property shall be?

Mr. THOMPSON. It seems to me most material to the construction and working of a railway that the interests of the shares shall be personal property, and that only. If we are to treat them as interests in real estate, the holders may at any moment interfere with the operation of the railway, and claim a division of the property, and their shares would be transmissible to their heirs, and a new set of shareholders would come in in that way. It is vitally connected with the exercise of the necessary control over the companies which are authorised to construct railways under our control. I would be sorry to be disposed to interfere unduly, but it seems to me to be necessary.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I will point out the difficulty which this may bring about. It is this: Personal property is a word used in English law, but we have not that word in our Quebec law. If you state that railway property will be personal property, it will raise a difficulty in our Province, where the law is not the same as in the other Provinces.

Mr. THOMPSON. I now see the particular point of the hon. gentleman's objection. It may need another word added to describe the kind of personal property it would be in the Province of Quebec; and I will therefore let the section stand, with that view.

On section 83,

Mr. TISDALE. I see that that clause is changed materially, although it does not show it in the printing. There is a portion of the old clause left out, as regarding the power to sell shares, which may affect railway companies already incorporated. It is a question whether those powers should be taken from the companies that are already organised. Some of those companies from time to time do sell shares that are not altogether paid up. I think the Canada Southern, and the Grand Trunk, and possibly the Canadian Pacific Railway, have a large amount of capital stock yet unsubscribed, and under the former Railway law they would have a perfect right to sell this, while according to the present Bill they would be deprived of that right. Formerly this unsubscribed stock could be sold, or they could make loans for it. On ordinary small railways it would not matter very much; still I would like to know if there is any objection to that power being retained. It would seem to me that there is an objection to its not being retained in the case of companies now incorporated, and I should think we ought to be careful how we should deprive them of rights they have had up to this time.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not see what is the use of retaining that provision.

Mr. TISDALE. Formerly they could sell or pledge the stock.

Mr. EDGAR. Not unless it is subscribed.

Mr. TISDALE. Yes, they could get subscriptions for it. It struck me it must have been put in the Railway Act for some object, and I think we should be careful in making such a radical change.

Mr. EDGAR. I think it is far better the way it is in the Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the view of the Minister of Railways was that it was too large a power to give to directors, to sell or pledge unsubscribed stock.

Mr. TISDALE. I have not heard that any railway companies object to this provision, but I know that in times past some of them have used that power to raise money. We know the Grand Trunk at one time sold several millions of that sort of stock, and, by what the hon. gentleman opposite says, I think the committee have hardly got the correct idea.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).

about the matter. There is a very material difference between people buying at 20 cents on the dollar, and subscribing so that they will have to pay 100 cents on the dollar. I might be willing to buy \$10,000 and to pay \$1,000, but I would not want to pay \$10,000 and be liable to be assessed for a hundred, when it is only worth 10 cents. As you will see by the stock quotations, the companies deal in this by millions. I remember well when Parliament authorised the Grand Trunk to enlarge their capital stock, and they sold it at 10 cents on the dollar and realised a great deal of money, because it tempted people to buy it in the hope that it would be worth something. Though this was a very large power under the general Railway Act, we should be careful that we do not put ourselves in the position of legislating away companies' rights.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is not my hon. friend fighting a phantom. I do not think the illustration he has given occurs at all in relation to this particular section. The section says:

"The directors may sell, either by public auction or private sale, and in such manner and on such terms as to them seem meet, any shares so declared to be forfeited, or may pledge such forfeited shares for the payment of loans or advances made or to be made thereon, or for the payment of"—

That is, only shares subscribed.

Mr. THOMPSON. What he complains of is that the provisions of the present law are left out, which enables the sale of unsubscribed stock by the directors.

Mr. TISDALE. After the word "forfeit" is left out several words, "Any shares remaining unsubscribed of the capital of the company and they shall be allowed to pledge for loans of money." That is a serious change and might affect some rights of those companies very largely.

Mr. HALL. I think it ought to be left out so far as general powers are concerned. The illustration the hon. gentleman gave of the Grand Trunk was by special legislation and under special circumstances. We can always give that power under similar special circumstances. I think the power is wisely left out of this Bill, of giving the company permission to sell their stock at less than its par value.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not think the special legislation the hon. gentleman referred to went so far. The special legislation authorised the company to increase their capital, and I think they sold it under this power of the general Railway Act.

Mr. HALL. They ought to have had special legislation for both.

Mr. THOMPSON. It does seem to me that power like that should be specially given. The powers here given are often overlooked by people who become shareholders. It is unsafe to entrust power like that to every class of directors.

On section 86,

Mr. MULOCK. I would point out that if you allow a shareholder to transfer his stock, on which there are no arrears, and on which he is liable to creditors, you allow him to escape from the provisions of that Act. The shareholder who is liable at the time ceases to be liable if you allow him to transfer. Section 86, pretending to give security to the creditor, can be defeated under the provisions of a prior section.

On section 88,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think you should have added the words, "Which shall be open to the inspection of shareholders."

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, I think that might be done.

On section 89,

Mr. THOMPSON. The Act at present provides that 10 per cent. of the capital stock must be expended on the construction of the railway within three years. It is proposed by this Bill to change the amount to 25 per cent. and to reduce the time to two years.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does that affect any special charter already granted?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. EDGAR. It seems to me that this is rather hard, because a large amount raised from bonds or otherwise may be expended, although 25 per cent. of the capital stock may not be expended within two years, and if not the powers of the company cease. I think if this were put into effect it would cause the forfeiture of almost every charter, because the system is to do the work by Government subsidy and the issue of bonds, and it is very seldom that 25 per cent. of the stock is expended in ten years, much less in two years. I think 10 per cent. would probably be enough.

Mr. THOMPSON. Ten per cent. would probably be too low. We might make it 15 per cent. instead of 25.

Mr. MULOCK. Would it not be better to make this a percentage of the cash paid, because capital stock embraces a great deal that is given away for nothing.

Mr. THOMPSON. If you said ten per cent. of the cash, that would mean very little.

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose a company had \$1,000,000 capital stock, and gave away \$800,000 of it; there would only be \$200,000 which represented cash.

Mr. THOMPSON. We should make it so that it is impossible to give away so much stock.

Mr. MULOCK. Every special Act allows stock to be given away in that way.

Mr. THOMPSON. It would be subject to this provision, which would make that unworkable.

Mr. EDGAR. As I understand, this provision will only apply to cases where there is no time limit fixed by a special Act?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 90, sub-section *d*,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Suppose a railway company was desirous of crossing an Indian reserve, which is not held in fee simple, but in common, how would it obtain the power?

Mr. THOMPSON. The title could be given with the assent of the Crown,

On sub-section *e*,

Mr. EDGAR. Surely this section, which permits a company to remove trees which stand within six rods from either side of the railway, or which are liable to fall across the railway track, cannot be intended to apply to the open country, because it would include trees in a man's orchard.

Mr. THOMPSON. If they fell on the track.

Mr. EDGAR. It includes all trees. If you strike out the word "or" it will be all right.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think there ought to be some provision that if the timber that is felled by the railway company is converted to their use, they ought to pay for it.

Mr. TISDALE. That is covered further on.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I hope it is, because the companies take timber and convert it into bridges, and refuse to pay the proprietors.

Mr. MITCHELL. There may be hardships about that. I have heard of a railway company going through a country and taking trees which were nothing but rampikes only about the size of a man's leg, and the owner made a claim on the company for using some of these rampikes for ties. We know that if certain obligations are placed on the railways they may be taken advantage of by some of these proprietors.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. MITCHELL. There was a claim once put in for something of that kind—but I will spare the hon. gentleman's blushes, and not go on.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I confess I have not heard anything from the hon. gentleman that removes the objection against placing the railway companies in any different position from that which they will occupy under the amendment I suggest. I do not know to whom the hon. gentleman refers. He should have told the committee when he went so far as he did.

Mr. MITCHELL. I shall certainly do so if you wish.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). But no matter whether those trees to which he refers were, in his opinion, of little value or not, they were the property of somebody else, and they should not have been converted by the company to their own use without compensating the proprietor. However, I am not speaking with regard to this particular subject, because I do not think it should have been alluded to by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), but I say that when trees are removed from the vicinity of a railway by the railway company and used in the construction of the railway, or for any other purpose, the value of those trees should be paid to the adjoining proprietor.

On sub-section *g*,

Mr. INNES. I would like to call the attention of the Committee to the large powers this section gives a railway company in respect of the closing up of roads, or making permanent embankments. You will notice by this section that it gives the company the power to make an embankment, and to close up a road or a road allowance. Of course section 91 provides that the company shall leave the road as nearly as possible as it was before, but we know well that in many cases railway companies exercise rather arbitrary powers in that respect. Section 92 provides for compensation, but in the case of municipalities it is very difficult indeed to assess the damages, as no individual is concerned. I think the section should be amended so as to be as much as possible in the interest of municipalities. There is a case in point in the corporation of Guelph, of which the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) knows. When the Grand Trunk was constructed, a good many years ago, they made a large embankment of 20 feet across the road allowance, and that road has never been made, and the company has never made an under-crossing. The matter is now in litigation. It is just possible, according to the terms of the clause, that the Railway Committee may make the under-crossing, but it provides that the approaches may be made by inclined planes, and these may be of such a nature as to render the crossing in a sense useless or impassable. I think the clauses should be modified in some way so as to conserve the rights of municipalities as much as possible, and to provide that these crossings shall be of such a nature that they will be useful. It should also provide for proper compensation to municipalities.

Committee rose.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee,

(In the Committee.)

On section 90, sub-section *g*,

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. member who called attention to the necessity for making a provision in favor of municipalities as regards the interference with embankments, aqueducts and bridges, will, I believe, acquiesce in the view that the company should have these powers. I have made a note of his suggestion that the municipality should have some protection, but in the meantime there can be no objection to this clause passing.

Mr. INNES. Do you mean both with regard to the proper crossing and with regard to the compensation?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. EDGAR. In this clause, the word "permanent" is quite new. I fancy it is taken from the English Act, but that makes a serious difference in the law as it has existed hitherto, because this gives power to the railway company to construct a permanent embankment across a roadway. That is entirely unusual, under our practice.

Mr. THOMPSON. As we go on, the hon. gentleman will find that there is a provision that, if the level of the highway is to be altered, the consent of the municipality has to be obtained, and if that consent cannot be obtained, it goes to the Railway Committee.

Mr. INNES. I think it is left altogether to the Railway Committee, and the power is taken out of the hands of the municipality.

Mr. EDGAR. That is in regard to running along a highway. I would like to ask if it is proposed to allow a railway company to obstruct a navigable stream?

Mr. THOMPSON. They cannot obstruct any navigable streams without the approval of the Governor in Council, under the Acts respecting the navigation of rivers.

Mr. EDGAR. Should not the power given under sub-section *h* be subject to the approval of the Railway Committee?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman will find that it is so.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to ask whether, under this clause, a railway is entitled to make all these obstructions in any direction without coming under the subsequent sections? Apparently, in regard to the permanent location of the road, its profile and alignment, the Railway Committee has control, but I think that in regard to these temporary proceedings they ought to have some control also.

Mr. HALL. I think some power should be given to a railway company in regard to highways. There is sufficient provision for Government control under sections 183, 184 and 185 of the general Act.

Mr. EDGAR. That is in regard to permanent construction, but this is only temporary.

Mr. LAURIER. These permanent powers taken under sub-section *h*, seem to be in conflict with clause 91, because the latter reads:

"The company shall restore (as nearly as possible) to its former state, any river, stream, water-course, high way."

Now, sub-section *h*, on which we are now, contemplates that the company shall have power to alter. I suppose the word "permanently" has been added since. It could not have been the original intention.

Mr. INNES.

Mr. THOMPSON. A highway, for instance, is to be restored as nearly as possible to its former state. It cannot be restored to its former place if it has been diverted.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, but if the alteration is to be made permanent how can it be restored to its former condition?

Mr. THOMPSON. The highway can be completed as well as it was before, or as nearly as possible.

Mr. LAURIER. The section now reads:

"Divert or alter, temporarily as well as permanently, the course of any such river, stream, water-course or highway."

Then clause 91 says:

"The company shall restore (as nearly as possible) to its former state, any river,"

And so on. Does not the hon. gentleman see a contradiction?

Mr. THOMPSON. It would be so, excepting for the words "as nearly as possible." I think that is about as close as we can get for a provision of that kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it is doubtful whether we can give such power. Of course they can do so in the English Parliament, because there is no other body having jurisdiction, but here there are Local Legislatures under whose jurisdiction all the property of the country is situated, and while we are authorised to incorporate a railway company, we cannot insist upon giving to that company any other powers than those which are necessary to its existence. We cannot do what we might do, if property and civil rights were under our jurisdiction. If a Province were to say, for instance, that a railway should drain the track in a particular way, that would apply to railways of the Dominion just as well as to railways of the Province. If a railway of the Province could exist when such powers are being exercised, so could a Dominion railway, and we could not protect the Dominion railway against the public policy of a Province.

Mr. THOMPSON. We cannot legislate on the subject of railways at all, if the hon. member's views are correct. We cannot invade the rights of property by allowing a company to take any lands, and if we cannot give them the right over land, the railway cannot be built.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My statement is, and it is in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, that if you have power to create a railway corporation, you have power to confer upon it all powers that are necessary to the existence of that corporation.

Mr. THOMPSON. And to enable it to carry out its undertaking.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But you cannot go beyond that. Suppose you were to authorise a railway company to build a road, and they located it along some river or water-way which would seriously interfere with the drainage of a large section of the country. I say you could not do that. That is my contention; and you could no more do that than a Local Legislature could deny you the right to create a railway corporation. Property and civil rights being vested in the Local Legislature, of course, do not deprive this Parliament from creating a corporation where such corporation comes within the exceptions in the 92nd section of the British North America Act. But surely you cannot give a railway corporation powers beyond that. For instance, you could not say that a railway corporation shall not drain its lands in the same way as any other portion of the municipality affecting the public health; if a railway corporation were to create a particular nuisance, you have not the right to say, by legislation here, that it should not be called upon to drain those lands in some other way. That is under the

jurisdiction of another body, and they have just the same right to legislate with regard to the conduct of a company created by this Legislature as they have with regard to the conduct of any citizen within the Province.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am afraid we cannot convince each other on these doctrines.

On section 101,

Mr. EDGAR. Do they decide who shall receive the compensation?

Mr. THOMPSON. In connection with the preceding clause I suppose it would be all right. It is just adopting the words of the Act amending the Indian Act of last Session.

On section 130,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I would suggest the propriety of changing this provision, which requires the map and the book of reference to be deposited in the office of the Clerk of the Peace, and make it the office of the Registrar, which is much more accessible to the general public, I think, in all the Provinces.

Mr. EDGAR. Besides, the Clerk of the Peace has no vault or safe place for keeping these plans, which are valuable and should be preserved for future reference. But the registry offices always have vaults.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, I think it should be the registry office.

On section 150,

Mr. LAURIER. This section provides that if the opposite party neglects to give notice to the company that he accepts the sum offered by it, or does not give the name of the person whom he appoints as arbitrator, the judge shall on the application of the company, appoint a person to be sole arbitrator. This seems to me to be rather arbitrary, as it would put the proprietor in that case altogether at the mercy of the sole arbitrator.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will let that stand.

On section 159,

Mr. LAURIER. This clause provides that the arbitrator may be a person professionally employed by either party. Is not that contrary to the general principle, that no one should be arbitrator who is interested in the suit or has expressed an opinion on it.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is the same as the law at present, and was really made in the interest of the property owner. The fact is that the property owner, in nine cases out of ten, selects some personal or professional friend as his arbitrator, but who is really an advocate, and the party on the other side does the same; then a third party, if they do not agree, is appointed to judge between the two.

Mr. EDGAR. The practical result of this is, as I know from professional experience, that the Railway Company employs one man who is a skilled surveyor as their arbitrator, and he, understanding the case, does not call in the number of witnesses that one not cognisant of the facts would. The other side selects their arbitrator on the same principle, and thus a great saving is made in the expenditure which would be entailed by calling in a large number of witnesses. Then, if these two disagree, they call in a third party.

Mr. THOMPSON. It looks unsound in principle, but it works really well after all.

On section 164,

Mr. THOMPSON. This section changes the percentage from double the amount mentioned under the notice served under section 146, to 25 per cent.

Mr. WELDON. On a small amount of land, 25 per cent. would be very little.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Better leave the law as it is.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, we will say 50 per cent.

On section 169,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to one great inconvenience which has arisen under the old clause. Our judges have decided in several cases, that no compensation can be awarded for witnesses, because, as they said, the witnesses must appear voluntarily. I have known cases where the parties have succeeded as against the railway company, but had to pay hundreds of dollars for witnesses, because the judges held that the witnesses appeared voluntarily, and that, therefore, the allowance to them could not be taxed. I think there should be some provision that the party that loses should pay the witnesses. Of course I am speaking of the law in the Province of Quebec, which is exactly the same as this clause, and it is under that that the judges have taken this position. I know, in my own practice, that a client of mine had to pay \$250 for witnesses, though he won his case.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will insert the words "including the proper allowance to witnesses."

On section 173,

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). That does not state how long notice shall be given before the application.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think the General Manager should be inserted, as well as the other officers.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, we will insert that, and make the notice ten days.

Mr. EDGAR. Why is the last part of the old clause left out?

Mr. THOMPSON. That is provided for in section 176.

On section 175,

Mr. THOMPSON. This is intended to enable the Railway Committee to impose conditions for the safety of trains passing over crossings which the Railway Committee may sanction. At present, the Railway Committee have only the power to approve or disapprove of the crossing, and sometimes, when the Committee ask that certain precautions shall be taken in regard to the crossing, they are told that they have no jurisdiction, and they can only get the control by refusing to allow the crossing until the parties agree to adopt the precautions. That is very indirect, and, therefore, this provision is made.

Mr. EDGAR. Does that arise in reference to the difference between the Grand Trunk and the Ontario and Quebec Railways.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, I think not. I did not hear that fully, but I have seen cases where this difficulty has arisen.

On section 176,

Mr. SHANLY. As this clause is somewhat cognate to sections 11 and 102, which have been allowed to stand, and as this section is a new one, I hope the Minister will allow it also to stand.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will agree to allow it to stand, as it is cognate to other clauses which are standing, but it is not new. It is simply a recasting of sub-section 13 of section 6.

Mr. SHANLY. In the expropriation of one company's property by another, that has not hitherto been the law. It is provided for in section 102, which has been allowed to stand, and therefore I ask that this should be allowed to stand also.

On section 177,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I cannot help thinking that this is an objectionable section, and that it is in all probability, beyond our jurisdiction. This section undertakes to control all crossings of railways, whether these are incorporated by the Provincial Legislatures or by the Parliament of Canada. Now, while we have a right to control corporations constituted by the Parliament of Canada, I do not think we have any authority to exercise jurisdiction over other corporations that have an equal right to existence, and an equal right to be protected against regulations and interference by a body that did not create them. Certainly the power to regulate or control implies the power to destroy, and the Bill here might establish regulations that would be so vexatious or so burdensome as completely to destroy the profitable character of roads that were incorporated by the Provinces; in fact they might make such regulations as would induce every railway corporation to seek to become a corporation of the Dominion, rather than of any one of the Provinces. I was not in the House during the Session that the Minister of Finance (I think it was) passed the Bill that usurped control over nearly all the local railways of this country. This is the first time the subject has come up since that period, and I wish to call the attention of the House for a moment to the provisions of the British North America Act upon this subject.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman allow it to stand for the present? We can discuss it more fully hereafter.

On section 183,

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to that clause, a very radical change is made in it. The old law provided that whenever a railway was carried along an existing highway, as distinguished from crossing it, the consent of the proper municipal or local authority thereof should be first obtained. I do not think the Railway Committee of the Privy Council should be substituted for that local authority. What means can they possibly have for knowing about the local interests affected by running railways along highways in every municipality where they may be constructed? It is not one of the class of cases that I think is at all proper for the Railway Committee to undertake, but is one that the municipalities have been accustomed to deal with.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will let that stand.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This subject is worthy of a good deal of consideration, and I think the time has come when the people of this country ought to have more protection against railways than they now have. It will be utterly impossible for the Railway Committee to deal with the various cases which require to be adjudicated upon. There seems to be a conflict between this clause and the 187th clause. This clause says:

"A railway shall not be carried along an existing line of highway."

But shall merely cross it. Clause 187 says:

"Whenever any portion of a railway is constructed, or authorised to be constructed, upon, or along, or across any street, or other public highway."

Clause 183 makes no provision whatever for any restriction being put upon railways as to the manner in which they shall cross highways. Then clause 187 provides, as I understand it, that no railway shall be constructed along or across any street or public highway at the railway level, without previously obtaining the consent of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Well, that would be all right if it was practicable, but how in the world can the Privy Council undertake to deal with the num-

Mr. SHANLY.

berless cases throughout the Dominion in which protection is required for the public? I am sure every member of this House must have within his own knowledge a number of cases where life and property are in danger every day in the week by railway crossings. I know one case of a crossing on the Northern Railway, which is practically within the yard of a station where there is not a day that life is not in danger. It may be said that this is the business of the municipality, but the municipalities have never yet, in any case that I am aware of, taken the matter up, and it is very certain that the Railway Committee cannot act, because the labor imposed upon them would be interminable. There should be some speedy and expeditious way of having these questions properly adjudicated, so that a railway shall not be permitted to cross a highway in a manner dangerous to life or property. Now, such a state of things as exists in the case I alluded to, and in several other cases within my knowledge, would not be tolerated in any other country. Any one who has travelled in England knows that, even upon branch lines upon which there is the least traffic, either by road or by railway, such a thing as a level crossing without some protection to the public is not permitted under any circumstances. But here we allow railways with long trains to go back and forward over crossings without affording any protection whatever, and the public have just to take their chance. The only protection they have is the privilege that, if a man is injured, he can bring suit against the company for damage, but that is a very poor compensation for the loss of life. I think the Government ought to deal with that class of cases. It has been supposed hitherto that it was so important to get railways built, that we should not interfere with their freedom of action in such matters, and that it was better to run a certain amount of risk than to put railways to the immense expense which they must incur if they provide proper protection. I do not think this 187th clause can be acted upon. I should like to know how, in cases such as I alluded to, and such as must be within the knowledge of this House, it is possible that a Railway Committee of the Privy Council can give us redress? It is one of those cases in which, it being nobody's business to act, and in which a remedy cannot be obtained without a great deal of expense, nobody undertakes it, so that we go on from year to year with an increased traffic, and yet the railways furnish no protection to life and property. I do think it is something that ought not to be tolerated any longer, and it is not tolerated in any other country in the civilised world.

Mr. EDGAR. I think that we should get section 183 amended as suggested. We want more protection to the public against railways. The whole of the plans and profile of the railway must be first submitted for the approval of the Railway Committee, before they can do anything. That is the safeguard, and it is a check on the companies. I propose that we should go back to the old provision that a railway shall not be carried alongside a road unless leave is obtained from the municipal or local authority.

Mr. HALL. It is idle to compare the condition of affairs in this country with that in England. It is said that there is no country where this state of things exist except Canada; in the United States level crossings are the rule, rather than the exception. It is idle to expect that we can have overhead and under-crossings; we are obliged to have level crossings in nine cases out of ten. The provision inserted is a very wise one. It would be unwise to go back and give power to municipalities to dictate as to how crossings shall be made. We might just as well tell individuals that they need not give up their lands to railways unless they are compensated according to the terms they choose to ask. Municipalities would impose crossings on railway companies which they could not comply with.

The Railway Committee of the Privy Council will safely guard the public interests, and it is a better tribunal resort than the one existing under which railway construction was first commenced in this country. The change is a wise one and it is in the general interests of the people.

Mr. O'BRIEN. No one has interfered, and the evil still exists. I do not say that we can get under or overhead crossings at every concession line; but some authority should have interfered in this matter long ago. Under this Bill there will be no interference, for it will be impossible for the Privy Council to take up all these cases. How are the people going to travel from remote parts, even of Ontario, to Ottawa, to see the Privy Council, in such a case as I have in mind this moment? I am not, I repeat, proposing that the company shall be obliged to make crossings at every concessional line, but there are a number of cases where protection should be afforded.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a point as to which I can confirm the statements made by the hon. gentleman who has last spoken. I recollect extremely well that in Kingston, or within two or three miles of it, eleven or twelve deaths occurred from the dangerous state in which railway crossings were left for many years. It was only after an enormous number of remonstrances, and after delegations had been sent to Ottawa, at very considerable expense, that the Railway Committee were at last, I believe, induced to take action. I doubt whether even at this moment the several crossings to which I allude have been put in proper shape. I dare say the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) will recollect the rather notorious crossing at Collins' Bay, where as many as ten lives were lost in the last twelve or fourteen years, and other crossings in the same vicinity where also lives were lost, and the crossing at Cataragui Road going out of Kingston. The appeal to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is a very tedious, expensive, and unsatisfactory proceeding. Very often the Ministers are away, very often it is difficult to obtain appointments at convenient times for delegations, and bringing people to Ottawa from a great distance necessarily involves a heavy expense. I should like to hear the opinion of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly). I know, as a matter of fact, not mere cases of inconvenience, but cases of very serious risk to lives of all persons who cross the railway track do occur, and if any means can be devised for providing some remedy, it is exceedingly desirable it should be done, even if we have to arm the judges of the land with some discretionary power to deal with the evil.

Mr. SHANLY. I quite remember the crossings to which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has referred. They were peculiarly dangerous; but I do not suppose that he, any more than the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), intends to propose that all level crossings shall be done away with, because, in this country, it would be utterly impossible to provide overhead or under-crossings at all highways. But, at the two places referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford, the crossings were peculiarly dangerous from the fact of there being short turns in the road. In cases of that kind I think it should be insisted on that overhead crossings be constructed. I rather think in one of those cases, that of Cataragui road, the cause of possible danger has been remedied lately, or, at least, it has been proposed to construct an overhead crossing at an early day. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) finds fault with the system of level crossings, especially in the vicinity of railway stations, but he does not point out a remedy. If we do not refer the matter to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, it is not to be supposed that that body can take cognisance of these dangerous crossings; but, when reported to them, this would be done. The Railway Committee is the gen-

eral court of appeal in these matters, and they could inspect crossings complained of through their officers. In the case of old-established crossings the municipalities might very fairly be asked to assist the railway companies in making the necessary improvements. Some of the earlier crossings were not dangerous until population increased and the roads were more used. I consider the Privy Council to be the best Court of Appeal in such cases, having, as they would, to deal, not only with cases of level crossings, but with all other subjects covered by the clauses of this Bill in which they are made sole judges. In those other instances the same objection might be taken, and it might be contended that some other authority should be established other than the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I think the clause as it stands is fairly protective of public safety. The appeal, I repeat, should be in the hands of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I do not think it is right or just that such matters should be left in the hands of municipalities, in regard to which I do not speak too harshly when I say that they are not, as a general rule, inclined to be over just to the railway companies.

Mr. COOK. In cities and towns I think gates might be erected at level crossings. We have an instance in Toronto in connection with Parkdale, where a great many accidents occurred. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council had been applied to frequently, but they would not move in the matter until, finally, there was an accident by which a valuable life was lost, and then the Privy Council gave the privilege to build the sub way, and it was built. On King street there is a crossing of about eight tracks, and that has been in a disgraceful condition for a number of years. Accidents occur there frequently, and, finally a nearly fatal accident having occurred, the Privy Council ordered the railway authorities and the city to build a subway there. The railways run through the town of Parkdale, and in some places the crossings are very dangerous; one place particularly so, because of a curve in the road and a high grade, where the trains come with great speed; and in this place, to my own knowledge, accidents have occurred. In places like this the railway companies should be compelled to put up gates, and it would not be very expensive. I believe that the public should be protected a little more than they are, and I believe, with the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that it is too expensive and too difficult to appeal to the Privy Council in such cases. It is too difficult to move the Privy Council when a railway company is concerned. Railways are great corporations, and they have very great influence. I do not care whether it is the hon. gentlemen who are occupying the Treasury benches to-day, or whether other gentlemen, are in power, but I know to my own knowledge that both sides are influenced largely by these corporations. Therefore, I think it would be in the interest, not alone of the Privy Council, and the members of the Privy Council, but of the country at large, that these influences should be removed, and that there should be a general Act by which the public would be fairly protected. The public of this country are not protected as they should be from these railway corporations, and I think it is about time that this House should study the public interest. I believe that the Privy Council would find it much to their advantage to see that the public are protected against these great railway corporations.

Mr. SHANLY. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken and with the hint which has fallen from my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that in all cities and towns there should be gates on the crossings. I am not so familiar with the cities of western Canada, but in Montreal it is never thought of having a level crossing without a gate. If they have none in Toronto, I can say that at the Parkdale crossing they have done a great deal

better, they have made an excellent under-crossing; in that instance, the municipality came to the aid of the railways.

Mr. O'BRIEN. How long did it take to get that done?

Mr. SHANLY. I do not know that; but it ought to be remembered that when those roads were first constructed they were scarcely dangerous at all, and that they only became to be so considered as the population increased. In the case of the Parkdale crossing, as I was the first person that constructed it, I ought to know something about it. When it came to be a great thoroughfare, and instead of being as formerly, an ordinary country road crossing, it was actually in the city, the necessity arose for giving increased protection. I remember the case, for I was applied to by some Toronto people for my opinion. As well as I remember, the Privy Council took notice of it very promptly. They had a meeting with the railway authorities, who divided the expense with the municipalities, and made an excellent safe crossing, better than gates could possibly be. I know that the King street crossing too, is a dangerous one, and I also know that it is in contemplation now to do something the same with it as was done in the case of the Parkdale crossing.

Mr. COOK. Oh, yes; it is under way now.

Mr. SHANLY. From having been a crossing in the open common it has become a crossing in the middle of the city. I am strongly of the opinion that the Privy Council is the proper court of appeal in those matters.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) has alluded to Montreal, and says that all the railway crossings in the streets are provided with gates. He does not know, perhaps, that outside the limits of the city proper, there are densely populated localities where the railways cross numerous streets, and where there are no gates to provide for the security of the people. He knows, probably, that every year we have to deplore the loss of many lives on account of the want of proper precautions on the part of the railway companies. I think it would be better if we had a clause in the Act which would immediately provide, instead of leaving it to the Railway Committee, that wherever a railway line goes across a densely populated town or district, the law would compel the company to build gates immediately and provide necessary safeguards against accidents. This would be moving in the direction that my friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has indicated. Take, for instance, the town of St. Henri, in the western portion of Montreal city, which has 2,000 of a population. The inhabitants of that town have applied several times to the Grand Trunk for gates to be put on the streets where the railway line crosses, and they have also applied here, but as yet there are no proper safeguards against accidents there. It is my opinion that the law should provide immediately that whenever a railway crosses the street of a town or a village, where the population is dense, that gates should be put there. If this were done those accidents which we deplore would be avoided, and it would meet the object which we have in view.

Mr. SHANLY. I quite agree with my hon. friend that some of the suburban towns around Montreal have become, to all intents and purposes, part of the city. I am entirely in favor of insisting that gates or some such safeguard shall be used where there is a large population; and not only am I in favor of it, but I would make it imperative that gates and keepers should be provided for those crossings.

Mr. DENISON. In Toronto the citizens have complained for a great many years of these level crossings not being protected. There are a great many level crossings in

Mr. SHANLY.

Toronto, and I know of only two instances in which there are gates. If anything can be done in this Railway Bill to protect the citizens of towns, where there are large populations, I think it should be done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My attention has been called over and over again to the very great indifference of the railway corporations, one and all, to the destruction of human life. The fact appears to be that when accidents to life happen the survivors are ready enough to bring claims against the railway companies for compensation; and, generally speaking, the railway companies, to do them justice, are willing to consider those claims and make settlements; but it is nobody's business to take steps to prevent the recurrence of such accidents, and the consequence is that year after year a succession of fatal accidents occur at particular crossings. Now, if this matter is going to be left to the discretion of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, it appears to me that the Railway Department should also be called on to investigate every case of death which takes place at a crossing. That might well be made a part of the functions of that department; and in such cases, it should be the duty of the Government, as the natural protectors of the lives of the people of this country, to see that effective steps are taken, as far as possible, to prevent the recurrence of similar disasters. There is no use in leaving the matter to private parties, because they will not exert themselves further than to obtain compensation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite agree with the observations of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). If this Bill does not provide, it ought to provide, that in every case of death caused by a railway, the Government ought to make an investigation.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Why wait for death?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Or in any serious accident to the person; for these accidents almost invariably result in death. I think the Railway Committee should investigate such cases and have a report, because that is the first necessary step towards taking such measures as will prevent the recurrence of such accidents, and the Railway Committee should be clothed with power, not only to make the investigation, but to apply the remedy.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite prepared to endorse what the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has said on this question. In my own riding there are many places where there is very great risk of the loss of life almost every day, not only from crossings, but from trains running close to roadways. If the municipalities are not given power to do something in the way of insisting on railways putting up high fences so as to prevent teams being frightened, and caused to run into ditches or against fences, and upsetting the vehicle to which they are attached, these accidents will undoubtedly continue to happen. In some cases the railway companies have put up snow fences, and have carried them close to the crossing, so that a person driving cannot see a train coming until he is right upon the crossing. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to advocate changes for the protection of cities, but my hon. friend from Muskoka and myself are here to advocate such changes as are necessary for the protection of life in the country districts as well. I hold that the municipalities should not be prevented from compelling a company to erect fences along the line where it runs beside a public road. If the matter were left to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, as the hon. Minister of Finance suggests, and if every constituency were compelled to bring before them the same number of accidents that happen in my constituency, they would not be able to investigate all the cases that would come before them. I quite agree with what the hon.

member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) says about level crossings. It is impossible at present to do without them in Canada, but I think that any hindrances, such as fences and shrubbery, should be removed, and I think the municipalities should have power to enforce their removal; and where the railway companies erect snow fences in winter close up to the crossings, they ought at least to be taken down during the summer. If the public have to come before the Privy Council with all such complaints, when there are, perhaps, forty or fifty crossings in each county, it would be quite impossible for the Privy Council to deal with all these cases. I do not see that a better arrangement could be made than to allow the municipalities to stipulate what protection should be afforded in the interest of the travelling public.

Mr. SHANLY. Will you guarantee the municipal councils being reasonable?

Mr. McMULLEN. I quite admit that in some cases they might be unreasonable. At the same time, there should be something done to protect the public from these accidents which are continually happening, and which will continue to happen unless some change is made.

Mr. BRIEN. In the town from which I come there is one of the worst crossings in Canada, where accidents are constantly happening. A year ago last winter a young man with a bob-sleigh ran upon it, when a train came along, and he was thrown on one side and the bob-sleigh on the other. The buildings are situated close to the track on each side of the crossing, so that one is on the crossing before he can see the train coming. Last summer a poor unfortunate fellow, while attempting to drive across, had his horse killed and his own head taken off. Action was taken against the railway corporation, who were, of course, quite willing to settle. The law provides that trains must travel through the town only six miles an hour, but they almost invariably travel at a more rapid pace, especially in shunting. I think it would be in the interest of railway companies themselves if some provision were made by which the public could be protected. The corporation or city council have made application to the railway company two or three times to do so, year after year, and invariably the reply has been that if the corporation will pay the man, the company will furnish him. That is equivalent to treating the corporation with contempt; and I think that now is the proper time to adopt some provision by which the public would be protected.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think it was Sydney Smith who said that if a director were tied in front of every engine, accidents would be less likely to occur. Many members of this House visit my country place, and every time they do so they run very great risks, as there are three very dangerous crossings on the way. Only the other night, on my way home, I had to wait half an hour for an engine to pass up and down over the crossing on the Gatineau road. No serious accidents have as yet occurred, but no doubt if this thing continues, some very serious accident will some day occur. On the road to Aylmer we have two very bad crossings, and I quite agree with the hon. member for Muskoka that country people ought to be protected quite as well as the city people, and that railway companies should be bound to provide against serious accidents resulting from these unguarded crossings. I hope the Government will see its way to do this, because this is really an important matter.

Mr. SHANLY. Would you advocate that for every level crossing?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would, certainly, for every level crossing in the county of Ottawa.

Mr. THOMPSON. This is, no doubt, a very important portion of the Bill, and it is well it should receive the utmost attention, I am quite willing, in accordance with the request made, to allow the clause to stand over for

future consideration; but I would ask the hon. members who have given this matter some attention this evening, to examine again the clause in connection with the existing practice and the difficulties which have arisen under that practice, and I think they will find that this section is a change in the direction of providing for the public safety. Whether it is adequate or not will remain to be considered, but it is, I think, a decided improvement in that direction. The discussion of this particular clause commenced by the suggestion that we were taking away the power of control from the municipalities, as under the existing law there can be no crossing over a highway without the consent of the municipal authorities. In the first place, we must provide, as has been suggested by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Shanly), for the arbitrary refusal of the municipality, because that is not provided for in the existing law; but, as regards the control of the municipality being sufficient for the purposes of public safety, hon. gentlemen will observe, on reflection, that it is under that system that all the present difficulties and negligences have occurred. While the law provides that there shall be an absolute veto in the hands of the municipal council, so little control has been exercised by the municipalities, that not only have the necessary safeguards never been taken, but the matters in dispute have never been brought before the Railway Committee for adjudication. The present law works, as I understand it, practically in this way: No railway crossing on a level shall be made, and no railway shall run along the public highway without the consent of the municipal authorities. A railway is built with or without that consent. Generally speaking, no doubt, that consent is assumed. Since I have been a member of the Railway Committee, in only one case, and that in the Province of Quebec, has a municipal authority objected to a crossing, and the matter had to come before the Railway Committee, and then the public interest was safeguarded to the fullest extent. In nearly all other cases, the consent has been given on account of the general desire which municipal authorities have to give every facility to railway companies; and they pay but little regard to the chances of accidents, when those chances are balanced by the danger of the railway being diverted to some other locality. In other cases, the consent is taken for granted, and there is no control in such cases in the hands of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council at all, unless some other question arising, it becomes necessary for the company to get its crossing confirmed; and it is only after the railway has once been constructed with the consent of the municipality or that consent having been taken for granted, that by the occurrence of some circumstances, such as conflicting interests, the matter comes before the Privy Council Committee. Now the change we propose to make is this: We say that a railway cannot be built, even if the municipal authorities consent, across or along a public highway unless the approval of the Railway Committee is first obtained; so that it will not be a question of depending upon the municipal authority for the safeguards which they have seldom insisted on down to the present time, but this will be a provision that a railway company shall not make the crossing until they come before the Railway Committee, where we will have an opportunity of hearing all the contentions made, and when we will have the advice of our own engineer, and thus be able to see that the public interests are guarded. I do not think that the Railway Committee is so inaccessible or so expensive a tribunal in cases of this kind as the hon. member for Muskoka has suggested. I have sat upon it in two cases which were presented in relation to railway crossings, one being the case in Toronto, which the hon. member for Muskoka has mentioned. In that case, representations were made by the mayor on one side, and on the other side by the counsel for the railway company, and I do not think

that any witnesses were examined. I do not think that the discussion occupied half an hour, and I am sure that the expenses incurred did not reach \$40. In half an hour a decision was made that gates should be put upon the crossing, and I understand that that decision is being carried out. If it is not, under the provisions of this Bill, it can be very speedily enforced, because an order of the Railway Committee may be made a rule of court, and be made compulsory by summary proceedings. Only one or two other cases have occurred in which the Railway Committee have been asked to intervene, either by the municipalities or any other person, as regards gates across highways, and in those cases the gates have been ordered to be put up; but, generally speaking, the difficulty has not been in consequence of the difficulty of getting the Committee to meet, or the cost of its proceedings, because its proceedings are very inexpensive, but it is owing to the utter negligence of the municipal authorities, which are far more under the influence of the railway corporations than the Railway Committee can possibly be, in bringing such matters before that committee at all. In the first place we have to be careful that we do not give a control to the municipal authorities, which will be absolutely arbitrary, and, in the next place, we must provide that some better and more independent authority than the municipality shall have the regulation of the question before the crossing is made. However, I am willing to let the clause stand.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may say that it would be well to provide in this Bill that at all crossings in rural sections, railway companies should be required to protect the crossings by removing trees or shrubbery, or anything of that kind that is growing up upon their land, and that prevent people approaching the crossings from seeing the approach of an engine or train. I know of some sections where the railway companies have never tried to remove the shrubbery growing up on their land, and which becomes a complete hedge, hiding the place of the crossing, especially where there is a deep cut. If this Bill would provide that in rural districts the railway companies must remove such impediments to the view, a good reform would be effected. I think there should be some provision that the railway should be required to remove anything which tends to prevent a party travelling along the line of the railway from seeing the approach of the train. I know that trees or bushes grow up, and the railway company should remove them, whether they are on their own property or even on private property, so that parties who are crossing the track should have an opportunity to see the train when it is approaching the crossing. I know of several cases in my own county where the shrubbery has grown to such an extent that it hides the train, and in several cases it has caused accidents.

On section 191,

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Am I to understand that the company is to be made liable only if it does not make provision for the passing of farmers' carts over the railway? Very frequently it is found better to make the crossing under the railway, but there seems to be no provision for that.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will insert the words which will make it read "under or over the same."

On section 193,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand the object of this section is to have means adopted which are found necessary for the protection of trains crossing bridges. It is proposed to have the floor of the bridge so constructed and maintained as to be a closed floor instead of there being large open spaces, so that if a locomotive is derailed it cannot crush down between the sleepers. It is also proposed to have a V shaped block next to the rail in order to pre-

Mr. THOMPSON.

vent cars striking against the bridge. It is a technical matter, and the importance of it will be seen by every one.

Mr. SHANLY. I quite agree that this is a technical matter and I think the sub-section had better be omitted. We are proposing to insert a specification in this section, but we may get a better system before long. It will be quite sufficient if it is provided that the trains shall not run on a bridge unless such bridge is approved by the Minister. The sub-section will simply complicate the matter and may lead to trouble.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so. The sub-section is all right at this moment; but a better system might be discovered afterwards, and the plans might then be varied as improvements are made.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose it is meant to be enforced against all railways after six months?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, it gives six months to enable the companies to conform to the provision.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have drawn the following clause to cover the point:

"No company shall run its trains on any bridge unless such bridge is constructed and maintained with the safeguards approved by the Minister. This section shall not apply to any bridge already constructed until six months after the bringing of this Act into force."

On section 194,

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Some further provisions should be made in regard to the fencing of railways. There is a provision already for fencing against adjoining proprietors, and section 196 provides certain penalties for neglect in such cases. In Ontario, municipalities have power to permit the running at large of cattle upon public highways. The railways are constructed in certain portions of my county without having any fences erected along the line for long distances and no cattle guards at the public highway crossing, and some of the municipalities where the road is not fenced have passed by-laws permitting cattle to run at large on the highways. In many instances these cattle stray on the railway track and are killed, partly because of the non-fencing of the track and partly because of the non-construction of cattle-guards at the public highway crossings. I know that instances occurred in my county during last summer where a large number of cattle were killed belonging to people who could not afford the loss. When compensation was applied for the companies sheltered themselves behind the common law, which provides that as the cattle were trespassers on the railway line at the time they were killed the owners were not entitled to compensation. What I want to provide for, if it can be provided for, is to make some provision in cases where municipalities have passed by-laws permitting the run of cattle on the highways, that the railway companies shall be required to maintain their fences and cattle-guards, and if they do not do that they shall be liable to damage for cattle killed when they may have strayed on the track from the public highway.

Mr. BARRON. The member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) anticipated me in the very point which I was about to raise. I have had some experience of this very matter in my riding, and at the present time I am asked to bring an action by people whose cattle have been killed by reason of escaping off land over which they had a right to be and to pasture under the by-law of the municipality allowing them to run at large. I rather fear that under the law as it is those people who have lost their cattle will have no remedy. We know it is only as against the adjoining property that the railroad has got to fence, and they have already refused to fence in many instances except in so far as to protect the cattle escaping from the farm of the particular men who wish to have an action brought. It seems

to me that sections 194 and 195 are somewhat defective, because section 195 refers to the fencing mentioned in 194 and says that "such fencing shall be done within three months after the construction of the railroad as against the occupier." That applies to the case where the land is already occupied. Section B applies to the case where it is not already occupied and it requires the railway company to fence it within three months after it is occupied. There is no means of giving an occupier any remedy in law for not fencing unless the occupier first of all gives notice requiring the railway company to fence. I do not think that is right. I think that the occupier of land should have an action of damages without first of all giving the railroad company notice to fence.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not quite comprehend where the difficulty arises. As I understand the member for North Renfrew, he takes the case of the railway crossing which the company has neglected properly to fence, and cattle are killed at the railway crossing. If they had escaped from the owner's property to the highway and had been destroyed for want of proper fencing of the railway, the company of course would be liable, but the company sets up a defence that they are killed on the railway crossing having first escaped from their owner's property and being wrongfully on the highway, and that although the company were wrong in not having those fences up, the cattle were wrong in being there. I would refer the hon. member to section 200 which requires them to fence the crossings.

Mr. LISTER. It is not the case of farm crossings at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand that.

Mr. LISTER. As the law now is all the railway company is bound to do is to fence against adjoining owners. The difficulty arises where they have not fenced as against the adjoining owners and where cattle belonging to people, owned by persons other than the adjoining owners, escape on the railway track over on fenced land. What I learned from my hon. friend is: If the municipality allows those cattle to be free commoners and enacts a by-law by which they cease to be trespassers allowing them to run over on enclosed lands, then if the company has neglected to fence they should be held responsible in the same way as if they are owners of the adjoining land. Of course, the law, so far as crossings are concerned, is plain enough.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Though the law expressly requires railway companies to put on cattle-guards on the level crossings, and if they do not and if cattle stray on the tracks, or even on the crossings, and get upon the railway line, from the fact of there being no cattle-guards, then the defence is set up that those cattle are trespassers, and although they are there by the law of the municipality, that they have no right to be on the public highway. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) contends with me that the railway company should be bound to fence against the trespassing of those cattle on their line. I think it is a manifest duty that they owe to the public in every populated portion of the country that they should fence their lines. What I want to get into this law, if I can, is a provision that will require them to do so, and if they neglect their manifest duty that they should be made to suffer.

Mr. WATSON. This is a very important point, and especially important in Manitoba and the North-West. A great many farmers there have suffered loss on account of fences not being erected along the lines of railway, and by cattle being killed upon the track off their own property, just as the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) and the member for Renfrew (Mr. White) have explained. These cattle do not get on to the crossings, but the railroad running through a section of a prairie country on which cattle are allowed to run at large, they get on the railway track

where the company does not fence the track, and the result is that numbers of cattle are killed, and the settler whose cattle are destroyed, finds it almost impossible to receive compensation. I hope the Minister will amend the law in such a manner as will compel the railroad company to fence the railroad through the cities or municipalities, and to protect cattle where they are allowed to run at large. It is the duty of the railroad company to protect their lines and the Government should insist upon it. Of course, I quite understand that when a railroad runs through twenty or thirty miles of unsettled country, it would be harsh to ask the companies to fence those lands.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In a thickly settled country you want fences?

Mr. WATSON. Yes, and if the land is not occupied and the farmer is allowed to have his cattle run at large.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They ought not to allow them to run at large; it is very dangerous to life.

Mr. WATSON. It would be almost impossible to compel a man to fence his cattle in. It is much more reasonable to say that the railway company should fence the railway track.

Mr. SHANLY. There is one view in the case that my hon. friends from Renfrew (Mr. White) and Lambton (Mr. Lister) have not touched upon. My hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White) seems to be particularly careful of the lives of cattle, but he should remember that in this free commoner business the lives of people travelling by trains are in peril by cattle being allowed to run at large. While I am entirely in favor of railway companies providing proper cattle-guards, I think it should be insisted upon by some law or other that cattle in a populous and settled country should not be allowed to run at large. No matter how good the cattle-guards may be even where high fences are constructed, you will occasionally find places where the cattle will get on the railway, if they are allowed to roam at large; and it is much more important to consider the danger to the people in the trains where the cattle are killed than the cattle themselves.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is very important that the quality of the fence should be considered, because if the fence is not of such a quality as to prevent cattle and other animals getting through, and on to the track, loss of life may occur from the trains coming into collision with them. Many of the railways have fences that are wholly inadequate to prevent cattle, sheep and pigs from getting through them. For instance, many of the fences consist of wire hung on posts which are twelve or fourteen feet apart, and frequently there is no board on the top of the posts, so that the animals can easily make their way over or through the wires. It is a great hardship to farmers, and to people living in towns, to prevent their cattle running at large. In many towns there are commons, and the municipal by-laws permit the cattle to run at large, and sometimes the cattle get on the station grounds, owing to the station grounds not being enclosed. I know of a case in which a cow was killed by getting on to the station grounds, and the company declined to pay for the cow on the ground that she was running at large. If there is anything in the contention that a cow coming in contact with a train is liable to throw the train off and destroy human life, it is of vital importance that the company should not be allowed to neglect to construct such fences as will prevent cattle getting on the track. The quality of the fence is not sufficiently laid down in the Bill. If the railway company erect a wire fence, it should be compelled to place a board on the top of the posts, and if the company neglects to construct a proper fence, it should be held responsible for the accidents which occur in consequence. I know of a number of cases in which cattle got through

improperly constructed fences and were killed, and their owners were not compensated, on some pretext or other. It is impossible for a farmer to go to law against a railway company, for the company appeals and appeals, and on some technical ground the farmer is defeated. It is the duty of this House to have the fence well defined in this Act. That is apart from the other question. I want to see human life protected, and in order that it should be protected the railway companies should be compelled to erect good fences which cattle will not be able to pass through, and thus throw the train off the track and endanger human life.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the Province of New Brunswick there is this difficulty, not in the cultivated portions, but in the woods. The farmers in the spring turn the cattle in the woods, and they get on the railway in spite of every precaution. If the cattle are to be allowed to run at large, the company would have to fence its road from one end to the other. Then, in some portions of the Province the occupiers of land do not want the railway fenced, because the fence takes up a large portion of land, and they prefer to crop it close up to the track. We have to consider the life of the public in these cases, and if the cattle are allowed to stray on highways in proximity to a railway, it is almost impossible to run a railway without some accidents occurring; and the question is whether in the interest of the public, cattle should not be prevented from running on highways which cross railroads. How can you make a company responsible in cases where the occupiers prefer not to have the land fenced? There should be consideration for the railway as well as the cattle in these cases.

Mr. McNEILL. I think if it is possible to keep the cattle off the line over all the rest of its course, they can be kept off the line so far as the highways are concerned. There is no doubt that in many parts of the country which are partially settled, it is of great importance to the settlers that they should have the opportunity of turning their cattle into the woods and along the roadsides, and it seems to me that it is a piece of almost high-handed tyranny on the part of railway companies to refuse to take the trouble of having the railway guarded against cattle in those districts as well as in other parts of the country.

Mr. SHANLY. How are you going to secure the highway if the cattle are running.

Mr. McNEILL. By cattle-guards. As my hon. friend will see, the point that the hon. member for Renfrew has made is this, that there are cases where these cattle-guards are not as well constructed as they ought to be and where there are none at all, and the cattle straying from the roads on to the railways are killed.

Mr. SHANLY. If the cattle are running at large, they may be killed actually on the railway line. The cattle-guard may be perfect, and still the cattle may be collected on the highways at the crossing and there be killed, and perhaps kill the railway passengers.

Mr. McNEILL. Of course it is possible that they may get on the road and stand just on the crossing, but that is very unusual. It is generally when the cattle get on the line and are collected in places within the fences and cannot get away, that accidents occur. When the cattle are standing on the highway at the crossing and a train comes along, all they have to do is to walk out of the way, and that they do. As soon as the engineer sees the cattle he blows his whistle, and they move on. It is not on the crossings that accidents occur, but it is on the line through the crossings not being fenced.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is in the cut.

Mr. McNEILL. It is in the cut and along the line. It is most important an arrangement of this kind should be

Mr. LANDERKIN.

made. I must emphasise again my statement that it is of the greatest possible importance, in sparsely settled districts, that farmers should have the benefit of their cattle feeding in the woods and along the roads, and I do not see why they should be prevented having this benefit, simply because railway companies do not choose to be at the expense of fencing their lines as they should.

Mr. MITCHELL. You can easily see the difference between the gentlemen who represent the population and wealth of cities, such as the hon. member for the city and county of St. John, and gentlemen who represent rural constituencies like the hon. member for North Bruce. I happen to represent a constituency which is a mixture of rural and urban, and I have had a good deal of experience in the matter of cattle being killed on railways. I must say I entirely differ from the hon. member for the city and county of St. John (Mr. Weldon), and I agree in the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman who so ably represents the British Empire, when he speaks on that subject, and who in this case is representing the farmers. I suppose I have had occasion to plead before the Railway Department of this country as often, and get as little, as almost any member of this House, and I have heard these legal objections raised there which have been raised by some hon. gentlemen opposite. I have had occasion to ask for compensation for cattle, horses, colts and cows killed on the Intercolonial Railway, and the only animal I ever got paid for was the widow Murphy's cow after a long and arduous fight. I believe it is the duty of railway companies, and of the Government, which owns a railway, to fence their lines both in settled districts and in districts which are only comparatively settled. In the latter the farmers have to allow their cattle to feed upon the unoccupied territory of their neighbors, and the hon. member for North Bruce has correctly represented the condition of things in relation to that matter. I will just say to the representative of the Intercolonial Railway that it would be very well if the Government will keep the fences in repair after they had put them up. As the chief manager of that enterprise is in the House, I hope he will see that the fences in the county of New-humberland are better maintained than they have been for some time past. There ought to be some provision in this Bill by which railway proprietors, whether corporations or governments, should be compelled to fence, not only through thickly settled districts but also through partially settled districts, especially as in the latter the farmers must utilise their unenclosed land to pasture their cattle during the summer.

Mr. EDGAR. There seems to be two points on which this discussion has taken place. One is the necessity of fencing a railway from the adjoining land. Now there is a very distinct and good provision for that in the first part of section 94; then, the other point is the necessity of having sufficient cattle-guards at all highway crossings to prevent the cattle getting upon the railways from the highways. That is provided for by sub-section *b* of section 194, in very clear terms, I think.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). But if the railway company does not put them in, what then?

Mr. EDGAR. Those two provisions seem to be clear and sufficient as to those two purposes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The fences should be made higher.

Mr. EDGAR. Apart from that, there are those two provisions. Now, how are they enforced? I would like the hon. the Minister of Justice to explain section 195. Is it in his view necessary that the adjoining proprietor should give in all cases six months' notice in writing to the railway company before it is liable for not fencing? I

cannot make out from that section whether it is necessary that the notice should be given, and whether the delays referred to in the first part (a and b) render the railway liable without a notice in writing. I think section 13 of the old Act renders it necessary that notice in writing should be given before the railway company is liable, because the old Act mentions these delays; and then it says: "and after the company has been so required to give notice." I observe that in this section the draftsman of the Bill has left out the word "and," so that it does not seem to require that the notice is necessary in writing in addition to the delay. I think it would be a most scandalous thing if that were allowed, that no railway company should be liable for damages to the adjoining proprietor if his cattle were killed, unless he had given six months' notice calling for the fencing to be done. I am glad to see that this Bill appears to change that provision, and I hope the committee will accept it so far. But, supposing that improvement is made, how is the remedy to be enforced? The railway is liable, but it is only liable to the occupants of the land in respect to which the fences are defective, and the occupants, as in cases that have been mentioned to-night, of all other land through which cattle may stray on to the track, over land which does not belong to the owners of the cattle, are left without legal redress. I think that matter ought to be considered. I think, if the company is bound to make and maintain these fences, it should be liable for the loss of all cattle straying upon their track through these fences where they are defective.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Where there are no fences erected at all, what would you do then?

Mr. EDGAR. Of course I am assuming that there are fences erected, and I think some means should be adopted in that case to make the company liable for damages.

Mr. SHANLY. You would not propose to compel the company to keep all the farm gates closed?

Mr. EDGAR. I am very glad to see the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly), with his great practical knowledge, taking part in this discussion.

Mr. SHANLY. Supposing the cattle strayed on to the track through the carelessness of a farmer?

Mr. EDGAR. That case is not in question, because section 201 says that anyone who leaves a gate open is liable to the company for all sorts of damages, but why should the company not be forced in all cases to make a good lawful fence. I think they should be made liable for damages if they are not.

Mr. SHANLY. That is, in a settled country. You would not want them to fence round Lake Superior, for instance?

Mr. EDGAR. Yes, in a settled country. It must be remembered that it is not only the cattle that are lost, and it is not only the loss to the farmer which has to be considered. I think we ought to make it absolutely clear and distinct that the railway companies, in settled counties at least, must be forced by some means to keep up these fences, and I do not think that the ridiculous provisions in the former Act, requiring notice in writing to be given, should be entertained for a moment.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Are you speaking of the Act of 1883?

Mr. EDGAR. I am speaking of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. WATSON. I would make a suggestion to the Minister of Justice to add these words in sub-section c.:

"If the company is required in writing by the occupant or by the municipal council."

I think that would suit most people, and certainly most people in the west, because I would not ask the Canadian

Pacific Railway, or the Manitoba and the North-West Company, in those portions of their line where they have to run through an unsettled country, where there is no danger of cattle straying on the track, to go to this expense, but, when a municipal council is giving the power, I do not think any municipal council would act unfairly to a railway company. I know of instances where some settlers had three or four head of cattle killed. They appealed to the county court, and were awarded the value of the cattle, but the railway company appealed to a higher court, and the settlers had to stop because they had not the means to go on further. If the railway company were notified, I do not think that any one would object.

Mr. McNEILL. I think that notice should be given before the railway is constructed, or before it is completed.

Mr. SHANLY. I think the suggestion of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) is a very good one, that the maintenance of the fences should be insisted upon when the municipality desires their continuance.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am not altogether in favor of that, because there are many places where there are no organised townships, were it would not apply.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I agree fully with the remarks of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), and also with those of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). In counties where people are settling and where the farms are new, it is a necessity that the cattle should be allowed to run at large. I speak with knowledge, and even with authority on this matter, because I began life on a new farm, and everyone who knows anything in regard to farming knows that a new settler has no choice, but that his cattle must be allowed to run at large. If the railway, therefore, is not to have its track enclosed, it simply prohibits the new settler from keeping cattle at all. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly), if I understood him aright, said that the same danger existed in regard to railway crossings.

Mr. SHANLY. Not to the same extent of course.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If we take the surveys which have been made in the Province of Ontario, we find that that danger is one to five hundred, and anyone who has observed the habits of cattle knows that there is nothing like a railway or a turnpike road where they will seek to lie down, to escape from flies or other nuisances; and I think the motion of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) meets the difficulty as well as it is possible for this House to meet it. I think the House ought to make the safety of the people the first consideration, and it is certain that there is no more fruitful source of accidents on railways than animals lying or being upon the road. I therefore hope that the Minister of Justice will adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson).

Mr. THOMPSON. The suggestion will go further than, I think, the hon. gentleman intends. It would enable the municipal council, in unsettled places, to fence on both sides of the line of railway, and I think the clause had better be allowed to stand.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think a municipal council would be unfair in dealing with a railway company. I think it would be perfectly safe to allow the council to decide as to whether there was any danger of cattle straying upon the road, and they might make arrangements with the railway company, in case of accidents, to pay the damages. But it is very annoying to a settler to know that his cattle are liable to get on a railway track, and he cannot recover damages if they are killed. I do not think there would be any injustice in asking a railway company to fence the land, when notified to do so by the owner or occupant, or by the municipal council.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would go somewhat further than my hon. friend. I think he will remember a discussion that took place here some five years ago in regard to fencing railways, in which I took the ground that railway companies ought to fence their roads without any notice from the adjoining proprietors; and I intend, if these clauses are allowed to stand, and when they come up again to renew that proposition, that railway companies shall be required to fence against the adjoining properties without any notice being given requiring them to do so. I quite agree with the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Shanly), that the protection to human life ought to be of paramount importance to this House, and I think that only strengthens the argument I have presented in favor of the proposition that railway companies should be obliged to fence their roads, not only for the purpose of protecting settlers from the loss of their cattle, but also for the protection of human life. Let me point out an instance that occurred in my county last year. In the township of Head, a considerable portion of the railway was unfenced, and representations were made to the railway company, by myself and by the municipal authorities, asking them to fence the road along this portion of their line, some four miles in extent, where there was a considerable settlement, but where the land is not of very rich quality, and consequently the settlers are not very well off. After we made these representations the company promised time and again that they would erect the fences; but they neglected to do it, and the consequence was that not less than 30 head of cattle were killed in that short distance, during last season, and no redress could be had from the railway company at all. When application was made for payment they replied that they did not believe they were liable, as the cattle had not strayed on the railway from the lands of the adjoining proprietors; and so these poor people, who were (in the exercise of their rights,) allowing their cattle to run at large, and in conformity with the by-law passed under the Municipal Act of the Province of Ontario, and who were not improperly occupying the land from which the cattle strayed upon the track, were prevented from obtaining a single dollar of compensation for the damages they had suffered. Not only that, but, as I have already stated, there are three or four crossings in that township, two at all events, that I am aware of, and I believe four, upon which there are no cattle-guards erected, so that if cattle strayed from the highway, at these points to which I refer, there would be nothing to prevent them from going on the track, that is, in the way of cattle guards. So I think that some provision ought to be made to carry out the idea I suggested, and if the Minister of Justice proposes to allow any of these clauses to stand, I would ask him to allow to stand all those clauses relating to fences, for future consideration.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will allow them to stand.

On section 201,

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Under this section, in case for instance, a farmer had a crossing on his farm, and through the negligence of a servant, his cattle happened to get upon the track and an accident occurred, according to this section, he might be called upon to pay an enormous sum, which would ruin the unfortunate farmer, when, perhaps, he was really not personally to blame.

Mr. THOMPSON. We have adopted a provision in the Bill which entitles every farmer to a crossing, and entitles him to have gates for the passage of vehicles. Surely it is necessary, in the public interest, that he should keep these gates closed. The company cannot be expected to keep them closed, because, they are entirely for his own use. If the provision is strict against the farmer, it is so in consequence of the necessity, on his part, of exercising care to prevent accidents.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My hon. friend supposes the case of an accident occurring upon the railway through the negligence of the farmer's servant, in allowing the gates open. I think he desires that you should attach a sufficient penalty to the farmer, without entirely ruining him, through no fault of his own.

Mr. SHANLY. It should be remembered that the farmer's negligence may almost ruin a railway; the destruction may amount to tens of thousands of dollars, not to speak of the loss of life that might occur. It should be made a terror to farmers to leave their gates open.

Mr. WATSON. Make the penalty not less than \$20 nor more than \$500. It might be a hardship to make the farmer responsible for the whole damage.

Mr. SHANLY. That is absurd, because the farm would not pay the damage, in most cases.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is the provision of the law at present.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No serious difficulties have arisen yet; no such cases have occurred.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin.) We may not have had any up to the present time, but we have no guarantee that they will not occur.

Mr. McNEILL. I venture to suggest that in the present state of scientific knowledge and inventive power if a premium were offered by the Government, and probably the railway companies would be willing to join in, as it would be very advantageous to them, some invention would be made by which a flag would be allowed to drop, say, eight or ten rods from the railway crossing, as the train was coming forward. I should think by the use of electricity this might be done without much difficulty. At night this might be done by using another kind of signal such as turning a red light in place of a green one. This is a matter of such enormous importance to the public that it might be as well for the Government to take it into consideration and see if something of the kind might not be done.

On section 250,

Mr. WATSON. I would suggest that a price not to exceed a certain amount per mile, should be fixed for passenger fares. In some cases the railroads charge 4 and 5 cents per mile. I think 3 cents per mile is generally conceded to be fair.

Mr. THOMPSON. Those rates are all subject to the control of the Governor in Council.

Mr. EDGAR. Was there any limit to the rate in the old Act?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. EDGAR. If it is not in the general Act it is in many special cases.

Mr. WATSON. The old Act subjected it to the regulation of the Governor in Council, and railroads were allowed to charge 4 or 5 cents per mile. I think we ought to fix by legislation the rate of toll not to exceed 3 cents per mile.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Are there any rates above that?

Mr. WATSON. I do not know this year, but last year I know the Canadian Pacific Railway charged 4 and 5 cents a mile; west of Brandon 4 cents and west of Barton 5 cents.

Mr. SHANLY. The Grand Trunk rate is $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents by statute; that is to say it is two pence per mile in the original charter which is equal to $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents.

Mr. WATSON. Make this $3\frac{1}{2}$ or $3\frac{3}{4}$ cents and have a limit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That might have the effect of preventing the construction of railways in many unsettled localities where they are a great benefit to the settlers.

Mr. SHANLY. It is better not to make a rate in partially settled countries like the North-West where there are few people to make the road pay. I think it is better to leave it to the Governor in Council to make the rate.

Mr. WATSON. I find that the Governor in Council legislates in the interest of railroads and not in the interest of the public.

On section 235,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This requires the company, on the demand of any person, to make known any special rates which they have given. Suppose they refuse to give the information, something is required to compel them to give it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, we will let this stand, and I will look at the Interstate Act.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are these clauses modelled on the Interstate Commerce Law?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 274,

Mr. HALL. I would suggest that the words "or across" should be added, because I have seen a prosecution fail on that ground.

Mr. O'BRIEN. That would be a very unreasonable regulation. If a railway runs through a man's farm, is that to prevent his crossing the track?

Mr. EDGAR. A man has to go across the track very often.

Mr. HALL. Railway companies never enforce the provision unless there is a wilful violation of the law, but there are cases in which the companies are prevented from stopping the public from crossing the track, though it is dangerous to the public themselves, and I think they should have the power to do that.

Mr. EDGAR. They have it already. They can stop trespassers on railway land.

Mr. THOMPSON. There are many cases where lands have been severed by a railway, and you would not propose to prevent persons crossing the track there. The provision the hon. gentleman suggests would be very severe.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would defeat itself by its severity.

On section 282,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think there ought to be some provision by which persons who purchase a railroad under the foreclosure of a mortgage ought to be able to become a corporation and obtain the franchises, because it is doubtful if a purchase under a deed of foreclosure passes the franchises. An Act was passed in New Brunswick last year to enable the persons who purchase under a deed of foreclosure or a deed of sale to become a corporation.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it is very undesirable that railway companies should be incorporated by letters patent.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This very day there is a railway to be sold, and there can be no incorporation until next year.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will make a note of the point.

On section 288,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Would it not be advisable to introduce a clause providing that parties should give notice to a railway company when they claim damages, on the same principle that notice has to be given to revenue officers? Sometimes these actions are brought on speculation. Frequently no notice is given to the railway companies, and the first thing they know a writ is served.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think parties usually try to get some compensation from the road before they bring the action.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). No, they do not. The first thing they know the writ is served. In the State of Maine a notice has got to be given to the railway, and the particulars have to be given, upon which a claim is made for damage, before the action is brought.

Mr. MASSON. I think the limitation of six months is too short. The last speaker says that often the first notice a railway company gets is the writ. That may be the case sometimes. I know cases where a railway have got the notice, and then pretending to promise a settlement, they waste time until the limitation expires, and then the company refuses a settlement, and the unfortunate man has to suffer a loss. I would suggest that the time be lengthened to a year, or that notice of action should be sufficient to prevent the limitation running. I think the object of the short limitation is to allow the company to have notice within reasonable time, while the means of obtaining evidence for their defence are available, and not allow the claim to get stale when they would be at a loss to discover evidence. I believe that to be the reason for which the limitation is so short. I think that notice in writing within six months would be sufficient, and it would then give time for negotiating a settlement.

Mr. THOMPSON. As regards the notice of action, the difficulty is that so many technicalities surround it, that practically, in four cases out of five, actions fail where notice of action is required.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). All that is needed is a simple notice to the company on the part of the claimant that he intends to bring an action, and to give some information to the company as to the particulars of the action. I know that in the State of Maine, notice is required, and if it is required here, I think it might be extended to 12 months instead of 6—so many days' notice, and then extend the time within which the action may be brought. I propose to join protection to the railway companies with further protection to the public. Six months is undoubtedly a very short time to let a suit clear a railway company.

Mr. THOMPSON. If we intend to insert a provision of this kind, it will have to be very carefully drawn, and we should let the clause stand.

On section 294,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You do not propose to make the employé responsible, but only the person who sells him the liquor?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the employé drinks enough to become intoxicated, he becomes guilty of a misdemeanor.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Suppose a conductor stops at a station and goes in to take lunch, and takes a glass of beer?

Mr. THOMPSON. Spirituous or intoxicating liquors.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Beer is intoxicating.

Mr. THOMPSON. I did not know that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It depends upon how much you take.

Mr. THOMPSON. If there is to be a prohibition, it must be strict, and we can only draw the line at spirituous or intoxicating liquors.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think to have perfectly sober men on a train is of very great importance. I do not see why we should not prohibit a person, when on duty, from taking it, as well as to prohibit a person from selling it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Suppose that party did not know that this man was engaged upon the road, and sells him a glass of liquor, would he then be liable to a fine?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If nobody sells or gives it to him, he will not take it.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is just the same as the prohibition against selling to minors. Persons who are engaged in a business which we restrict must take the risk of violating the law.

Mr. DAVIN. I desire to call attention to what I consider a very grave circumstance. In the North-West Territories we have, or had up to the time I left, conductors and brakemen running from Donald to Swift Current and from Brandon to Swift Current, and I have seen conductors dropping asleep. They had been up the best part of two days and one night on that run. This causes danger to life, for the whole train depends on the wakefulness of those men. I will not comment on the cruelty to the men. By clause 293 we declare that "every person who is intoxicated while in charge of a locomotive engine or while acting as conductor to any car or train of cars is guilty of a misdemeanor." The reason why you punish him for being intoxicated is because his intoxication unfits him to discharge his duties, and if conductors have to run from Donald to Swift Current, by the time he is within 100 miles of Swift Current the average conductor will be not wakeful enough to attend to his duties.

Mr. SHANLY. What is the distance?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know the exact distance at the present moment. It will take the best part of two nights and a day, and that is too long a time for the men to be at work on duty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That there and back?

Mr. DAVIN. No; direct.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Surely not.

Mr. DAVIN. I rather think so.

Mr. SHANLY. It must be a very slow train.

Mr. DAVIN. I believe the train leaves Donald some time in the night, and it will get into Swift Current the day following. The conductor has to get up in the night, get on board the train, run a whole day, and it will be night before he gets into Swift Current. I have seen the men dropping asleep. They come in and sit in the "Pullman" for a moment and their eyelids fall. I have spoken to them; I have written to Mr. Van Horne; I also sent an account of what I saw to the Railway Committee, for I think it is a serious matter.

Mr. SHANLY. How many miles a week does the company get out of them?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know. The fact is as I state it. From Brandon to Swift Current is not so long a run, but I apprehend it is too long. They leave Brandon at about half past one or two o'clock and get into Swift Current the next day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is a very important question.

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. SHANLY. It is a question as to the number of miles a week the company get out of the men. Somebody must do the night work.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Is it the intention of the Government to embody in this consolidation the Bill introduced by Mr. McCarthy in reference to protecting railway employés?

Mr. THOMPSON. Some parts of it I propose to add when the House goes into committee again.

Mr. DAVIN. The question I apprehend is not how many hours of work you get out of them, but how many hours continuously can a man stand it. That is the real question. There cannot be the least doubt, I can assure the Government, that this is required in the interest of the public, in the interests of human life, and I would say even in the interests of the railway companies, because they will one day or other have an accident and the result of that accident will cost them, by many times, more than if they had adopted this regulation.

Mr. SHANLY. They have too few conductors you claim?

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). On behalf of my hon. friend the member for York (Mr. Mulock) who has been compelled to leave before the committee had finished their work, I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that the hon. member said to me that last year when several amendments were moved by him to the Act respecting the sale of railway passenger tickets he moved the following amendment:—

"Every railway company liable to redeem any such ticket, which refuses to redeem the same when so presented, shall forfeit to the holder thereof a sum equal to ten times the amount payable for its redemption, which sum shall be recoverable, at the suit of the holder against such company, in any court of competent jurisdiction."

The member for York (Mr. Mulock) tells me that that amendment was left out with a promise from the Minister of Railways that it would be incorporated in the consolidation of the Railway Act which was to be introduced this Session. I see that it is not incorporated in this Bill, and he says the amendment is an important one. I do not think it has any great application in the Province of Quebec. Since some of the amendments passed last year, compelling railroad companies to redeem their own tickets when they are not used to the end, the railway companies have refused to do so, or they have placed such conditions on the redemption that it makes it practically impossible to redeem them. The result is that the value of the tickets are lost, or they are sold at a loss by those who are the buyers of them. I would not be prepared to support the amendment as proposed last year compelling railway companies which refused to redeem the tickets to pay ten times their value. I think the penalty is rather too high. We might say they would pay double the value of the ticket or some other figure. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to the statement of the hon. member that there was a distinct promise made last year by the Minister of Railways that this would be incorporated in the consolidation which was to be made this year.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken about there being a distinct promise. The Minister of Railways did promise that this year there would be a consolidation Bill introduced, and also stated that that would be the time to consider the matter. If the amendment has been overlooked in the drafting of this Bill, I will see that it is considered. In relation to what the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says I will also see that that matter is considered before the House goes into committee again.

Committee rose.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 4th May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LETTER FROM THE GOV. GENERAL'S SECRETARY.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following letter from the Governor General's Secretary:—

"OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY,
"OTTAWA, 4th May, 1888.

"SIR,—I have the honor to inform you that Chief Justice Sir William Ritchie, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber this afternoon, at three o'clock, for the purpose of giving the Royal Assent to the Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present Session.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"HENRY STREATFIELD,

"Governor General's Secretary.

"The Honorable

"The Speaker of the House of Commons."

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY MORTGAGE.

Mr. EDGAR. I wish to ask the Government if they would lay on the Table of the House the mortgage of the Canadian Pacific Railway under which the existing bonds of the road are secured. I do not think it has been laid before the House at all. It would be very important for us to have it in considering the questions which are coming up.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If it has not been laid on the Table of the House, and is not in any of the public documents, we will have it laid on the Table.

Mr. EDGAR. I could not see it amongst the documents.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not quite certain, but my impression was it had already been laid on the Table.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 95) respecting gaming in stocks and merchandise (from the Senate).—(Mr. Thompson.)

Bill (No. 104) further to amend chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, the Territories Real Property Act.—(Mr. Thompson.)

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. LAURIER asked, 1. What number of acres is there of unsold lands which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company propose to receive by deed of bargain and sale to trustees under sub-section c of the resolutions now before the House? 2. What portions of such lands lie within the Railway Belt? 3. How many acres of those lands are there in Manitoba, and how many in the Territories, east of the 3rd meridian? 4. How many acres have been sold by the company, paid for, and the deeds completed? 5. How many acres have been sold, but the sales are still incomplete? How much paid on the same, and how much remains due, and when and how payable?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 1. The unsold lands, representing the balance of the land grant, amount, as stated in the memorandum of the Minister of Railways, printed in the Votes and Proceedings, to 14,934,237 acres. 2. The land accounts of the Canadian Pacific Railway are not subdivided so as to show the number of acres within the railway belt, or in any particular district; and besides, the

selection of the company's lands has not yet been completed, either inside or outside of the railway belt. 3. It will take a considerable time to make up a return which would serve as an answer to this question, since, as already stated, the lands inside the railway belt or in the Province of Manitoba are not shown particularly in the company's accounts, and, moreover, have not yet been fully selected. 4. The number of acres sold and paid for, and for which deeds were completed up to the 1st of October, the date of the last return to Parliament, was 517,120. 5. The number of acres contracted to be sold, the deeds of which had not been made, was at the 31st of December last, about 2,755,629. The company cannot at present give exact information as to the number of acres for which full payment was made and deeds executed between the 1st October and the 31st December last, without reference to their land commissioner's office in Winnipeg. The amount outstanding on uncompleted sales was, at the 31st December last, \$1,252,857, which is payable by yearly instalments spreading over various periods not exceeding nine years from the date of the contract of sale.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Medical Inspection, Quebec\$1,600

Mr. MITCHELL. With regard to that medical inspection, I believe there has been a great change in connection with the old gentleman who formerly had the superintendence at Quebec. Only one inspection is required now, and it is said that some cases of small-pox passed the inspection at Grosse Ile and the inspector at Quebec, owing to the fact that the inspector there has been prohibited from inspecting ships at Quebec. This requires some explanation.

Mr. CARLING. When did this happen?

Mr. MITCHELL. Last year or the year before.

Mr. CARLING. Under the new regulations put in force last August, all vessels, except the mail steamers, which are inspected at Rimouski, are inspected at Grosse Ile before they come to Quebec, and it is improbable that anything contagious should break out between Grosse Ile and Quebec, a distance of 30 miles.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman inform the House whether he is able to state that no cases of small-pox were discovered on landing at Quebec, although the vessels had been inspected at Grosse Ile.

Mr. CARLING. I am informed to the contrary.

Mr. MITCHELL. As I understand it, the officer at Quebec, is, under the regulations, authorised to inspect, but has received official instructions not to inspect. Now, he is on pay there and there is no reason why he should not inspect the ships on their arrival there.

Mr. CARLING. I think the statement was made, over a year ago, that some cases of small-pox had been sent to Ontario, but it has never been proved to the satisfaction of the department that such was the case. I contend that as the inspection is now made at Grosse Ile, and a certificate is given by the doctor to the master of the vessel, it is not likely that any cases as the one referred to will occur again.

Mr. MITCHELL. The officer is on pay at Quebec to superintend the landing of passengers, and there is, therefore, no reason why he should not continue the inspection.

Mr. CARLING. The Government will see that particular care is taken to have a good inspection.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I notice also that the expenses at Grosse Ile are increased \$4,000. The medical superintendent last year had \$1,600, and his salary is increased to \$2,400, and he has an assistant at \$1,200. It seems to be a very large increase to give the medical superintendent \$800 extra, and the other items are increased generally, making altogether \$4,000 increase at Grosse Ile. I can hardly see the necessity of having an assistant and then increasing the pay of the inspector 50 per cent.

Mr. CARLING. New regulations were put in force in August last. Previous to that vessels were only inspected during the day, but now they have to be inspected day and night, and the doctor could not be called upon to discharge duties by night as well as by day.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is a fair explanation for the appointment of an assistant, but not for increasing the salary of the superintendent.

Mr. CARLING. In addition to the regular officer, it has been found necessary to have an assistant, and therefore this appointment was made.

Mr. MITCHELL. That does not come in under the salary question.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman is speaking about the increased expense.

Mr. MITCHELL. We are speaking about the increased salary.

Mr. CARLING. The increased salary is caused by the increased duty which these gentlemen have had to do, having to work day and night.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). But you do not require two physicians at the same time to inspect, and, if you have the twenty-four hours all round, it is obvious that the inspecting physician who was there before has no more work to discharge than he then had, because you have given him an assistant to do the extra work, and I do not see why you should increase his salary 50 per cent. It seems altogether out of proportion to the duty he is called upon to discharge.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I understand that now all ships are to stop at Grosse Ile. I understood the Minister to say that, if that is done at night, the medical superintendent at Grosse Ile station will go on board, and—

Mr. CARLING. And inspect.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). He has no time to make an inspection. Suppose there are 500 or 600 passengers, it would take a whole day for the doctor to inspect them. I think the previous system was much more efficient, that is, the system which was adopted when there was some fear of the cholera epidemic. There was a physician stationed at Rimouski or at Father Point, and he boarded every ship which carried passengers.

Mr. CARLING. That was only in regard to mail steamers.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). If we are to increase the expenditure—and I do not object to that so long as it will prevent the introduction of disease into this country—the same policy should be adopted as was adopted, I think in 1871 or 1872, by appointing a physician residing at Father Point, who should board every vessel carrying passengers, and should come up with the ship, and would have plenty of time to examine all the passengers, to look into every room and every berth on board the steamer by the time it arrived at Quebec. But, if the examination is to be made at Grosse Ile, as I understand, either the examination will be a perfunctory one, or it will take so much time that those interested in trade and commerce will complain. In the case of a ship with 500 passengers on board, it would take twenty-four hours to make an efficient exami-

Mr. CARLING.

nation, and the trade would complain if the vessel were delayed so long for that purpose. I think it would be a much better system not to have the inspection at Grosse Ile, but to have physicians detailed at Father Point to board every ship carrying passengers and inspect the ship on the way up, which would be done without delaying the ship in any way. Then there would be plenty of time to make a good inspection. In the case of fast ships, it would give the physicians 12 or 15 or 16 hours from Father Point to Quebec, and he would have all the time necessary, I think we are not improving on the old system which was adopted when there was fear of a cholera epidemic. I have heard it remarked that it is impossible that this inspection should be effective. There is no doubt that, under this system, the physician will go on board and make enquiries of the captain, and of course the captain does not like his ship to remain there for two or three days, and, if he has only one or two cases of disease on board, he will say it is all right; and, so also the physician paid by the steamship company will report everything correct, and so the ship will come to Quebec, and then, perhaps, it will be discovered that there is disease on board.

Mr. CARLING. The Sanitary Boards of Health of the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, have highly approved of the new quarantine regulations at Grosse Ile. In regard to what the hon. gentleman says as to the detention of vessels, the vessel owners have highly approved of the system we adopted last year. The physician goes to the vessel in a tug, and the tug goes up the stream alongside the vessel, and in one or two or three hours, the doctor makes his inspection, and then he has also an affidavit from the captain in addition to his inspection that all on board are in good health, and on that he gives a clean bill of health.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I can quite understand that these boards would approve of the regulations, because they understand that the inspection will be efficiently done. It does not matter where the physician goes on board, so long as the inspection is efficient, but it is within my own knowledge that, under the present proposals, it would be done in a perfunctory manner. The Minister stated that the reason for an increase is that the inspection may have to take place during the night, and of course the increased machinery necessary has to be provided for.

Committee rose.

ROYAL ASSENT.

A Message was delivered by R. E. Kimber, Esq., Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sir WILLIAM RITCHIE, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of your Honorable House in the Chamber of the Honorable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House went up to the Senate Chamber; and having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Deputy Governor had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company.

An Act respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.

An Act respecting Bonds on Branch Lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

An Act to enable the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to run a ferry between Beecher Bay, in British Columbia, and a point on the Straits of Fuca within the United States of America.

An Act respecting the South Norfolk Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Hereford Branch Railway Company and to change the name of the Company to the Hereford Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company.

An Act respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.

An Act to incorporate the Western Ontario Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Pontiac and Renfrew Railway Company.

An Act to confirm a certain agreement made between the London and South-Eastern Railway Company and the Canada Southern Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Adirondaek Railway Company.

An Act to confirm a certain agreement made between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Canada Southern Railway Company and the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.

An Act to reduce the capital stock of La Banque Nationale.

An Act to incorporate the Chinook Belt and Peace River Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Kincardine and Teeswater Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Moncton Harbor Improvement Company.

An Act respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States.

An Act to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter one hundred and eighty-one, respecting punishments, pardons and the commutation of sentences.

An Act to amend the Adulteration Act, chapter one hundred and seven of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

An Act to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, chapter twenty-nine of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

An Act further to amend the law respecting Procedure in Criminal Cases.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MITCHELL. If I understand aright, with regard to this Grosse Ile business, you do not intend to disturb the inspection, or the salary of the inspector at Quebec?

Mr. CARLING. We do not propose to interfere with the duties of the port physician.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the Minister why he has increased the salary by 50 per cent., and provided an assistant at the same time?

Mr. CARLING. The inspection is continued now twenty-four hours instead of twelve hours, as formerly, and we have a night service as well as a day service.

Mr. MITCHELL. \$600 for Chatham, New Brunswick. When was the Chatham officer appointed?

Mr. CARLING. In August, 1887.

Mr. MITCHELL. There was no vote last year.

Mr. CARLING. He was paid out of the quarantine vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. Was there any special reason presented for his appointment?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, special reasons were given for the necessity of appointing an officer there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What were they?

Mr. CARLING. The large number of vessels arriving at the port of Chatham, and the necessity for an inspection.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No immigrants come there.

Mr. CARLING. I think there are.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How many immigrants?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say the number of immigrants, but the vessels were inspected by this officer.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think there are any immigrants coming, but the necessity of the appointment is apparent, with the threatened cholera scare that occurred, and so many vessels coming from the continent. I would like to know on whose recommendation he was appointed. I had been trying to get an appointment made for five or six years, and could not succeed, but as soon as I assumed the attitude of freely criticising the action of the Administration, parties were appointed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps it was to inspect you. You were in quarantine, in a sort of fashion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A very good reason.

Mr. MITCHELL. But I do not think it was a good use to make of the public funds. Either the officer was necessary or he was not, for some years past, and if he was necessary, he ought to have been appointed while I had the ear of the Administration, and not immediately when I ceased to possess that influence. I do not object to the appointment —

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL—because I think it is necessary, and I think it has been necessary for a good many years, when the hon. gentleman did not "hear, hear" so cleverly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hearing has improved lately.

Mr. MITCHELL. They say you have got religion, and I don't see why you should not get hearing, too.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Port Hawkesbury, Nova Scotia, \$300. Why do you select Port Hawkesbury? It is not so far, as I understand, a port of very great call.

Mr. CARLING. It has been represented to the department that a very large number of vessels touch that port. It was represented by the medical men in that district, and by the townspeople, that it was very important, and after we made enquiries we found that it was necessary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are a great many ports that appear to be of more importance than Hawkesbury, so far as one can judge, and I want to know how it is that Hawkesbury comes to be a port of special call? If I am correctly informed, but a very small revenue is received there.

Mr. CARLING. A very large number of vessels touch there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does not appear to be a very great port in point of customs receipts.

Mr. CARLING. We are not paying a very large amount of money.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But where do the vessels come from? What sort of vessels are they—fishing boats, or traders, or vessels taking in coal?

Mr. CAMERON. Hawkesbury is a port near the Strait of Canso, and a quarantine station was established some years ago on Point Tupper, in the county of Richmond. The Strait of Canso separates Nova Scotia from Cape Breton, and a very large number of vessels pass through the strait, and as a general thing, make Port Hawkesbury a port of call. Steamers ply between the United States and Prince Edward Island which call there, and it is the terminus of the Cape Breton Railway. It is true that a number of contagious diseases have been sent to hospitals there, and it was found necessary, on the representation of the late member for Rich-

mond, I presume, to have a quarantine station established there. I do not know of any point in Nova Scotia, with the exception of Halifax and North Sydney, where so many vessels call, and where I believe a quarantine station is more necessary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To meet expenses of precautionary measures for public health, \$15,000—I am not disposed to object to a vote of \$15,000 for the benefit of public health, or for enabling the Government, in case of the outbreak of an epidemic, to take proper precautions, but I fail to see, although the journal may deserve some assistance, that it is quite correct to charge to the vote of precautionary measures for public health, a sum of \$1,200 as a subsidy to Dr. Playter for his health journal, and other sums to other medical men who are starting other journals. It seems to me it is rather a misappropriation of the public money to have expended that amount under a vote for precautionary measures for the public health. I do not mean to say that the Government may not be justified in subsidising those medical publications, but the amount should be placed under a different head from precautionary measures. As I understand it, the Government require this vote in case of an epidemic, so that they may be able to isolate patients, or take such other precautions as may be necessary, and to that I do not object, but I seriously think a subsidy to journals should appear under a different head.

Mr. CARLING. This item has appeared in the Estimates for a great many years, and it covers a sum given to Dr. Playter and also to a French journal in Montreal. The medical profession have brought pressure to induce the Government to increase the amounts, but I have not seen my way to recommending an increase to the Government. This vote has been passed a number of years, and I think it is money very well expended.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be; but I do not think it comes fairly under the head of precautionary measures for the public health.

Mr. CARLING. They advise the public what to do in case of an epidemic occurring.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The vote for precautionary measures is none too large if an epidemic should occur.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What is the method of distributing this health journal; how many copies are published, and in what way are they distributed? We should take the necessary precautions against an epidemic, but I really do not see the propriety of giving a large sum of money for this useless book. Perhaps the Minister will be able to explain in what way it is distributed or placed in the hands of those who would be benefited by it?

Mr. CARLING. These pamphlets or books that are printed by Dr. Playter and by the French Hygienic Society of Montreal are distributed to the press, to the medical profession, and in different cities and towns throughout the country. A large number of professional men in the Provinces have written asking to have an increased number distributed, and I take it for granted that it has done very much good in instructing the people as to what precautions to take in the event of an epidemic.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). That is a very strange explanation. If a medical man desires special information, in regard to the treatment or prevention of disease, he should subscribe for appropriate books. I have been practicing some length of time, and I cannot recall any of the books being sent to me. I do not desire them, and I do not think much of the information in them; but if they were sent to medical men in towns and cities, certainly some would have fallen in my way, and I would have had an

Mr. CAMERON.

opportunity of seeing them. According to the experience of the majority of medical men this book is not sent to them, and the vote is a useless expenditure of money. We further find that this vote is squandered very recklessly, regardless of the manner in which it is expended and benefit done. A number of physicians received payments for visiting vessels. Some, I observe, received \$4 a visit. Another medical man at Rimouski made twenty-five inspections, and received \$10 a visit. Besides, he received a salary of \$250; then there was a boat and \$374 wages of boatmen. I can understand the necessity of such visits, if we were threatened with special diseases. Perhaps the Minister will explain why \$10 is paid in one case and \$4 in the other case, and that fees are paid in addition to salary? There must be something wrong.

Mr. CARLING. The fee of \$10 is for each inspection of the mail steamers at Rimouski by Dr. Gauvreau. He is a very excellent officer, and makes a thorough inspection of the mail steamers, which is necessary to allow them to proceed to Quebec without further detention. The payment of \$4 a visit is for the ordinary inspection of other vessels; it is fixed by law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Were there only twenty-five mail steamers in the course of the year? I thought the Dominion as well as the Allan line carried the mails.

Mr. CARLING. No; there is only one mail steamer a week we inspect.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I understand that at Grosse Ile there is a medical officer who is paid for his services. What are his duties? What is the use of having a medical man there if vessels are not inspected? He is apparently there to perform no duties whatever, but he sends the steamers forward to this other point at which a medical man inspects them, receiving \$10 a visit.

Mr. CARLING. I stated, a short time ago, that between 900 and 1,000 vessels came up the St. Lawrence last season, and I have no doubt that as many will come up this season. All those vessels will have to be inspected, and Dr. Gauvreau inspects the mail steamers, which come up once a week. The mail steamers are obliged to stop over at Rimouski to deliver the mails, and Dr. Gauvreau makes that inspection. The number of steamers amounted to twenty-five as I see here, or it may have been more than twenty-five, and Dr. Montizambert and his staff inspect over 900 vessels at Grosse Ile, for which we pay his salary and that of his assistants. This amount is only for the inspection of the mail steamers at Rimouski, which inspection is made there so that they shall not be detained at Grosse Ile, and it enables them to bring up their passengers as rapidly as possible to Quebec.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). How long is the mail steamer detained at Rimouski?

Mr. CARLING. I understand that it is not more than an hour or two. During the time the mails are being delivered at Rimouski the medical officer makes the inspection.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). As I understand the Minister, he says the vessel remains for about an hour, and the doctor, who lives in the place, is understood to make a thorough inspection of the boat during that time. According to the Minister this man made a careful and particular inspection for which he receives \$10, and the other men only receive \$4, because it is not as important an inspection. If the steamer remains there an hour a thorough inspection must be made in that time, so that the doctor gets \$10 for one hour's service. If that be the fact I think the Minister is very liberal indeed.

Mr. CARLING. It was mentioned to me by a gentleman who has passed up and down the river that a steamer may remain there longer.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The Minister said an hour.

Mr. CARLING. I was informed by a gentleman sitting beside me, and I cannot say whether it is an hour or two hours. The vessel is inspected and the doctor and the captain are obliged to make the same affidavit to Dr. Gauvreau at Rimouski as the officers of other vessels are obliged to make to Dr. Montizambert at Grosse Ile.

Mr. SPROULE. The member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) forgets that the doctor is obliged to be there day and night, whenever he is notified of the arrival of the steamer. Every medical man knows that if he makes a night visit it costs more than if he makes a day visit. The necessity for inspection means that there may or may not be contagious disease on board the vessel, and if the doctor finds any evidence of disease the vessel will be detained longer than if he found no such evidence. The length of time occupied will depend on whether or not there is disease on board the vessel. It does not mean either that the doctor is on service just the actual time he is on that vessel, because from the time a vessel is notified he must be in readiness at any hour of the day or night. It is hardly reasonable, therefore, to suppose that the doctor is paid \$10 just for the time he is on board the vessel. With regard to the distribution of the literature by Dr. Playter, I remember that it was distributed very largely throughout Ontario, not only to medical men but to the heads of municipalities and others interested in health matters. Two years ago, when it was anticipated we might have cholera in Canada, this pamphlet was distributed. It was a very good pamphlet and contained information regarding cholera, diphtheria and other contagious diseases, so that persons who were not medical men, when they came into contact with contagious diseases, obtained information as to what they should do, and were instructed how to isolate cases as soon as possible before they could bring them to the notice of the health officers or medical men of the district. In my part of the country those pamphlets were found very useful, and when they have not been distributed lately there have been a number of enquiries for them by medical men and the heads of municipalities.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With regard to the inspection that mail steamers undergo at Rimouski, if I understood the Minister aright, he said that when they are inspected at Rimouski that they are not inspected at Grosse Ile. Everyone who passes up the St. Lawrence knows that those vessels are not detained long at Rimouski, perhaps an hour and a half. It is utterly impossible, I should think, for any medical officer to make a personal inspection, which would be of the smallest value, of a mail steamer in that time, for there are often 800 or 900, and possibly 1,000 immigrants on board. This is all the more difficult if a ship comes in at night. It appears to me all the medical inspector can do is to confer with the medical officer on the mail steamer, and if that gentleman tells him it is all right he accepts the statement and the vessel goes on. That, I take it, is practically the result of the inspection of the mail steamer, carrying many hundreds of immigrants and reporting at Rimouski. The inspection is simply equivalent in value to an affidavit made by the captain and medical officer that they have no contagious diseases on board. It seems to me, on the Minister's own saying, that this gentleman stationed at Rimouski cannot by any possibility make any perfect inspection of a large number of immigrants arriving under the conditions stated. I fail to see that there is any practical use in it which cannot be equally secured by an affidavit made, under penalties, by the medical officer on board.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You can understand that a steamer arrives there with a large body of immigrants on board. The vessel has a captain, who is responsible by his character and under the law, for a true report, and there is also a medical man on board who is likewise responsible. We must not allow the ship to pass simply upon the idea that the medical officer on board, when he arrives at Quebec or Montreal, or wherever his destination may be, will make an affidavit that there is a clean bill of health. We have a right to see that when those ships enter into our waters they should be examined.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You can understand how it is. The medical man at Rimouski goes on board and he must be paid for that service. He sees the doctor of the ship, and he asks him what has been the state of the health of the passengers on board during the voyage. He asks the captain the same thing; and they are bound to make honest and true statements, and there is no reason why they should not make honest and true statements. I take it the medical man may say: There are so many cases on board; there are some of measles, but we think they are over; there is no small-pox; there are no other of the innumerable diseases I could mention; but here is a case I would like you to look at, I am not sure whether it is small-pox or measles, or anything else. He goes and sees that man and adds his responsibility as a Dominion medical officer to the responsibility of the captain and the surgeon; and there is a substantial advantage in getting the captain and the medical officer on board cross-examined by the medical man who is responsible to the Government, that no unhealthy or diseased person should pass the inspection. It is of very great consequence that that should be so. While on my legs, I would say that although the quarantine regulations lately adopted are a very great improvement on the previous system, yet I am not at all prepared to say that the Government and Parliament would not be justified in sanctioning a very considerable additional expense to provide for extra precautions being taken against the introduction of disease by the large mass of immigrants at the very portals of the Dominion. I quite agree with the hon. member for Quebec that it is not sufficient that they should be passed either at Rimouski or Grosse Ile, but that if there is the slightest suspicion of disease, there should also be an examination at Quebec. I am rather surprised to learn, for I did not know it before, that there is no officer to examine them at Montreal. The ships now go up to Montreal. Years ago, when these Grosse Ile regulations were established, Quebec was the place of debarkation for all the immigrants. I am not at all satisfied that there should not be an examination both at Quebec and Montreal, just as much as at the other two points. I thoroughly agree that this is a matter as to which there should be no starving of the service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have no desire that there should be; we are quite agreed as to that. Probably a bow passes between the medical gentlemen, and the examination is one of a very free-and-easy description. I am not sure that, if there were serious cases, the captain or owner of the vessel should not be held responsible. In fact, I would be disposed to do as is done in England, make it equivalent to manslaughter for the captain or owner of a vessel to allow it to enter a port, knowing that there were contagious diseases on board, without reporting.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It should approach to that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a great offence against the public weal, and the hon. gentleman has just touched the point, which is, that the ships cannot be

properly inspected at Rimouski, unless you allow the medical officer to accompany the ship to Quebec or to Montreal, and make a pretty thorough examination as he goes; and I would suggest that he should do so.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The moment a ship arrives at Rimouski the medical man goes on board for a short time, and then the vessel starts for Quebec. There is no opportunity of making a proper examination; but if the previous method were adopted, of accompanying the vessel to Quebec, the officer could make a better inspection than he is able to do at present.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not think the explanations offered are quite satisfactory. I do not doubt that the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) receives some of those documents; but what I said was that I did not think it was reasonable that the country should pay for those works to be sent to medical men. If they require them, let them pay for them as other people are required to do. I should like to ask the Minister whether the officer at Rimouski has detained any vessel after it has arrived at that port?

Mr. CARLING. He has sent vessels to Grosse Ile if he has discovered any contagious diseases on board. There the patients are taken charge of by Dr. Montizambert, and the vessel is disinfected.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Can he tell me the number of vessels which have been detained and sent to Grosse Ile?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot at this moment, but I shall be very glad to furnish the information to-morrow.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that every steamer is examined at Rimouski?

Mr. CARLING. All the steamers that stop at Rimouski to deliver the mails are examined. The Allan line and the Dominion line carry the mails week about alternately. Twenty-five come up during the summer months, and these are all inspected.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it would be strictly germane to this item, relating to precautionary measures for the protection of the public health, to call the attention of the hon. Ministers to the fact that for the last two or three days there has been a very unsavory and unwholesome smell on this side of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman had better change to this side.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection if hon. gentlemen come over here. It is particularly disagreeable this afternoon. I believe our worthy Clerk has noticed it for the last two or three days. It evidently comes from the ducts under the Clerk's table; I do not know what the cause of it may be. I think it is eminently in the interest of the public health that it should be looked to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I had no idea that there was anything of the kind. I may say that the officer in my department, who has charge of these ducts, stated to me not more than two days ago that they had all been examined, and were perfectly clean, and that the air in them was pure. It seems to be only on that side of the House. However, I will have the matter enquired into.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am quite willing to accept the suggestion to change places *pro tem*, and to consider this the right side of the House for the time being.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a constitutional objection to that—the eyes sit on this side, and the noses on that side.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh,
Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. COOK. I think it would be an improvement if the ducts were whitewashed. There is a good deal of whitewashing going on on the other side.

To meet expenses for cattle quarantine, Province of
Quebec \$5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would call the attention of the House to a rather extraordinary correspondence which took place with respect to this item between the Auditor General and the Department of Agriculture. The House will recollect that we had a great deal of trouble in fixing the value of animals, and that after a good deal of discussion it was decided that the sum to be paid should not exceed \$150 in any one case. Last year the payments were made to two or three gentlemen largely in excess of what the Act permits. One is Mr. James McEacran—who is he?

Mr. CARLING. He is an importer of cattle and resides in the city of Guelph.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And Messrs. Clarke and Norris?

Mr. CARLING. They belong to Nova Scotia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that the Auditor General declares that in the case of the First mentioned gentleman, an overpayment was made of \$795, and in the other case an overpayment was made to the amount of \$856. I have looked over the correspondence, and desire to call the attention of the House and the Minister to a very remarkable letter from Mr. McEacran, who, I understand, is to be the inspector employed by the department. In the first instance, Mr. McEacran made the appraisalment low, and the Auditor General properly pointed out that under his appraisalment the sums paid were considerably in excess of what is provided by law. I shall not trouble the House with reading all Mr. McEacran's letter in reply, but will point out the remarkable statement with which he concludes. He had made an appraisalment under which, according to the Auditor General, a considerable sum had been overpaid. He does not deny that he made that appraisalment, but he states:

"In filling up the appraisalment forms, I put the appraisalment at a low value purposely, in many cases, under the then market value. My motive being to make the compensation allowed appear in the most favorable light to the owners of the cattle. I can, however, with perfect honesty make the appraisalment equal to one-third more than the amount paid, and I herewith enclose certificate amended in this sense."

That is rather a remarkable declaration. First of all, he sends an appraisalment under which payment is made considerably in excess of the law, and then he declares that he could with perfect honesty have appraised the cattle one-third more, and encloses certificates amended in that sense; and on those the department consider that the Auditor General's objections are overruled. I do not think that is a sound way of doing business. It might be quite true that the total value of the animals was in excess considerably of the amount the Department were allowed to pay, but it is quite clear from Mr. McEacran's own statement that the Auditor General was right in saying that the Department had paid two sums of nearly \$1,000 in excess of the law, and that Mr. McEacran's mode of dealing is not a correct mode of dealing with the subject.

Mr. CARLING. In no case has more than \$150 been paid. No doubt Mr. McEacran had made an error of form in his certificate.

Mr. LAURIER. The law does not allow the full value of the animals to be paid but only two-thirds of their value, and that value must not in any case exceed \$150. In the present case the parties were paid not only according to Mr. McEacran's appraisalment, the full value of the animal, and thus Mr. McEacran and the department seemed to have overlooked the law. No doubt the loss to the proprietor of the animals was a serious one, but still the law must

be carried out. If it is unfair it may be amended, but as long as it remains what it is, it is not within the competence of any officer of a department to go beyond it. In order to cover this violation of the law Mr. McEachran says that he filled up the appraisal forms at a low value, his motive being to make the compensation allowed appear in the most favorable light to the owners of the cattle. The proprietor, however, not being satisfied, he says :

"I can, however, with perfect honesty make the appraisal equal to one-third more than the amount paid, and I herewith enclose certificate amended in this sense."

The whole thing is irregular. I am fully aware that in many cases this law must work extreme injustice to the owners of cattle, but in this matter their rights must be sacrificed to the general good. Therefore these cattle are slaughtered, and for compensation the law provided that two-thirds of their value shall be paid but not to exceed \$41.50. The Department simply disregarded the law and paid the full value. Under the circumstances it is impossible that the department should not be censured.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt there is an apparent irregularity in this matter. But, after all, the desire of Parliament and the public is that parties who lose their cattle should get this \$150 if that is two-thirds of the value of the animal. It appears that Dr. McEachran, from some mistaken idea, undervalued the cattle, and afterwards, when the error as respects the regulations was pointed out, he says :

"I can honestly and fairly state that the cattle are worth one-third more."

I admit the irregularity still. On the whole the money has been paid and the party has not received more than the two-third value, looking at the amended report of Mr. McEachran. At the same time I do not underestimate the importance of officers like Mr. McEachran—who, I believe, is a very good man—being kept strictly on the line of their duty and not left to their discretion. He should have given the full value in the first instance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The value appears to have been lumped, which the Act clearly intended it should not be. There are cases, no doubt, in which some of these cattle were worth less than \$150. That is almost as good as stated here. The statement is that the value of many, if not of all, was one-third over the maximum, and that the owners were heavy losers. I do not doubt that many of these cattle were worth more than that amount, but we know that the value of fancy cattle goes up to enormous figures, \$4,000, \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000 and \$8,000. The Act, however, is clear in declaring that each animal shall be dealt with separately, and there is good reason for that. It would seem to be a sensible view that gentlemen who choose to import very expensive cattle should be their own insurers and should stand their own risk. For instance, we should not be called upon to pay \$12,000 for one animal, though I believe that amount has been paid for certain cattle. In fact I have known that to be paid. It would never do for the owner, if that animal were lost, to come on the country for that amount. I simply call attention to it because I think the Auditor General is perfectly correct in calling the attention of the department to it. The department, no doubt, without meaning any harm, have been incorrect in this matter, and my special reason for referring to this is to point out that the officers of the department ought to be very careful not to make two distinct appraisements. When an appraisal is made, whether under oath or not, it is supposed to represent the true value of the article, and after that the appraiser ought not to add one-third to the value and so change his sworn appraisal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I simply would call the attention of the department to it, and after the statement of the First Minister, I suppose we may understand that it will not occur again.

Mr. LAURIER. It is evident that the owner of cattle will never be satisfied with the amount given by the appraiser.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It should be a final estimate.

Mrs. Delaney, wife of Indian agent killed at Frog Lake..... \$400

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose this is a proper opportunity to enquire what decision the Government have arrived at in the Gowanlock case, which the Prime Minister stated the other day would receive their attention.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the Supplementary Estimates will show that the Gowanlock case has been considered.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, I do not press this, but possibly the hon. gentleman might as well state now what decision the Government has come to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, but I am not sure, that it has been put on the same footing as the case of Mrs. Delaney.

Pensions payable on account of Fenian raid\$3,355 60.

Mr. DENISON. I would ask whether these pensions could not be paid next year in advance in the same way as other pensions are paid? Of course, I do not suppose it can be done this year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That will be considered between this and the next Session. It is too late now to make the change.

To meet probable amount required for veterans of war of 1812 \$4,530

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are you giving these old men at present? I think the amount was raised a little, was it not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They are getting \$30 each. The number who were paid last year was 151.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman recollect the age of the oldest of these veterans?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I must say that I do not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it must be over one hundred.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). How many of these veterans are still living? It seems to me that they must be very, very old, and I should like to know whether there are any fresh applications placed upon the lists.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have told the hon. gentleman that we paid 151 veterans \$30 each last year, and I may add that we have a couple of new applications which are now being considered by the department.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In regard to the item on account of the Fenian raid, I would like to ask whether that was not a liability incurred previous to the Union. If so, I do not think it is a proper charge on the Dominion, but it should be born by the Provinces.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is regulated by the Statute, 42nd Vic. Some portion of the amount was incurred previous to Confederation, but it was all assumed by the Federal Government after Confederation.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would like to ask the Minister if he pays any pensions to widows of veterans of 1812. I know of a case of a poor woman whose husband served in that war, and I know she is in destitute circumstances, and, if there were any possibility of getting anything for her on account of her husband's services, I think, under the circumstances, it should be given to her.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Under the law we do not provide for widows.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Other pensions, in other cases.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This matter is regulated, the hon. gentleman should see, by statutory enactment, out of which, of course, I cannot go.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes; but you do take care of widows in other cases. Your military regulations provide for widows of officers and men who are killed, or who are wounded, and they get paid.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. But we do not at present provide for the widows of 1812.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes, we have paid them since the last two years. Do I understand there is no possibility of a provision being made?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I do not think there is any law regulating pensions to the veterans of 1812. It is an annual vote, given to the department to pay them. Would the Minister tell me what the law is?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But don't you see that unless she volunteers we cannot pay her? It is to pay the volunteers, not the volunteers' widows.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No, it is the veterans of 1812.

Pensions payable to Militiamen on account of Rebellion of 1865 \$25,000

Mr. JONES. I would ask the Minister of Militia whether he has arrived at any decision with regard to Capt. Fortune of the 63rd, whose application has been before the department for some time. I understood he passed several boards of enquiry, and it was known that the injury he received was incurred while he was serving in the North-West. Last year the Minister promised to look into that case, and I hope he has arrived at a favorable decision. The man is completely incapacitated for work, and has to use a crutch.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The case of Capt. Fortune was brought to my notice, like that of all the militiamen who served during the troubles of the North-West and who were wounded. He had to go before a board of doctors, and under the first report that was made he was granted a gratuity. Representations have since been made to the department, and a report has been sent in by a new board of physicians, and his case has been submitted to Council—all the pensions are regulated by Orders in Council. I have made my recommendation to Council, and I am happy to be able to tell the hon. gentleman that his case is now before the Council, but it is not yet passed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is an increase of \$5,000 in this vote. To that I shall not object, but I think we ought to have supplied to us, in the shape of a memorandum, which might be printed in our Votes and Proceedings, or otherwise, information as to whom this \$5,000 is to be distributed. I suppose, as to the other \$20,000, I can find particulars in the Militia report.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, no doubt. I will be happy to furnish the hon. gentleman with the information he requires.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that it ought to be furnished to us at the present moment, but if the hon.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

gentleman will lay it on the Table I will not object to that, on the understanding that I can bring this up at any convenient time in the passage of supplies.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, I think I can lay it on the Table on Monday.

Mr. LAURIER. Is there an increase of new applications?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There are some new applications; and the hon. gentleman will understand that some of these applications already made could not be immediately brought before Council. In some cases there are certain arrears, and the money they were entitled to under a new Order in Council had to be provided for.

Pensions payable on account of Rebellion of 1885, to Mounted Police, Prince Albert Volunteers, and Police Scouts \$4,324.91

Mr. DAVIN. Before that item is passed, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the claims of certain persons which I brought before him last year, but without success. After I brought these claims before his attention last year, the Minister paid a visit to the North-West, and with Col. Scott and Major Mowat, I saw him, and my impression was that we had entirely removed from the Minister's mind the difficulty that he found in acceding to the proposition that I laid before him. There are other persons to whose claims I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention—in fact there are two classes of claims that I would press upon his attention, and upon the attention of this committee. There is a class of persons who are legally entitled to what they claim, but who have not got their legal rights; and then there is a class which has an honorable claim, a just claim, but under the law they may not be able to substantiate it. Sir, I contend that in a matter like this, where men have been ready to risk their lives for the country, where men have been fighting our battles, it surely is not creditable, it is not what the country desires, that we should go into every nice question, and consider in a huckstering spirit whether we shall acknowledge their claims or not. Now, Sir, the fortune of war, at all times, has been unequal. Men die in thousands in a ditch, heroes die in thousands, in order that one man—and he, perhaps, may not be as brave as the least brave amongst them—may wear a star; and I should be very sorry, in this free country, in this country where we are accustomed to hold that one man is as good as another, that our Government should have one rule for the rich and powerful, and another rule for the poor man. Now, Sir, there are cases like this. For instance, there is the case of a man named Whalen, who served as gallantly as any man that ever fought for his country and flag, who was under fire, but because he was under the police at Cut Knife, instead of under the militia, a distinction is made in his case. He was at the head of the teamsters, he was under fire at Cut Knife, and although he was recommended strongly, yet nothing is done for him. Now, I urge that the scouts and the teamsters, those men who were engaged in that rebellion in one form or another, should have their claim considered; and I urge in the case of the police, not merely those who were under fire, but those who were actively engaged in other ways, who might have been under fire, that no invidious distinction shall be made between them; and that they shall get their medals. I believe there are only about 150 of them who want their medals. I am told they do not want scrip, but they want their medals, and I hope they will get them. Now, I will ask the Minister's attention to the case of those who have a legal claim, the volunteers at Regina, and others like those at Edmonton, who are on the same footing. Last year I presented to the Minister every element in their favor that a case could require. I met the Minister, and everybody who meets him knows how courteously he enters into their

demands. But the fact is this, as one brother member of mine said to me, "He is too polite." I do not give the exact language he used. But, Sir, I will put it in Shenstone's language:

"He kicked him down stairs with such a sweet grace, You might have thought he was handing him up."

But the objectionable thing about it is that the Minister is not to be moved. We have failed to move him, even though we put, as I believe, just claims before him. In the case of the volunteers whose claims I put before him last year, he acknowledged there was every element of a case made out, but he said to me: "Here is a telegram in which Col. Scott acknowledges that these are home guards." When I read the telegram I confess it seemed to me that we had been bowled over. But we were able to show the Minister, when we met him in January, that these telegrams about the home guards had nothing whatever to do with the volunteers. Every telegram about the home guards is signed by Mr. Scott as mayor; every telegram about the Regina volunteers is signed by Mr. Scott, with his military rank attached to it. Now, this is the telegram respecting the home guards:

"REGINA, April 1st, 1885.
"To the MINISTER OF MILITIA, Ottawa:
"Guard organised here for home protection. No arms. Can they obtain 75 stand and ammunition from the department? If so, when? Town Council will be responsible.

"D. L. SCOTT,
"Mayor."

Here is the answer, signed by A. P. Caron, dated Ottawa, April 1st:

"To D. L. SCOTT.

"Yes. Must apply to Major General for permission."

In the case of the volunteers—I have the telegrams here—the Minister does not say that he must apply to the Major General, but he at once says that the arms are on their way. Another telegram is dated Regina, April 11th, 1885:

"The MINISTER OF MILITIA, Ottawa:

"Have applied by telegram to Major-General for arms for home guard, as directed by you. No answer from him. Can you order arms and ammunition for 75 men to be supplied from stores at Winnipeg?"

"D. L. SCOTT,
"Mayor."

The reply was:

"OTTAWA, April 12th, 1885.

"To D. L. SCOTT, Mayor:

"Cannot interfere with distribution of arms. My doing so might disturb arrangements made by General.

"A. P. CARON."

When the Minister comes to deal with D. L. Scott as colonel, he does not make any such statement as that; and I will call the attention of the committee for a few moments to this subject. On July 12th, Colonel Scott wrote to the Minister informing him that he was the commanding officer of the Regina volunteers, and that he had issued to the members of that company the necessary certificates of enrollment and service to enable them to obtain land warrants or scrip under 48-49 Vic., c. 73. One of the members of the company who had applied under the Act brought to Colonel Scott a letter from the Department of Interior, in answer to his application, stating that no further action could be taken with regard to the issue of scrip, until a certificate showing that he was entitled to military bounty was received from the Department of Militia and Defence. Another member of the company had also shown Colonel Scott a letter from a friend at Ottawa, through whom he applied for a warrant, enclosing a memorandum from T. B. Aldrich stating that the Regina company was recognised only as a home guard. From those communications Colonel Scott was led to infer that the right of the members of the

Regina Company to the bounty under the Act had not then been recognised by the Department of Militia and Defence. Colonel Scott, in conclusion, said:

"I beg to enclose herewith for your information, copies of the correspondence between me and the militia authorities."

He goes on to say:

"I have the honor further to state that on 1st April, 1885, I, as mayor of the town of Regina, telegraphed you stating that a home guard had been formed here and asking you to forward arms and ammunition for its equipment. The home guard mentioned in the telegram was a different body to the volunteer company organised by me, and at the time I telegraphed you I had already received the arms and ammunition for the volunteer company.

Then, Colonel Scott gives the telegram relating to the formation of the corps of Regina volunteers:

(Telegram.)

"REGINA, 27th March, 1885.

"The Minister of Militia, Ottawa.

"Will you authorise enrolment of volunteer rifle or infantry corps, and direct equipment to be forwarded forthwith? Corps will be filled at once.

"D. L. SCOTT, Lt. Colonel,
"Mayor."

To this telegram he received the following answer:—

(Telegram.)

"OTTAWA, 26th March, 1885.

"Lieut.-Colonel, D. L. SCOTT.—Yes, authority is given to organise company at Regina. Arms and equipment on way to Winnipeg."

"A. P. CARON."

Here is a letter addressed to Lieut. Colonel C. F. Houghton, Deputy Adjutant General, Winnipeg, Manitoba:

"REGINA, 31st March, 1885.

"Sir,—I have the honor to inform you that acting upon the suggestion of the Lieutenant Governor I telegraphed the Minister of Militia as follows:—

Here follows copy of first telegram sent in his capacity as Lieut. Colonel:

"I received a reply from him as follows:—

"ANDON, 28th inst.

Here follows copy of telegram I have already read.

"In pursuance of this authority I was deputed by the citizens to proceed with the organisation of the company, and I have the honor to state that I have enrolled a company of 55 men, and have arranged to put them through a course of drill instruction, and I hope to be able to put them in a state for active service by the time the arms and equipments reach here. It is the unanimous wish of the members of the company that the corps should be equipped and uniformed as a rifle company, and I have been requested by them to acquaint you with their wishes in that respect. I have the honor to request that you will take the necessary steps to have the corps and the officers thereof gazetted and have the arms and equipment forwarded to us here as soon as possible."

To that communication Colonel Scott received a letter from the acting Deputy Adjutant General. On 17th April, 1885, the following telegram was sent to the Minister of Militia by Colonel Scott:—

(Telegram.)

"REGINA, 17th April, 1885.

"The MINISTER OF MILITIA, Ottawa:

"Has my company been placed on active service? When will uniforms be forwarded.

"D. L. SCOTT,
"Lt. Colonel."

The answer was as follows:—

(Telegram.)

"OTTAWA, Ont., 18th April, 1885.

"Yes, your company is authorised. Make requisition for equipments.

"A. P. CARON."

After the troubles were over, C. F. Houghton, Lieut. Colonel, Deputy Adjutant General, wrote to him the following:—

"HEADQUARTERS, MILITARY DISTRICT NO. 10.

"WINNIPEG, MANITOBA.

"Sir,—I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 20th inst., relative to land grants for the late Regina company under your command. Your service roll was duly received and forwarded to head-

quarters on 3rd October last. The course now to pursue is that a separate application must be made in each case direct to the Department of the Interior, by the soldier or his duly appointed attorney, stating clearly whether a warrant to enter for 320 acres of land is required or scrip for \$80 in lieu thereof.

"Pay lists will be forwarded to you to be filed in for the time your company was engaged on active service and returns to this office to be submitted for approval."

On 7th October, 1886, Colonel Scott wrote to the Militia Department as follows:—

"REGINA, 7th October, 1886.

"SIR,—I have the honor to state that on 12th July last, I wrote you respecting the application of the members of the Regina Volunteer Company for land warrants or scrip under 48-49 Vic, c. 73, and enclosing for your information copies of the correspondence relating to the formation of the company and other matters relating thereto. I have not yet received a reply to my letter."

To that communication Colonel Scott received this reply:

"OTTAWA, 17th October, 1886.

"SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 7th inst. I am directed by the Minister of Militia and Defence to direct you that it appears that the Regina volunteer company were organised as a home guard."

And so on. It is perfectly clear that the Minister acted *bona fide*. I think he was misled by the fact that Colonel Scott, as mayor, had communicated with him about the formation of a home guard, and I think the Minister confused the action of the mayor with the action of Colonel Scott; and after I have pointed out to him that there is no connection whatever between the two, and that those telegrams *re* home guard were telegrams having nothing to do with the Regina volunteers, I hope the Minister will have no difficulty in acting. In case he should feel any difficulty about it I will forward either to him or the Minister of Justice the whole case, and I have no doubt whatever that the Minister of Justice, or any lawyer—I had forgotten that the Minister of Militia is himself a distinguished lawyer—will see at once that those men have a legal claim. The Birtle volunteers, as I showed last year, were acknowledged and from the *Gazette*, which I quoted last year for the Minister's information, I will give him the details again. He will find, for instance, in the *Gazette* of 11th April:

"The following companies have been authorised to be raised in Manitoba and the North-West Territories for active service."

A list of the companies is given, and among them are the company at Regina, Captain David L. Scott, and the company at Birtle, Captain James H. Wood. The hon. Minister found no difficulty whatever in dealing with the company at Birtle. He gave them the scrip, he acknowledged their status, he acknowledged the status of other companies, and I should think it a very extraordinary thing indeed, if after his doubt has been removed by what I have pointed out to him respecting the mistake made by confusing the home guard with Regina volunteers, he will not see his way at once to admit my contention in this matter. Again, in the *Gazette* of 18th September, 1885, there appears a list of the following corps that have been relieved from service and disbanded, among others: Infantry company of Regina, Captain Scott, infantry company of Birtle, Captain Wood. I have a letter here from Captain Wood, and probably it reflects upon myself for not having got the scrip for the Regina volunteers. Captain Wood addresses this letter to the major of the Regina company:

"BIRTLE, 8th May, 1886.

"MY DEAR MOWAT,—I have been in Ontario for the past three months on the business to which your favor of the 28th February refers, and had it not been that I was in Ottawa when the Riel rebellion broke out, and got our company by general order gazetted on actual service, we were left, as far as recompense for services was concerned. As it was we were relegated to the home guard list till I went down, and after a pretty hard fight in the department, I succeeded in establishing our claim to be placed on the active service list, and thus we got our claim to the land allowed."

MR. DAVIN.

Now there are other companies that have been dealt with, as I contend, justice demanded, and I trust that the Minister will take steps to deal with the Regina volunteers, and other corps similarly situated, in accordance with the legal claims of these bodies. It cannot be contended that the Regina company was a home guard within the meaning of the amending Act, 49 Victoria, chapter 29, because the latter Act is not intended to restrict or annul the operation of the former. The expressed intention in section 1 is to widen the scope of the original Act by extending its privileges to certain classes who would otherwise be excluded, as, for instance, members of the irregular forces. Nor is the Regina company within sub-section "a," by reason of the fact that having been duly organised and enrolled under the special provisions of the Militia Act, it is not an irregular force, and the special section mentioned only excludes irregular forces serving as home guards. I do not think that I need trespass further on the attention of the committee, because I have established, if I may venture to say so, the legal claims of the volunteers. But I would just urge on the attention of the Minister, with whatever little persuasiveness I might be capable of using, to consider claims that are just as strong, morally—although they may not have a legal backing—to consider the claims of the police who, although having been on active service, are deprived of their medals, to consider the claims of those scouts and those teamsters who may have served under the police, which claims have not been acknowledged, because they did not serve under the militia. In conclusion let me say that I think it is not desirable, in the interests of Canada, that we should make a distinction between the North-West Mounted Police and the militia in such a manner as would make those policemen feel, if ever called again to perform service to the country, that when their services come to be appraised a gallant deed done under the red coat of a mounted policeman is one thing, but a gallant act done under the uniform of a militiaman is quite another, I hope that the Government will take the view of the people of Canada that any man whether he be a mounted policeman, militiaman or volunteer, who in the hour of danger strikes a gallant blow for his country will be acknowledged in Parliament with the same gratitude which his fellow countrymen feel, and that he will know equal justice will be dealt out to him by the Government of Canada.

MR. SPROULE. I would just like to say very briefly that I can endorse what the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has said in reference to the police and the scouts in the North-West, who did not get medals and scrip, or land grant warrants. On behalf of some of those police scouts I have for a couple of years past been endeavoring to get them that acknowledgment for their services, which I believe they are fairly entitled to. There seems to be an interpretation put upon the law, that does not appeal to common sense as a correct one. The law was amended, as I understood it at the time the amendment was made, so as to include those police scouts and to insure that they would get their land grants or scrip the same as others who had served in the rebellion. When the application was made in their behalf the objection was raised that they were not police scouts in the ordinary acceptation of the word as interpreted by the Minister of Militia and Defence, but that they were home guards. At the time, I was not aware whether they were or not, but in looking into the case further I asked the Minister's interpretation of what he considered was a "home guard." He said he considered it was the men who were appointed to look after their property at home. For instance there might be a locality where a number of people were congregated

together and they were afraid of some infractions of the law or intrusion from outsiders, and they banded themselves together to look after their property. I found, after examination, that those men to whom I refer were enlisted by Lieut. Col. Macdonald for the purpose of scouting all over the country, and that they were employed at Wood Mountain, more than one hundred miles from home. They were sent to this place because it happened to be on the trail between Batoche and Montana, where it was expected the Indians from Montana might come, or where there might be communication from the half-breeds and Indians around Batoche with those of a foreign country. They were stationed there for the purpose of giving information to the authorities, and they were supplied with arms, but each man had to furnish himself with a horse. They were on the prairie at the time, and were subjected to all the hardships and all the dangers of those engaged in quelling that rebellion. It was only by the accident of war that they were not under fire the same as the volunteers were, yet those men were denied the same consideration and remuneration that the volunteers got, because of what I believe to be an unfair interpretation, or some technical defect, in the law intended to cover those men. The objection was raised that those men could not get either scrip nor land grants because their services were not certified to by competent parties, and the question arose who would be competent to certify to them. It was thought at the time that the certificate from the officer under whom they served would be competent, and for that purpose those men got their certificates from Lieut. Col. Macdonald. It turned out afterwards that this certificate should have been from the head of the police force there, but they only got that information after the head of the police force was changed and another man who did not know the circumstances had been sent to his place, and at this time it would be a very difficult matter to get a certificate, as the man who occupied the position did not know of their services. The objections raised were tried to be got over so far as they possibly could, with the object of satisfying the department that those men were entitled to compensation, but up to the present they have failed to receive that acknowledgment which is their due. I am glad to say the matter is now under the consideration of the department. It may be that through time they will get what they are entitled to. Whether they do or do not, it is not amiss at this present stage to say—inasmuch as the notice put on the Order Paper is not likely to be reached—that I think they are fairly entitled to some reward. In regard to those policemen who did not receive their medals, I am told that \$150 would cover the whole expense, and it does seem to me very unfair that one part of the forces engaged in that rebellion should receive medals and that other members engaged similarly in defending the country should not receive medals. If any dissatisfaction is created, for the small amount of money that would be required to satisfy all of them, I think the country could well afford to place all of these gentlemen on an equal footing. We have plenty of land in the North-West, and these police scouts only ask for land or scrip. Many of them are actual settlers in the country, and as we have 250,000,000 acres there that we want to get settled, the consideration necessary is only a small one, and I do not think any hon. member on either side of the House would object to the Government granting it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In regard to the remarks which have been made, I am bound to state that no member of Parliament has taken a deeper interest in trying to secure recognition for those who took part in the suppression of the rebellion troubles in the North-West than my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). On more than one occasion the hon. gentleman has come into my depart-

ment, and he has been most energetic and careful in securing all the information that could possibly be secured for the purpose of making the case which he was submitting to me as strong as possible. I must, however, recall to his recollection that when he and I discussed the various points which he has submitted to-day, the hon. gentleman could not overcome the objections which existed, according to the statute as I understand it, against the recognition of the Regina company as anything but a home guard. The hon. gentleman submitting the case *de novo* to-day, has read some letters which have not yet come to my notice. As I am ever so anxious to meet the claims of those who took a prominent part in the suppression of the troubles in the North-West, and who have earned from Canada the gratitude which our country should grant to those who at the call of duty sacrifice their business and their daily occupations for the purpose of resisting any risings from outside or at home, I shall be very happy indeed to reopen the case and consider it from the new information which has been submitted to the House to-day by the hon. gentleman, and see whether it is possible for me to alter the decision that I arrived at. The hon. gentleman must consider that, however anxious we must all feel to recognise the services that have been rendered, those troubles have already cost a very large amount of money. The list of pensions has been large and I believe the pensions and gratuities granted have really been most liberal, so far as the circumstances of the country would allow. I must also draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that I am controlled by the statute, which was passed by this Parliament, and which decided what classes were entitled to receive pensions and gratuities. The hon. gentleman remembers that the point of discussion between us was whether the company he has referred to to-day had been regularly enlisted in the militia force of Canada. I claimed that they had not been; and if it should appear from the letters from Colonel Scott, which the hon. gentleman has read to-day, that that decision should be changed, I shall be very happy to change it. The hon. gentleman referred to the Birtle volunteers. That case is no doubt different from the case I have just referred to, and I think it has been considered as much as it is possible to consider it from the information we have received. In that case, as in the other, if any fresh information can be furnished to the department, I shall be very glad, indeed, to reopen it and consider it *de novo*. The hon. gentleman from the east riding has referred to the case of the Wood Mountain rangers. Under the law as it exists, as I have explained to the hon. gentleman, I do not see that it is possible for me, as Minister of Militia, to do anything more than has already been done. I have been anxious to meet all the claims of the volunteers who took part in the suppression of the troubles, but I have to be controlled by the law passed by Parliament. The hon. gentleman has referred to the fact that some of the police have received medals and some have not. He must remember that the same distinction was made in the case of the volunteers. Parliament decided that only those volunteers who had seen active service west of Port Arthur should be the recipients of the medals received from Her Majesty, and that those of the police who had been under fire should receive medals, while those who had not been under fire should not receive them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I find very great difficulty in understanding on what principle pensions are granted by the department. I call attention to two pensions which were granted to the families of militiamen who were killed in action or died from wounds or disease, reported at page 12 of the Militia report. The first of these is that of a man named Ryan, who died from disease, leaving a wife and daughter. The widow receives \$68 and the daughter \$14 a year. I am not in the slightest degree

inclined to object to that; but the next case is that of a man named Valiquette, who died from disease likewise. He apparently leaves no widow or children, but he leaves a father, two brothers and three sisters, all presumably adults, each of whom receives \$51, making in all \$307 a year; or practically four times as much is granted to collateral relatives, brothers and sisters, in the one case, as is granted to the direct heirs, the widow and daughter, in the other. There may be some reason for this distinction; but *prima facie* it seems a very absurd thing that widows and children, who are necessarily dependent on the husband and father as the bread-winner, should receive a very small proportionate sum, and a very much smaller absolute sum than is granted to the collateral relatives in the other case. I should be very glad to hear an explanation of what appears to be a very unfair distribution of the Government bounty.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The question which the hon. gentleman has submitted could be much more intelligently discussed and understood by reading the Order in Council which afterwards appeared in the General Orders. Every individual pension granted was decided by the Governor in Council, and every pension was decided according to circumstances, possibly the nature of the wound in some instances.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. These are cases of death.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In cases of death the financial position of the relatives or family of the deceased was considered. In other cases, some of those who received pensions had means of their own, and the pensions were given to supplement that portion of which they were supposed to be deprived by the death or loss of those who were killed on the field of battle. In all cases the pensions have been submitted to the department, and the documents accompanying the applications looked into, and it was only after careful examination into the special circumstances attending each individual case that the department arrived at a decision. On Monday I will bring down the list of pensions granted, and a copy of the General Order which appeared in the *Canada Gazette*, as well as a copy of the Order in Council regulating those pensions. In the case of Valiquette, I am not to-day prepared to give an explanation, but I will look into the docket and give the hon. gentleman the information he requires. I may say that the board which was called upon to examine into these cases was careful to get all the evidence possible before arriving at a conclusion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is all very proper, but it is our duty to see that justice is done between the parties; and I must say that the allowance to the daughter of a dead soldier of \$14 a year, and the allowance to each of the sisters of another of \$52, would strike most men as a very disproportionate allowance.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. One may have been an officer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. One man was gunner Ryan and the other sergeant Valiquette, so that there could be no such distinction in rank as to warrant paying the one 300 per cent. more than the other. In the former case the grant was made, besides, to collateral relatives. This is a thing subject to great abuse. A man is not usually the supporter of his brothers and sisters. They are expected to look after themselves, but he is supposed to be the supporter of his wife and children; and my point is not alone with reference to the enormous disparity of the allowance, but also the fact that in the one case they are the parties who would have looked naturally to the deceased, in his lifetime, for support, and in the other case they are collateral relatives who have no *prima facie* particularly good claim on the country to be compensated for the loss caused by the death

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

of their relative. It is possible this man was the sole supporter of his brothers and sisters, but it is an unusual case, and the allowance is a large one for a discharged sergeant. For instance, an annuity of \$300 is given to his family, and unless sergeant Valiquette was a man of superior education and rank in life, an annuity of \$300 to his family is excessive; while, in the other case, the widow gets some \$64 and the children \$14 each, in all \$33. In all these cases where there is a discrepancy, a full explanation should be appended. I called the hon. gentleman's attention last year to a discrepancy between the pension given to the widow of a captain and the allowance made to the collateral relatives of a lieutenant, the latter getting much more than the former, while the information given by the hon. gentleman, who professed to know both parties, was that the widow was in quite as destitute circumstances as the father, brother, and sister of the officer I refer to.

Mr. SPROULE. As I had not the Act when I addressed the House I would like to draw the attention to the clause that refers to those scouts. The Act is 49 Victoria, chapter 29, and the clause is as follows:—

"Whereas it is expedient to make further provision respecting the grants of land authorised to members of the militia force by the Act passed in the Session held in the 48th and 49th year of Her Majesty's reign and chaptered 73: Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, declares and enacts as follows:—

"In the Act hereinbefore cited, the expression 'member of the enrolled militia force actively engaged and bearing arms in the suppression of the Indian and half-breed outbreak' shall be deemed to include, in addition to the members of the said force mentioned in the said Act:

"Every officer, non-commissioned officer and man of any irregular force raised by authority and actively engaged and bearing arms in the suppression of the said outbreak, other than as a home guard for the protection of property at or near their place of residence."

Now, the Wood Mountain scouts could not be termed "home guards" under this clause, because they were employed 100 miles from home, and at a place where their services would be needed. That disposes of the contention those men were not entitled to compensation because they were home guards. The Act provides further:

"Every scout actively engaged during the said outbreak, whose services have been certified to by competent authority."

The objection in the next place was that their services was not certified to by competent authority, and the question arose as to what was competent authority. They were requested to send certificates of service, and they thought the best certificate was that of the lieutenant colonel under whom they were serving. They, therefore, sent the certificates of Lieutenant Colonel Macdonald. Then it was contended that the certificate should be either the certificate of the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police or of Major General Middleton, and they could not get the certificate of the former because he had been changed and was out of the country. Under a fair interpretation of the Act these men ought to be included among those entitled to consideration. Therefore, I hope the Minister will look into this matter again, and will give them what they are entitled to under a fair interpretation of the law.

Mr. WATSON. Last year, I asked the Minister of Militia to look at the discrepancy between what was paid to Mrs. Brown, the mother of Capt. Brown, one of Boulton's scouts, who was slain on the field, and the pension allowed to the parents of Lieutenant Swinford of the 90th Battalion, Winnipeg. The father and mother of Lieutenant Swinford are both living, and I believe the father is performing his usual occupation in Guelph, but they received a much larger pension than the mother of Capt. Brown. I think the Minister of Militia told us last year that he would look into the matter, and explain why the discrepancy existed. I think the amount granted in the case of Capt. Brown is something over \$200, while in the case of Lieutenant Swinford

it is something over \$700. I wish the Minister would look up this case and give some explanation in regard to it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will make a note of it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is evidently a mistake in the principle which has been adopted in regard to these pensions. I think the Minister has hardly satisfied the House in regard to the cases which have been brought up by my hon. friend from Norfolk and my hon. friend who has just spoken. It is clear that, when a man loses his life in the service of his country, it is intended that the pension is for his family and not for his collateral relations. In the Imperial service, I understand that the pension only goes to the widow or children of the man who loses his life, and not to his brothers, or sisters, or father, except under peculiar circumstances. I do not deny that such circumstances might fairly arise, but there is no case in which the Government should award so large an amount to the brothers, and sisters, or father, of the one and so small an amount to the widow of the other. The only excuse that has been given is that it was settled by an Order in Council, but the hon. gentleman knows that he made the recommendation to the Privy Council, and, therefore, it is the same thing. He is responsible, and the Government are responsible. There is no reason that we can understand for this irregularity, that such a large amount should be allowed in one case and such a small amount in the other, particularly when, according to my judgment, in the first case they have no right to anything at all. As far as I can judge, in the case of sergeant Valiquette, his father, his two brothers and his three sisters were not entitled to any pension at all. He must have been a young man of age, and his two brothers and three sisters with their father had no claim upon him for their support, and the fact of the Government adopting a principle like that may lead to very much further results than the hon. gentleman is aware of. I think the House cannot protest too strongly against such a misappropriation of the public funds, and I should very much like to see the papers connected with that case, if the hon. gentleman can give any explanation of it, because, up to the present time, as far as I am concerned, the explanations are not at all satisfactory.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have already explained that every case was investigated by a board. Upon the report of that board, it was submitted to the Minister of Militia. After the report was concurred in, the Minister of Militia made his recommendation to Council. Of course, I am quite prepared to take the responsibility of that recommendation. If the hon. gentleman will point out any individual case where he finds that there is a disparity, or where he believes that the pension or gratuity is larger than it should have been, I am prepared to bring down the information and to put upon the Table the docket containing the history of that individual case; but, considering that the list of pensions is very large, I am not prepared from memory to go into every individual case and state the circumstances which led to the conclusion arrived at. I am prepared to give every information in regard to the case of Valiquette, and the other man, whose name I forget.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Ryan was the name, and it is mentioned in the hon. gentleman's own report, page 12.

Mr. WATSON. There is also the cases which I have mentioned of Capt. Brown and Lieut. Swinford.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My objection is to the principle of granting pensions to collateral relatives.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is explained by the General Order regulating pensions.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That may explain the Government's view, but whether it is wise or proper for the Gov-

ernment to adopt such a policy in this country which does not obtain in other countries, and certainly does not obtain in England, is another matter. If the hon. gentleman has opened the door to giving a pension to every connection a man may have, if in his wisdom and in that of the Government behind him they see fit to do so, it is difficult to see the end of it. I think none of these people have any right to a pension. I am simply contending for the principle being wrong and vicious, and I think it should be put a stop to.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company.—(Mr. Fisher.)

REPORT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg to lay on the Table of the House Abstract of statement of the Insurance Companies in Canada for the year ending 31st December, 1887, and in doing so I may say that this statement has been in the hands of the printers since March, a circumstance which I mention to account for laying it on the Table at so late a period.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Among the items for quarantine there is one for \$200 for chaplains at Halifax quarantine. Only one chaplain acted last year, the Catholic chaplain, and the rector of the parish having left that district and another person having been appointed, he was not aware that \$100 was appropriated for that service at the quarantine station. Of course, I do not ask that he be paid for the time he was not doing the duty, but I suppose the \$100 will be continued as usual to the Protestant chaplain as a similar sum is paid to the Catholic chaplain.

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to express my gratification at learning, from the observations that have fallen from hon. members during the discussion of the Estimates, of the very great appreciation with which the volunteers regard the medals which have been struck for them at the instance of the Government. As I had the honor of recommending, or suggesting, to the Government that these medals should be struck, I feel very much gratified to find they are so much valued, so much prized by the men and so much sought after. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) took occasion, from his place in this House, to state, judging from his supposed knowledge of the feelings and sentiments of the people of Canada, that they would not wear the medals, that they would reject them, with scorn, in fact. From my knowledge of the views and sentiments of the people of this country I believed that they would value them, and I am glad to find that my view in reference to this was correct, and that the view of the hon. gentleman was wrong. The hon. gentleman seeks to pose as the representative of the views and sentiments of the people of this country, but he only represents certain peculiar views and sentiments that he himself entertains. I may leave it to this House and to the country to decide, as to whether he or I best represent Canadians in reference to this matter,

I who proposed that these medals should be struck and believed that the people of Canada would value them, or he who says that the people of Canada would refuse them with scorn.

Mr. EDGAR. I am very glad indeed that the hon. member is so satisfied with rejoicing over the unfortunate events that occurred in Canada in connection with the North-West rebellion. What I said before on the subject of medals I will repeat now. I think it a great pity that so unfortunate an event as that should be commemorated by striking a medal. It is very well when Canadians fight for their country against a foreign foe that they should be decorated with medals, but when Canadians fight against Canadians in a miserable civil strife like that, I think we ought to be ashamed to strike medals to commemorate it. I thought so when I spoke before and I think so now.

Mr. McNEILL. It has been reserved for the hon. gentleman to suggest that Her Majesty the Queen would grant medals on an unworthy occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. I must call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. McNEILL. If I am out of order I will sit down.

Mr. LISTER. This self-glorification is perfectly ridiculous. He thinks there are no loyalists in the country beside himself.

Mr. McNEILL. I am not speaking of loyalty now.

The CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. LISTER. He has no right to lecture native-born Canadians.

Mr. McNEILL. I shall move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. McNEILL. I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman should be amenable to discipline. There is no question before the Chair. The gentleman is entirely out of order from the first.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If you allow me I will put a question before the Chair. I move—

Mr. McNEILL. I think I am in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. McNEILL. I rise to a point of order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McNEILL. I am merely rising to a point of order and I think I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. McNEILL. I move the Committee rise, and I want to know whether that is in order or not. If the Chairman rules I am out of order I shall discontinue.

The CHAIRMAN. What do I understand the hon. gentleman to move?

Mr. McNEILL. I move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must raise the question that the hon. gentleman having spoken he is not competent to move—

An hon. MEMBER. He has a right to do so in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman is in order, and he has a right to speak.

Mr. McNEILL.

Mr. McNEILL. So far as the observation which has fallen from the hon. gentleman opposite is concerned that I am lecturing native-born Canadians, I just simply wish to say that I am representing the North Riding of Bruce in this House, and that I think the representative of the North Riding of Bruce has as good a right to express the views of his constituents in this House as the representative of any other riding in Ontario, or in Canada. I am perfectly satisfied that in any observations I have made in this House in reference to this, or any kindred subject, I am only representing the views of those who did me the great honor to send me here. I am responsible to my constituents, and I am prepared to abide by their verdict in reference to my conduct in this House. So far as my representing the views of the people of Canada is concerned, I think I have the right to say that I represent the views of the people of Canada a great deal better than the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) or the hon. gentleman from Lambton (Mr. Lister) who so rudely interrupted me, inasmuch as, since I came to this House, I have consistently supported that great consistent policy which has been approved by the people of Canada, and the hon. gentlemen who have so interrupted me have inconsistently supported in this House a score of inconsistent policies, all which have been disapproved by the people of Canada. Therefore, I think I represent the views of the people of Canada as well, if not better, than the hon. gentlemen opposite. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) who prides himself so much upon the possession of the wisdom of the serpent, may find, and his party may find, that that wisdom has been as superficial and dangerous to them on this occasion as it has often proved in times past. I will say that the suggestion which came from the hon. gentleman that in this country men who happen to be born in the mother country, or in any other part of the Empire, are to be distinguished from those who happen to be born in Canada, is carrying pretty far that policy which the hon. gentleman has so distinguished himself in supporting, that is the policy of sowing dissension among the people of this country. He has been distinguished in sowing dissensions between Province and Province, race and race, creed and creed, and between the Provinces and the central power. Now, he goes a little further and endeavors to sow dissension in the family circle itself. He endeavors to teach the son that the father who came to this country has not as good a right to have a say in the affairs of Canada as the son has himself. I do not think that policy is one which will commend itself to the people of this country, and as I said before, I think that the hon. gentleman will find that the policy which he now represents is not so very astute as he thinks it to be. Speaking for the native-born Canadians of the North Riding of Bruce, whom I represent, I venture to say that if the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) came there, and from any public platform suggested that the people would refuse to wear the medals which Her Gracious Majesty, whom they so love and so revere, had presented to them, although there is not any more orderly constituency in the Dominion of Canada, he would—well he would very likely have cause to repent his temerity. I do not say that he would receive a baptism of fire, for that he would require to go south where his affection is, but I think he would be likely to get a baptism in the nearest swamp.

Mr. LISTER. I came into this House, I think, about the same time that the hon. gentleman for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) did in 1882, and I think there has hardly been a Session from that time to the present that that gentleman has not sought every available opportunity of proclaiming his intense loyalty, and speaking about the disloyalty of the Opposition.

Mr. McNEILL. That is not so. Please do not misrepresent me.

Mr. LISTER. One would think he was a warrior bold; he reminds me of Artemus Ward, who was always willing to sacrifice his wife's relations for the good of the country. I am not aware that the hon. gentleman shouldered his musket on the occasion he speaks of, or participated in any way in the rebellion. I want to tell this to the hon. gentleman: That so far as Canada is concerned it belongs to all people no matter from where they come. Every man in this country has an equal right, but a certain portion of the people of this country have a right to say, to a gentleman like my hon. friend, that he has no right, on every occasion, to lecture any other portion of the community. Now, so far as the rebels are concerned, I have nothing to say one way or the other. If it pleases the volunteers to receive these medals and to wear them, all well and good; but this I have to say, that in that rebellion our own people were called on to shoot down their brethren, and that war was a war caused by the administration which the hon. gentleman supports. If the people of the North-West Territories had been treated as they ought to have been treated, if the privileges had been conceded to them which they demanded, and which were ultimately given to them, there would have been no rebellion, and no occasion for striking the medals and giving them to the gallant men who went to the North-West to suppress it; and yet the hon. gentleman, who supports the Government that was the prime cause of the rebellion, takes every opportunity of saying to gentlemen on this side of the House: You are disloyal. Disloyal for what? For putting the blame on the proper shoulders? Now, I want to say to the hon. gentleman, who has all the loyalty of Canada wrapped up in his particular person, that his constant prating about loyalty does not prove that he has any of it himself, and it is obnoxious to a large portion of the community. People who are constantly preaching virtue have generally very little of it themselves, and people will be apt to say of the hon. gentleman, who is always preaching about loyalty, that he has very little of it himself. The hon. gentleman talks about being the representative of North Bruce. How is he the representative? By the most infamous gerrymander that was ever perpetrated. He might live to be as old as Methuselah and never have been in Parliament but for that gerrymander. But if we happened to get into power, and it became necessary to redistribute the counties, he would not be here at all.

Mr. McNEILL. You would gerrymander me out of my seat.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman knows that he is only a representative of a particular section—they are all put there together—not a temperance section, but another section. He knows as well as I do that he is here by virtue of a gerrymander, not by the free will of the people.

Motion withdrawn.

Salaries, Military Branch and District Staff..... \$14,100

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is the decrease of \$3,400 caused?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. From the fact that two of the deputy adjutants general, Col. Harwood and Col. Jackson, have been retired this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What retiring allowance is made to these gentlemen? What is the rule of the department in that respect?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We give two years' salary.

Brigade Majors, salaries, &c..... \$15,100

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to a matter of some importance to one of the brigade majors; I refer to Col. Aylmer, at London. The hon. gentleman knows that he has a claim

against the department of two or three years' standing, and I believe the hon. gentleman some time ago assured Col. Aylmer that that claim would be paid, but up to this moment that promise has not been carried out. It is a claim for having discharged the duties of a special officer for a time, and, according to law and the practice of the department, he was entitled to be paid for those services.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not at all admit that I ever told Col. Aylmer that his claim against the department of Militia was going to be settled. The circumstances under which that claim was made are these: During the troubles in the North-West some of the deputy adjutants general were sent, under orders from the department for active service, to the front, among others Col. Straubenzie and Col. Jackson, the former under orders of the major general, and the latter being put in charge at Winnipeg. In the case of Col. Straubenzie, the allowances made to the deputy adjutant general were transferred by him to the brigade major, who acted as commanding officer of the district during his absence. In the case of Col. Jackson, his allowances for a portion of the time he was away were paid to Col. Aylmer, and a difficulty arose between the deputy adjutant general and the brigade major as to the balance of those allowances, the deputy adjutant general claiming that some reduction had been made by the department when he was acting here as commissioner for trying claims arising out of the troubles in the North-West, and that this reduction should go to pay Col. Aylmer. The hon. gentleman brought this matter under my notice the other day, when I told him that I would take it up again and see whether or not it was possible to adjust that claim; but I wish it to be distinctly understood that I made no promise or pledge to Col. Aylmer or anybody else to settle the matter, because the contention of the department was that we had nothing to say of the transfer of allowances to other districts.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask whether it is not the uniform practice of the department, and the recognised right of an officer who takes charge of a district and discharges the duties of an absent officer, that he shall receive the extra amount making up the difference between the salaries of those officers.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It has never been the practice. The department has always left the two officers to settle that between themselves.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood that the department kept back the amount.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is a mistake. It has not been kept back.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say that the hon. gentleman made me any promise at all, but I understood Col. Aylmer to say that when he met the Minister in London he promised to pay this claim.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is a very fair way of settling it, but I do not want to pledge the department at all.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What makes that item so much in excess of the expenditure of previous years? I see in the Militia report that brigade majors are put down for \$10,800 for 1856-57, and the hon. gentleman is now asking for a vote of \$15,100.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In District No. 2, I had placed the whole district under the charge of the Infantry School. We found that Col. Otter's time was fully taken up with his duties as commandant of the Infantry School, and also as acting deputy adjutant general for District No. 2. It had been in contemplation to supplement that by throwing the work of the brigade major upon the officers of the Infantry School. However, the Government decided to appoint Col. Gray, who is an officer of great experience,

and who had been a prominent member of the volunteer force, as brigade major, and he has been acting as such ever since. Of course the hon. gentleman, in noticing the increase to brigade majors, will also notice that there is a decrease, in so far as the staff expenditure is concerned. The second increase is for the purpose of appointing a brigade major in the Eastern Townships. We found that, as I was dispensing with the services of two deputy adjutants general, and making a reduction in so far as those two salaries were concerned, that for the efficiency of the service, it was necessary to appoint a brigade major in the Eastern Townships. I think the system adopted by the department will act satisfactorily. It is a reduction in so far as salaries are concerned, and I think the efficiency of the service will benefit by the change.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That will absorb the difference of \$5,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think the policy of the Government is a very good one. In the first place, the appointment of the commandant of the Infantry School as deputy adjutant general brings the school itself more directly in contact with the force, and will prevent to some extent the tendency, always had by these corps, to assume a professional standing above that of the ordinary militia. The fact of the commandant of the school holding the position of commandant of the military district, as well as the appointment of brigade majors from the active force itself, will have a tendency to prevent that. This will make a connecting link between the two corps. Where it is necessary to have a brigade major, he should be appointed from the active force, and the deputy adjutant general should also be the commandant of the Infantry School.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the exact position of Col. Irwin? Is he still in the Imperial service?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, he has retired altogether from that service.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence to a memo. that was handed to me by Mr. Little, and if the statements therein are accurate, I think the hon. gentleman must be laboring under some error with regard to what has been the practice in former times in his department. I find it here said:

"Mr. Aylmer was major in the Military District No. 1, acting as such, during the absence of the deputy adjutant general, from the 3rd March, 1885 to the 11th December, 1885, and he received an allowance for that time at the rate of \$500 per annum. That he acted as deputy adjutant general from the 6th January, 1886, until the 6th January, 1887, and received no portion of the allowance for performing duty during that period of time, although he was entitled to \$41.66 per month. The \$500, however, was paid monthly to Colonel Jackson, who was absent for the whole time, from the 6th January, 1886, to the 6th January, 1887, as chairman of the North-West Claims Commission."

Mr. Aylmer was engaged in the discharge of his duties.—

"That subsequently the allowance of \$500 was withdrawn from Col. Jackson, that officer having been paid his salary on an Order in Council of August, 1885."

Consequently neither the brigade major nor Col. Aylmer who had charge of the district received any portion of this \$500.—

"That the officer in charge of Military District No. 1, although that district was in an inefficient state, was allowed this particular sum. That the precedents show that the brigade major has received the staff allowance in the following cases: During the absence of Lieut. Col. Osborne Smith, the deputy adjutant general at Winnipeg, District No. 5, in 1871, 1872 and 1873, the brigade major, although the junior in District No. 5, drew the staff allowance at the rate of \$41.66 a month."

And that was paid by the department and not by the officer.—

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

"In 1876, Lieut. Col. Wilson, brigade major of the District No. 9, acted as Deputy Adjutant General, and drew the allowance. At that time Lieut. Col. Straubenzee, the deputy adjutant general in Military District No. 5, was seriously ill at Montreal, and the brigade major, who acted in his absence, drew the staff allowance."

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Quite right.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell)—

"And during the time that Lieut. Col. Straubenzie was absent on the North-West service, in 1885, the brigade major, on orders from headquarters, as will be seen from the Auditor General's report, drew the staff allowance."

Not by a private arrangement between the absent officer and the party acting on his behalf, but by order of the department, as appears by the Auditor General's report. I think that these statements show that it has been established, as a regulation by the department, to pay the money. So far as I know, this is the only officer in the service who has been so dealt with. Lieut. Col. Aylmer made official application to the hon. gentleman for the amount to which he was entitled, on three different occasions—on the 23rd March and the 19th May, 1886, and on the 23rd December, 1887—and he has not received any allowance, nor has there ever been any decision communicated to him with reference to his claim upon the hon. gentleman's department.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In the several cases to which the hon. gentleman has referred, I have no doubt that in so far as the fact of the payments is concerned, it is quite correct; but the point between the hon. gentleman and myself is simply this: What I claim is that the payments were made by an arrangement between the deputy adjutant general, and the brigade major serving under him. The position I took, as Minister of Militia, when the troubles broke out in the North-West, was that I did not consider, when taking an officer in that position and sending him to the front to take the risk and hardship of a campaign, that it was right for us to deduct anything from his pay; but, in the case of Col. Straubenzie, under whom Col. Worsely was acting as brigade major, Col. Straubenzie handed over to Col. Worsely his allowance, but that was by an arrangement between Col. Straubenzie and Col. Worsely, but not by any direction of the department. In view of the serious illness of Col. Straubenzie, the allowance was made to the gentleman who was performing the duty of deputy adjutant general, and that was all. I can, however, give a case of similar nature to that of Col. Jackson and Col. Aylmer. In this very district, Col. Lamontagne was adjutant general, and Col. Lewis was acting under him as brigade major. Col. Lamontagne was sent to the front ill, but he did not pay over his allowance to Col. Lewis, the brigade major, and the department did not interfere. The department did not think it ought to interfere in the case of Col. Jackson either, although it is true that I thought, if I could bring on an arrangement between the two officers, it was not only my duty but it would be a pleasure for me to make that arrangement. I was under no pledge to Col. Aylmer, and he is in the same position as Col. Lewis was in this district, when serving under Col. Lamontagne. No doubt this money may have been drawn and paid through the Auditor General in the case referred to, but, if so, it was drawn and paid by an arrangement between these officers. I am not prepared to say that, previous to the time when I undertook the administration of the Department of Militia, some cases may not have been dealt with in a different manner by other Ministers of Militia, but I can say that, during the time that I have been acting in that capacity, no such case has been settled in the way the hon. gentleman says it has been settled by the Department of Militia.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). While Col. Straubenzie was in the North-West, I think you will find that the payment was made by orders from headquarters.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is so stated in the Auditor General's report.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It may have been, with the consent of Col. Straubenzie, but I state positively that no such payment was made without the consent of Col. Straubenzie.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I may say further that the hon. gentleman has overlooked the fact that Col. Jackson was supposed to be differently paid while he was acting on the Commission, and the Government were of the opinion that his payment as deputy adjutant general should cease for that time.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He was paid, and he was called upon to return what he received, and he did return it, and neither Col. Jackson nor Col. Aylmer has received any allowance for that time, which they were entitled to as officers holding that position.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is not so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am so informed.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The pay as deputy adjutant general, the salary, was not affected in the least. This is simply the allowance.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What I am referring to is the allowance.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The question is whether he should have handed over his allowance as commanding officer of that district to the brigade major during his absence. I have stated that, during the absence of Col. Straubenzie, with his consent, the money may have been drawn by Col. Worsley, but the department was never brought into play to get Col. Straubenzie to hand over his allowance to Col. Worsley any more than it was to get Colo. Jackson to hand over his allowance to Col. Aylmer.

Ammunition, Clothing, Military Stores, &c..... \$205,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister will remember that last year there was a discussion on the subject of the manufacture of ammunition at Quebec, and I took the opportunity then of expressing an opinion which I had heard from several quarters as to the poor quality of the ammunition manufactured there, and issued to the force. The hon. gentleman then said that they were about to institute a system by which they hoped to obviate that difficulty, and that in future he hoped there would be no complaints made in regard to that. Would he now be able to inform the House as to what changes, if any, have been made, and what has been the result in regard to the expenses attending it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Since the time that the question was brought before the House, we have had competent men, who take a great deal of interest in rifle practice, who have made a report as to the cartridge factory. A great deal of the trouble, if I may so express myself, arose from the fact that it was supposed that the powder used in the manufacture of these cartridges, which was manufactured in Canada by the Hamilton Powder Co., was not as good as the powder we imported from England. To obviate this difficulty, we ceased to use the Hamilton powder, and got the powder from England. Of course, I need not explain to the hon. gentleman that, like himself, when he was occupying the position I happen to occupy to-day, I am a layman, and my experience of rifle practice has not been as large as that of some other hon. gentlemen. I should not undertake to express my own

opinion on this subject against that of prominent members of the militia force who occupy seats in this House. About two weeks ago there was an article which appeared in a certain newspaper criticising the quality of the cartridges manufactured in Quebec. For my part, I did not even know that the cartridges manufactured in Quebec were being used in Infantry School "C" in British Columbia, the latest addition to our Infantry Schools in Canada, but I received a letter from Col. Holmes who, after reading the article in the papers, thought it might be desirable, from the standpoint of the department and also from the standpoint of the force, to give his experience during the period of time when it was his duty to put his school through rifle practice in British Columbia. He writes the following letter, and as it is the opinion of a practical man, who has been one of the leading shots in Canada during most of the competitions that have taken place, I think it will satisfy public opinion more than anything that I could say from personal knowledge:

" 'C' Battery has just completed firing at the annual practice, and has fired 4,000 of Snider ammunition of Canadian manufacture, which was sent with the corps to British Columbia. As I have heard of discontent being prevalent regarding its reliability, although I had never seen any of it in use before, as our supply here is of English make, I was prepared to find fault with it, if necessary. I must say, however, that what we have just used is really as good and reliable as any I have ever seen anywhere, and I should be a judge, as I stood 5th in the Wimbledon team for 1873, and have always been a fair average shot. Peters—"

Major Peters, who is also known to be a capital shot and great sportsman, and one of the best officers we have in the force—

" Peters also agrees with me as to its good quality, and speaks highly of it, and says all the fault found with it of late years is groundless. I thought you would like to have an opinion from British Columbia in this matter, as I presume some one may possibly bring up the same remarks which have appeared in the papers against the cartridge factory."

Now, this is evidence of an officer who is not only a very good officer, but who is known to be a first rate rifle shot; and relying upon information which I received from competent officers such as he is, I believed that the cartridges manufactured in Canada were not perfect at first. Like every other new enterprise it required skilled men and skilled labor, and that skilled labor could only be acquired by the experience which we possess to-day, and which is making of the cartridge factory a success.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the Minister tell me what the cost of manufacturing is? It occurred to me that if the Minister has to import powder, he might import the cartridge filled much cheaper from England than he could manufacture it here.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. So far as possible, I am very much in favor of keeping Canadian money in Canadian hands. I believe the reason why we decided upon importing the powder from England was that it was reported to me by men who understood the question thoroughly that the powder which we had was not up to the mark, possibly from the fault of our specifications, or from some other reason, because I believe that just as good powder can be manufactured in Canada as anywhere else. Possibly we had not acquired sufficient experience to specify the manufacture of that powder in such a way that it should be equal to the requirements of the cartridge factory, so we got the powder from Waltham Abbey, where we all know that the test is absolutely certain, and it is known all over the world as being equal to any powder manufactured.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman tell me what it costs to manufacture the cartridge, including the cost of powder, as compared with the cost of importing cartridges from England filled?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The only way we can arrive at that point is to know how much the cartridge factory costs to Canada.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Cannot the hon. gentleman give me an idea of how much they cost per hundred?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The cartridges cost us \$20 a thousand—manufactured in Canada. But I must draw the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact, that we have got the Enfield rifle here, and that the same cartridges are no longer manufactured in England, consequently we would have had to change the whole of our armament, at a cost of millions of dollars to Canada, or to manufacture our own cartridges, because the cartridges we used to obtain from England are no longer manufactured there.

Clothing, [great coats..... \$90,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I notice by the Public Accounts that these infantry overcoats cost \$5.48; scarlet tunics, \$5.50. I do not remember at the moment what those imported cost during the time I presided over the department.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is the cost, \$5.48.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My experience was that two suits of English clothing were equal to three suits of the clothing manufactured here. Is that the hon. gentleman's experience since that time?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister seems to have had some doubt about it, because in his report he says:

"The contracts for the clothing in the force have been given to experienced Canadian contractors, and I have no doubt that the clothing manufactured by them will give entire satisfaction."

Has it given entire satisfaction?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is the relative cost cheaper as compared with the figures I have given?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Not cheaper.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is still that difference in the wear?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. A great difference.

Mr. JONES. That is to say, that it takes three suits of Canadian to last two of English. That was the experience during the time I was in the department. Is that the result of your experience up to this time?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No. The National Policy of Canada has been improving our manufactures so rapidly since the hon. gentleman ceased to be at the head of the Militia Department, that the reverse of the hon. gentleman's experience now is true.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh!

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman says, Oh! but I am asked a question to which I am attempting to reply, according to the experience I have acquired in the department. We find the cloth manufactured in Canada is far superior to any cloth we have imported. I am expressing not my own opinion but the opinion of the officers who have had charge of the store department for years, and they all agree that the cloth manufactured in Canada is superior to any we have ever imported from England, in so far as durability and comfort are concerned; it is a warmer, heavier and better cloth in every way. We consider that overcoats which formerly lasted only five years will now last six or seven years, owing to their being manufactured of better material.

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Mr. LISTER. Do I understand that the cloth for the trousers is manufactured in Canada?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, everything now.

Mr. LISTER. I brought this matter up at the last Session of Parliament, and I have reason to do it again this Session. I see that the contractors are: for trousers, Henry Shorey & Co.; great coats and tunics, W. E. Sanford (who is the senator) and James O'Brien. I have not heard any complaints about the tunics and great coats; but as regards the trousers, they were made of nothing but shoddy. I am told by members of the force who were out last season that the trousers only lasted a few days, that you could take the cloth and pull it to pieces, the fibre was so short, that they were perfectly useless. My own company went out well clothed but some of the men had to buy new trousers during the 12 days and in other cases the trousers were not fit to wear. I have seen the cloth, and it is the most wretched shoddy ever manufactured. Any hon. gentleman who has given attention to the matter, I am sure will corroborate my statement. I am not blaming the hon. gentleman for it but the contractor, and I bring it before the attention of the Minister in order that the matter may be remedied. What I complain of is that shoddy cloth should not be distributed to the force. We are paying good prices for the cloth and it should be a good article. The force is entitled to that, and I trust the Minister will make it his duty to enquire into the matter, and I am sure he will find that the statement I have made is strictly accurate.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I have had some little experience in regard to militia clothing. The great coats are of excellent quality; I could not say how they compare with those issued under the old system, but so excellent was the cloth that I obtained a piece for my own use and have been wearing a coat made from it regularly. It is a cloth of excellent quality both as regards quality and wear. The new tunics I cannot say anything about, because our tunics were of English manufacture, and we have not yet had issued any of Canadian make. With regard to trousers, there was one sort, a sort of serge, that was certainly very poor stuff. The clothing we had in the North-West certainly wore very well.

Mr. LISTER. I am speaking of trousers only.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The serge trousers were very bad. Any further issue of them should be stopped; but the cloth is very well.

Mr. LISTER. I am speaking of last summer. The men went out with apparently good trousers, and they were worn out in the course of a few days.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I cannot speak of last year's issue.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I have had some little experience in volunteer matters and have taken an interest in the clothing of the force. So much interest have I taken in the matter that this year I have gone through the stores. My attention having been drawn particularly to the trousers I can offer my testimony that the cloth is of an unusually good character, and the clothes were much better finished in every way than they have been during the last twenty years. I did not see the issue of last year; but the issue of the year previous, and we have been using them in my corps, I found of fair quality. Those of the present year are of exceptionally good quality and much better finished. No comparison whatever can be made between those trousers and the trousers of previous years, as the former are so very much better.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Has the department in hand many trousers of the inferior quality mentioned by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien)?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not admit that we issue any clothing of inferior quality. I do not make that statement on my own authority alone, but I will give an opinion that will carry great weight with hon. gentlemen opposite, namely, the *Globe* newspaper. It says, speaking of military cloth:

"Lieut. Col. Gibson, commander of the 13th Battalion, and Captain Hendry, of the Hamilton Field Battery, in company with our correspondent, this afternoon were shown through the factory of W. E. Sanford & Co., manufacturers and contractors for the Canadian militia clothing, with the idea of giving them an insight into the character and quality of the goods manufactured for the militia. After inspecting the machinery, the process of making the clothing, and making a minute examination of the material, with a view to its quality and durability, as compared with imported cloth, they expressed their entire satisfaction with the result of the inspection, as well as their complete confidence in the ability of the present contractors to produce superior military clothing. During the visit of these military gentlemen a comparative test between English and Canadian cloth was made, proving the latter to be in every particular superior to the English make, the imported cloth tearing with comparative ease, while it was almost impossible to make the home fabric move, it being of superior quality. Its weight, dye and great durability seemed to be all that could be desired. Whatever may be said of the militia clothing, the clothing now being made for our active militia by W. E. Sanford & Co., and which will be distributed in due course, if it does not prove to be the best ever worn, at all events will compare advantageously with any previous issue. The officers noticed in particular a marked contrast between the quality of the cloth used for the trousers and that of the material worked up in most of the outfits to which we have been accustomed. We are happy to say that the issue to the 15th Battalion seems excellent, especially as compared with the ill-fitting, badly made clothing supplied after the burning of the drill shed in 1886."

That happened to be imported English clothing which was served out. I am free to admit, for I wish to be perfectly frank in the matter, that we had, at the beginning, certain complaints in regard to some of the material used. It was at the beginning of a new enterprise, and it is not surprising if the clothing was not as perfect then as it is to-day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is more to the point than the advertisement which the hon. gentleman has read. Of course, the hon. gentleman well knew that it was an advertisement.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not an advertisement; it is published in the *Globe*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that a puff is being put into a newspaper without being paid for?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. I will venture to say that if I called Mr. Sanford's book-keeper here he would tell a wholly different story. It is merely trifling with the House to read an advertisement for which, perhaps, double or treble rates were paid, as showing the excellent quality of the clothing, in opposition to the statement of my hon. friend made from personal knowledge, that the men had to buy trousers in order to avoid coming home in their shirt tails. In the face of a statement of that sort the hon. Minister reads an advertisement.

Mr. TISDALE. I am surprised at the allusion made to Col. Gibson, who although opposed to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, politically, yet occupies a very high position as a politician, a gentleman and an officer, and if I understood the article which the Minister of Militia read it was on the authority of Col. Gibson. I am surprised, therefore, at Mr. Mills insinuating, indirectly, in that way a charge against Col. Gibson and not against the *Globe* newspaper.

Drill Pay, etc..... \$290,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Perhaps on this vote for militia the hon. gentleman will explain how it is that he is asking for \$290,000 this year as against \$257,000 last year. Is he going to give those he calls out a greater length of service?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The items are 12 days' drill, city corps and brigades of garrison artillery at local headquarters, for cost per officer and man of 72 cents a day.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Would the hon. Minister explain where the increased amount comes in and we might dispense with the items?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot see any increase. I am explaining the details to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I see by the report that this amount seems to be creeping up year by year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, it is not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In 1886 for this purpose there were \$241,217, in 1886-87 \$257,385, and now the Minister is asking for \$290,000. I merely ask the hon. Minister where the increase comes in?

Mr. O'BRIEN. There is no increase. The same amount has been voted year by year since I have been a member of this House. The number of men who turn out is not always the same, and there is thus a difference between the amount voted and expended. Suppose that one year the brigade camps do not cost the same amount, it is carried on to the next year, but the same amount has been voted by Parliament for years back. What we should complain of is that the Government does not deem it proper to have the rural corps out every year.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am not complaining of the amount. I only asked where was the difference.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The amount voted has not varied. I do complain that while the city corps get their pay every year the rural corps are only called out every two years.

Mr. DENISON. I endorse what the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) says about the necessity for having the militia drilled every year. I see that for some years back about the same amount has been voted for this purpose, and while the amount for the ordinary militia has remained in the neighborhood of \$290,000 that for the permanent schools has steadily and largely increased. I think that the amounts for each are out of proportion, too much being spent upon the schools in proportion to amount spent upon the militia. We find here that we have an amount of \$290,000 for drilling the ordinary militia of the country for the coming year, and we find that there are \$522,700 set apart for permanent schools. I have taken the trouble to look over some blue-books to ascertain the figures upon this question, and although I am not quite sure of my figures, because I had some difficulty in culling them from the different reports, I think they are in the main correct. I find that, in 1884, the drill pay was \$314,473.50; and for the permanent schools, \$226,720.81. In 1884-85 the drill pay was \$270,151.19; and the permanent corps had increased to \$280,945.51. In 1885-86 the drill pay was \$281,207.91; and the permanent corps had again increased to \$350,858.87. In 1886-87 the drill pay was \$290,000, and the permanent corps \$482,700, and for the coming year the drill pay is estimated at \$290,000, while the permanent corps is estimated at \$522,700. I regret very much that some move is not being made in the direction of increasing the amount that is spent on the ordinary militia of the country, in the same manner as they are increasing the amount that was spent on the permanent corps. If the present policy is pursued we will soon not have any militia, but only expensive schools in which the militia are to be trained, but no pupils. In 1873, some fifteen years ago, when our population was much smaller, we expended on the militia, \$1,248,663; while we had a gross expenditure of \$19,174,647. Then we were drilling 45,000 men, or in other words all the militia we had in the country, and we were drilling them every year. In 1886-87 we

are drilling only some 18,000 or 20,000 men and the militia expenditure is \$1,193,692, while our gross expenditure for all purposes in Canada reaches the sum of \$35,658,161 10. I, therefore, wish to draw your attention to the fact that while the ordinary expenditure of the country has been very largely increased, that the expenditure on the militia has not increased in the same ratio or in anything like it. If we increase our expenditure on the militia in anything like the ratio of the general expenditure, we would now be spending on it in the neighborhood of \$2,000,000 a year. I regret that within the past few years so much has been devoted to the permanent schools while the amount for the militia remains as it was, and in looking over the report of the Major General of Militia this year we see no indication from it that any move will be made in the direction of staying the expenditure on the permanent schools and increasing it on the militia, but rather the reverse. Speaking of the school at Quebec, the major general says:

"A riding school is very much needed, and I would again beg earnestly that the strength of the troop be increased, its present strength being inadequate for the work. It should number at least 60 troopers with 50 horses, and the commissioned ranks should be increased by one captain, one subaltern, a riding instructor and a quartermaster."

In reference to Toronto, he says:

"I again beg to recommend that a cavalry school be formed in Toronto where it is much required, and also with regard to 'A' and 'B' Batteries I would beg to point out that the present organisation of only two guns in each school is not a good one, two guns only not being sufficient to give proper instruction in field artillery, and I would recommend that each school should have four guns fully horsed, the guns of the battery should be replaced by more modern guns when possible."

He goes on to say with regard to Winnipeg:

"A riding school is absolutely necessary, and I hope will soon be built. The mounted men of this force should, as in the Imperial service, have a slight addition to their pay, their work being harder and the wear and tear of uniform being greater."

He also says:

"I would again urge the necessity of increasing the number of officers in the several schools. This is requisite for the due exercise of discipline alone, since owing to the paucity of competent officers it is now almost impossible to hold regimental courts martial without employing non-competent officers or such officers of the local militia as can be found available, which practice is not for obvious reasons advisable."

That is certainly a thing that I cannot agree with, for we have a good opportunity in those schools of instruction where the local officers might be placed on courts martial and so taught to do the duties of officers of court-martial. It seems to me a great mistake to appoint a permanent officer on purpose that he should be ready to go on courts martial for the purpose of trying these men. It would certainly be an advantage to the militia force generally, if that money were spent in having different officers go on the board, and so teach them these court martial duties. Then he goes on to say:

"I would again recommend that the school corps be armed with Martini-Henry rifles now in store, and be supplied with the latest equipment—the belts and straps of brown leather."

Again, he says:

"I would here beg to recommend strongly that liberal assistance be afforded by the Government towards the maintenance of the non-commissioned officers messes and the men's reading and recreation room. . . . I venture to think it would be unwise of the country to begrudge a little extra compensation, within reasonable limits, to the permanent corps, as being so small a force it should be thorough and ready in the time of need to act as a foundation on which to form rapidly a large force."

All these remarks, advocating increased expenditure, are in reference to the permanent corps, a body of some 900 men. Then, we come to the general's report in reference to the militia of Canada, which is supposed to consist of about 40,000 men, and here is all we find in regard to increased expenditure on them:

Mr. DENISON.

"This year I was enabled to visit all the camps assembled in the Dominion, and to see the troops at different stages of their training, and from this experience I am confirmed in my opinions, expressed in my last year's report, that though the men and officers do certainly make the most of their time, it is altogether too short, and I do earnestly hope that some arrangement may be made to lengthen it, and that the city corps, who with their superior knowledge of drill would greatly benefit by it, be encouraged to join the camps in their districts, if only for a few days."

Then he says he would like to see the city regiments with paid adjutants; and says further:

"My experience of another year does not lead me to alter the opinion expressed in my previous reports, that with the amount of money now voted for the militia, the strength of the force should be reduced, and that every regiment, corps and battery liable to camp service, should be called out every year for not less than sixteen days, which, when compared with the number of days that the Imperial militia are out for training, seems a very limited time."

Then he urges the formation of an engineers' corps. I have searched through his report, and that is all I find in reference to increasing the expenditure on the ordinary militia of the country—a force which we all know is absolutely necessary for the purpose of maintaining order, in case of any serious trouble. While making these remarks about the schools, I must not be understood as saying that they should be disbanded, for they do a great deal of good. But we should not have the whole life-blood of the militia drained into these schools, which show very small results for the large expenditure of money upon them—355 obtaining certificates, with an expenditure, last year, of \$482,700. If something like the old system were adopted, it appears to me that it would be a great advantage to the country. Now, the plan adopted is that any one who wishes to join one of these schools has to go in either as an officer or a private. When the original schools were formed twenty years ago, a captain and half a dozen non-commissioned officers were told off from a regiment to carry them on, and anybody, whether an officer or private, or anybody else, could go into one of these schools and be drilled for the small sum of \$50. There are no doubt a great many young fellows in the country who would be willing to go in if they could go in in that way, and get their certificates, but at present they do not care to go in, either as officers or privates. I received a letter the other day from an officer, not a constituent, but one living outside of Toronto, which with your permission I would like to read for the benefit of the House. He says:

"DEAR SIR,—Knowing the great interest you take in the militia of this country, I have taken the liberty of writing you in regard to it. The evident tendency of the policy of the Government seems to lean towards decreasing the militia force and adding to the permanent corps, at least that is the opinion of a great many militia officers in this district, and I think we are justified in this opinion by the action of this and preceding Governments. We used to have about 45,000 men drilled every year, then it was reduced to 35,000, now we drill 19,000, but keep on the rolls 37,000. The general recommends that the force be reduced to 18,000, and drill them every year, probably in a year or two they will again economise and drill some corps every two or three years, until we have no militia, and the defence of this country is left to the permanent corps consisting of say 3,000 men; 18,000 men are no use, we should drill 50,000 men twelve days every year, and this could be done at a very small increased expense, the same brigade staff general expenses would do for 50,000 men. The same officers would look after a company of sixty men as well as forty, same case of arms, instruction, drill sheds, the only increase would be averaging city and rural corps: pay, \$6; rations, \$1.25; clothing, transport, contingencies, \$3; \$11.25 difference between 18,000 and 50,000—32,000 men at \$11.25 or \$360,000—or a great deal less than we now pay to support 950 men at the schools. I would also like to give you some examples from the Public Accounts.

"The following city corps cost in pay \$25,000: 7th, 2nd, 10th, 13th, 14th, 1st, 5th, 6th, 3rd, Governor General Foot Guards, 3,000 men, add \$9,000 for clothing, ammunition, &c., per year, and 8,000 for care of arms instruction, &c., we find that these 3,000 well drilled men, that in the recent rebellion turned out as promptly and marched and fought as well as any there, did not cost the country as much to support as the 100 men at one of the schools, 3,000 men against 100 for the same money. Again take a field battery of artillery, of whom Lieutenant Colonel Irwin says they are as efficient as they will be under existing circumstances, and of whom the general also speaks very highly: pay, \$900 per year; instruction and care of arms, \$200; rations, \$230; clothing, \$150; \$1,480. This, for about 60 men, would be slightly increased 70 and 30 horses, and it just costs the country as much to maintain as three garrison gunners

from a permanent corps without guns. In the event of serious trouble, which is of the most service? The country can afford to thoroughly equip, drill and clothe men in a rural company, as cheap as it can keep one private at the schools. Most of the schools are asking for more men and money. If they get more, five or six regiments will not go to camp next year, and so on until the militia ceases to exist, when the excuse for maintaining the schools will also cease. We want good schools, well equipped, with the best men we can get in the country to manage them.

In conversation with some officers it was suggested I should write to you and give you some figures, and if the people want regulars by all means let them have them, but they must be prepared to pay for them and even then, say in a war with Russia, militia would have to be again organised. Hoping I am not giving you too much trouble.

"Yours truly."

I think that shows conclusively the value of the militia as compared with the permanent corps. I hope, therefore, that the hon. Minister will bring down in the Supplementary Estimates an amount sufficient to drill the whole militia force of the country. I would like to see him look after the militia in the way I have pointed out, and to show that, if he is looking after the permanent force, he is not altogether unmindful of the militia.

Gen. LAURIE. As the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison) has gone fully into this subject, I will not speak on it at any length; but I feel that I would be recreant in my duty if I did not say a word on this question. The total sum to be voted for the militia is \$1,319,000, and yet, as the hon. gentleman for Toronto has said, only \$250,000 of that is given for drill purposes. We are to have a militia composed of 37,000 men, and yet we are only to drill of that number 20,000 men, so that 17,000 are to remain undrilled. Now, I maintain it is very desirable that the whole 37,000 should be drilled. I am not opposed to any of the expenditure made in connection with the permanent force, which is a very valuable force indeed, for I have had reasons to change my views, since I have been on active service in the militia, with regard to the value of a permanent force, and will touch upon that subject when we come to deal with it. With regard to this vote, however, I must repeat I think it is unreasonable that whilst we have a militia expenditure of \$1,300,000 a year, the force proper should only consist of 20,000 men drilled, and the amount devoted for drill purposes be but \$250,000. I do not wish to draw comparisons between the country and the city militia. They both render good service. I have seen the two under all circumstances, both in aid of the civil power at home and on service in the field, and the one is as good as the other. I contend, therefore, that similar treatment should be dealt out to each. The city militia have special advantages for perfecting themselves through the opportunities they have for assembling for drill purposes, but the country militia, although they have not such favorable opportunities for improvement, have done themselves and Canada great credit by the way they have turned out, and I think they should have the same facilities accorded to them as are accorded to their brother corps in the cities. I am not prepared to go as far as my hon. friend for Toronto has gone. I know that the hon. the Finance Minister finds it difficult to spare even this sum; I know the great difficulty that war ministers, in other countries, and the Minister of Militia here, have to contend with in obtaining an adequate allowance from the Finance Minister. It is the Finance Minister who is checking the Minister of Militia in this case. Of that I do not think there can be any doubt. The hon. the Finance Minister has been so often criticised for allowing so large a sum of money to be expended, that I am not surprised he should draw the cord as tightly as he can when he has the chance; but I think the House and the country will back up the hon. the Minister of Militia, in asking for a sufficient sum to enable the whole force to be drilled. I am sure that the feeling in the country is that although the force is what is called a spending service and does not bring back an immediate

return, still the expenditure on it is a proper one, especially in the rural districts. The expenditure is scattered throughout the country and the people get the benefit of it, although I do not give that as a ground for a heavy expenditure, because the money must first come from the people; but I maintain that it is essential that this valuable military training should be given to as large a number of our population as possible. The rural militia have performed their share of service and should be given the same advantages as the militia in the cities. I, therefore, trust that at as early a date as possible we may see the whole rural militia trained to the same extent as the city militia. It simply amounts to this: that, while on the expenditure, under our system, of \$1,300,000, we can only drill 20,000 men, we could on an expenditure of \$1,500,000 drill double that number. As that is actually the case, I do think that if we are to get 20,000 men trained for the \$1,300,000 it is right that we should train all our force and get 40,000 drilled for the \$1,500,000.

Mr. McKAY. I would like to say a few words in reference to the remark of the hon. member for Bothwell, when commenting on the quotation made by the hon. the Minister of Militia from the *Globe* newspaper, that the extract quoted was merely a paid advertisement. I can assure the House, on the highest authority, that the extract referred to was not a paid advertisement but the voluntary opinion of Mr. Gibson, colonel of the battalion of Hamilton in question, and a member, on the Reform side, of the Ontario House.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think there is a good deal of feeling in this country in the direction indicated by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison) and the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), that we are expending too much money on the permanent force and too little in training the militia and giving them yearly drill. I am aware that there is rather a strong sentiment in this country against expenditure of that permanent character, and that the feeling is in favor of expending more money and giving the whole of the militia some training every year. In my judgment, such expenditure would be more beneficial to the country in the end, as would be proved should the militia ever be called out on active service.

Mr. PRIOR. I heartily endorse the opinions expressed by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison) and the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) with regard to the desirability of the militia being trained every year. In my district, the brigade, in which I have the honor to hold a commission, has not been out for drill for the past four years. It is not fair to the officers or men that such should be the case. The officers are put to heavy expense in getting their uniform and making their course through the schools and obtaining certificates; and when the force is not allowed to go out, they can never become proficient, and the whole thing seems to me a farce. In regard to the clothing, I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Militia whether he could not give more clothing to the artillery. I do not think it is fair to put the artillery on the same footing as the infantry, because they have a great deal of hard and dirty work to do, which the latter have not, especially in the shifting of ordnance, which wears out clothing quicker than ordinary work. The clothing is supposed to last for five years, but that it should last that long is out of the question. This remark applies specially to the trousers. I must bear out what the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has said with regard to the trousers. Those issued to us were very poor shoddy indeed, not at all the same quality of cloth as the tunics, and I would ask the hon. the Minister if he could not remedy this and see his way to issuing some extra clothing to the artillery.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The system which has been adopted in Canada has been discussed several times, and I

believe, in so far as I am personally concerned, in the policy of having training schools. That is the system which has been adopted in every country in the world, and I think unless you have some way of training these men within the period of time which their civil occupations will allow them to give to military matters, it is quite impossible to expect that they can acquire the efficiency they ought to have. When the Imperial troops were in Canada it was different, as we had then our military schools which were drawn from the Imperial troops, and were models which our volunteers were called on to copy. I believe it is desirable the militia force should be drilled every year, if possible, but we must proceed gradually. Canada has been called on to incur heavy expense for very important public works, and it is essential that, without neglecting in any way the military service, we should be as prudent as possible in our expenditure in that service. I hope the day will come before long when it will be possible for Parliament to add to the money which is now voted every year for drill purposes a sum sufficient to drill the entire force. I fully concur with what has been said about the rural militia. The city militia are certainly equal to any militia I have seen, but we must remember that, in times of trouble and when the militia force has been called upon to do duty for the protection of the country, the rural corps have been equal, in every respect, by their pluck and their powers of endurance and in every way, to any regiment from a city. In answer to my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior), I may say that the matter he has referred to has already been brought under my notice, and I must admit that I agree with him, and that for two reasons: I believe that, from an economical point of view, it would be a saving if we issued, as we did during the troubles in the North-West, a canvas suit for artillery purposes. In regard to the artillery, who have to do the heavy duty of handling heavy ordnance, I think we could issue a suit of canvas such as the artillery have for training in England and in Canada. If that can be done—and I can almost say it shall be done—I can tell the hon. gentleman who, for one, has brought the matter under my notice, that the reasons he has given from his standpoint, as a practical officer belonging to that branch of the service, have had great weight in getting me to arrive at the conclusion to which I have arrived. As to the trousers, that is a matter which has been brought to my notice tonight. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the trousers which he says were made out of shoddy were imported from England. I do not want in any way to disparage what we have imported from England so far, but they issue their clothing for one year instead of five years, and the shoddy stuff is sufficient for that time. The suits we issue are supposed to last for five years, and our material is so far superior to what we have had from England that, judging even from that article in the *Globe*, I do not think any comparison can be made between the goods made by our own manufacturers and those we import from England. If in the case of any contracts given out by the department, some inferior article has been produced, the officers of the department have taken care to call the attention of the manufacturers to anything which is not up to the standard, and in several cases those articles have been returned to the manufacturers. I hope, as I told the hon. gentleman before, that we will be able to issue a common suit which will serve during the training of twelve days for the handling of heavy ordnance, and which will save the more expensive tunic and trousers which are supposed to last for five years.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would again call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the case of the volunteers in reference to whom I spoke to him about two or three years ago. I understand that this grant is increasing, and it will be in the recollection of the Minister that there were five or six volunteers from the Grey Battalion who went to

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

drill in Toronto and were incapacitated through illness. They were young men who were drawing from \$1 to \$1.25 a day before they went to Toronto. They went there in the service of their country. They fell sick. One of them was sick for about six months before he could go back to work. He lost his situation, and was put to great personal inconvenience and a great outlay of money. Another of them was, to my own knowledge, sick for six weeks. The four others were sick for a long time, and I regret to say that one of them subsequently died. There is no doubt, in my mind, that they contracted the disease in camp. I have the testimony of the medical men who attended them, and that is their opinion. Those were industrious young men, active and hard-working young men, and, with that spirit of loyalty which we hear spoken of so often in this House, they were willing to qualify themselves to defend the country in case of danger. When application was made that they should be paid for the loss, and the suffering they endured in preparing themselves for the service of the country, a deaf ear was turned to their claim. I have brought this matter to the attention of the Minister before, and it may be due to the imperfect way in which I presented it, but nothing has been done for these men. Of course, they are but poor laboring boys, or they were at that time. If they had been officers, or if they could have brought political influence to bear in their behalf, probably they would not have had a deaf ear turned to them. I know a case of an officer who suffered from trouble which he contracted in camp, and he was paid something like \$400, but these young men—and young men are the hope of the country—find their claim treated coldly by the Minister of Militia, an hon. gentleman who has been received with marks of affection and esteem by Her Majesty, who has received honors from the Queen; and is he going to leave these young men, who suffered for their country, neglected, and is he going to tell them that Canada has nothing to give them? That is a strange commentary upon the policy of the Militia Department. This country wants no unpaid services; it wants to see the humblest person in this country who discharges his service, and contracts an illness in discharging that service, requited for his sufferings, and I think that the claims of these young volunteers are as deserving of the support of the Minister of Militia or of the Government of this country as any claims which have been brought to their attention. There is not the slightest shadow of doubt that these young men contracted the disease in camp, and they were put to great inconvenience and loss, and suffered a great deal, and one of them has since died, I regret to say. I hope that, having brought this question again to the attention of the Minister, that hon. gentleman, with the generous heart that throbs in his bosom, and with that politeness with which he is so largely endowed, will no longer neglect the claims of these young men.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Landerkin) forgets that the surgeon who examined these men has reported the contrary to his statement, and that report is in the hands of the Minister. Besides, I understood that at least three of these young men had gone out of the country and had never come back.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, they have not gone away. They stayed with their friends for a considerable time and those people were never paid for their board. They were told that the Militia Department would pay for it. They kept them, and nursed them, and looked after them and it is on their behalf that I have spoken. It is on their behalf that I am speaking, and I think they should not suffer. They were told, when the doctor came there, that the Militia Department would attend to their case, but the surgeon reported against them. The surgeon did not see them, never saw a single one of them in their illness. He came almost a year after they

had recovered and consulted me, and I told him the nature of the disease and where they contracted it, and that no others in that broad country had the disease at that time. It only existed where they were drilling. He then told me that he would report in conformity with the testimony I gave. Dr. Jamieson, who attended the others in Durham, also made me the same assurance. I read his affidavit to this House a year ago, stating that they had contracted the disease in camp. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) probably would be prepared to believe the affidavit of Dr. Jamieson who attended the three—I attended the other two myself. I have no doubt about the matter at all. If he has no confidence in me, probably he would have in Dr. Jamieson who made the affidavit I spoke of. The surgeon did not come to see them, and did not gain any information except what he got from those who were in attendance, and those who were in attendance were the best judges of the cases. There is not a doubt in my mind, there was no doubt in the mind of any of the volunteers. Dr. Jamieson believed, and everybody who knows about the circumstances is well satisfied, that they contracted that disease in camp. Now, these men had to be cared for. Any gentleman will understand the affliction it is to have two volunteers in the same house to be nursed for six months by their friends, to be provided with medicine and every other comfort that is required in a sick room. We may well understand what their friends had to undergo. They have never been requited for their care, nor have the Government requited them a single cent. It is a case of hardship that the hon. Minister of Militia should not allow to exist. I do not think the hon. Minister of Militia because I do not uniformly support his Government, should do an act of injustice to a volunteer, which he would not do if it were brought before him by some other person who had uniformly supported him. Would the hon. Minister of Militia give us to understand that the militia force is conducted in that fashion?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, no.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Now, I am speaking of what I know. I care not what any other mortal man says. I say I understand the case, and I believe they contracted the disease while in camp, and after they recovered, they left debts incurred which the parties believed were to be paid by the Government of this country, and they are still unpaid.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems very strange that when the Minister of Militia, as a member of the Government, is asked to recommend the payment of money, that he should be expected to do so upon the strength of representations made by officers outside his own department. The surgeon of the 31st Battalion who examined into these cases, I take it, would be the only responsible person whom the Minister should listen to on this subject, and the report of that surgeon was against it. In connection with that I may say that the hon. member for South Grey intimates that the surgeon of the 31st Battalion did not see them for a year after the time they got better.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I say so.

Mr. SPROULE. Now, he tells this House that one of them was sick for six months before he got better, and that makes a year and a-half before the surgeon went to examine these cases; in other words, they were allowed to go to that length of time before the application was made. It seems strange that so long a time was allowed to elapse before an application was made for some compensation for the disease said to be contracted during the time they were putting in drill. The surgeon of the 31st Battalion was in camp at Toronto, and during that time I believe the drill was put in. If they had contracted the disease then and then went home sick with it, or shortly after, I can see no reason why it should not have been so reported

and the claim be put in at an earlier date, and then the surgeon could have been sent there to examine these cases before they got well.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I dare say the surgeon could have been sent, but he was not sent, and what is the use of fighting a phantom of that character? If it suits the hon. member for East Grey to try to oppose these volunteers, these poor young men, from getting their pay, then he will have the consciousness of trying to deprive them of getting justice through some technicality. I am not going to be so accurate about the time, but I know it was quite a length of time. It was somewhere about a year before the surgeon came to see them, and he spent the day with me. He did not see one of them when he came there, and all the information he got in connection with these two cases he got from myself. The doctors assured the surgeon that these cases were contracted while on drill, and I have no doubt about it in the world. I am only astonished that it would be any pleasure for the hon. member for East Grey to strive to prevent the volunteers, who deserve so well of this country, from getting their pay on the ground that there is a technicality arising in the report.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to remind the hon. member that I am not opposing the volunteers getting a just claim, but I am opposing the department paying out money without competent authority. I know if any department of this Government paid out \$10 without a very good reason, the hon. member for South Grey would be the first to condemn it, but in connection with this case it suits his purpose better to be on the other side. Now, what I have said was rather to defend the Minister for not paying out money without having just grounds for doing so. I am sure the hon. member for South Grey would condemn it as quickly as any man in this country, if the Minister did so.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will just say that any Minister who would refuse to pay this claim would never get my support at all.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the reason he gave first would be much more likely to induce me to consider this claim favorably, when he spoke of my humanity, and from that standpoint I am perfectly prepared to say that I would have been only too happy to entertain the claim which he prefers on behalf of these young men, if I could have found it consistent with my duty to do so. But when he supplements the compliment he pays me by stating that possibly if the claim had been brought before the department by a supporter of my own—

Mr. LANDERKIN. Allow me. You mistook my meaning altogether. I said I would not believe for a moment, or entertain the idea, that you would refuse—these are the words I used—because I had brought it forward, because I thought you were more of a warrior than that.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am glad the hon. gentleman has such a fair opinion of me. I agree with him that it would be a very poor reason for refusing to consider this claim, because it was put forward by a gentleman who does not support the Government. The hon. gentleman knows that the matter was investigated, and I could not pay out public money without having a report from the officers of my department recommending the same. I did get a report, and it was directly opposed to the claim. The hon. gentleman brought the matter to my notice on more than one occasion, and he was very energetic in pushing the claim. I reopened the case, and reconsidered it, and I should have been only too glad to be able to comply with his wishes, but I could not see my way clear to do so. I had no ground officially which would warrant me in paying out for that claim the money which was entrusted to my care.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But you could easily get over that by putting a sum in the Supplementary Estimates. The House will vote it.

Contingencies \$38,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has been done, or what has been proposed to be done, with respect to the rifle range of Toronto? The Minister is aware that a very unfortunate accident happened there by which a poor young fellow was shot; and no doubt he is also aware, and if not I can tell him, that no matter how carefully arms may be used there, so long as the range is in its present position bullets will be apt to drop into the water. When that occurs, the water being a common highway, it is quite clear that near a large city there will always be a certain amount of danger, and I wish to enquire if any steps are being taken to prevent that risk and locate the range at some point where the public will not be exposed to danger.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am very glad indeed the hon. gentleman has brought this matter under my notice to-night. A few days ago I had the pleasure of receiving a large and influential deputation, headed by the mayor of Toronto, who called upon me as Minister of Militia, to point out the danger which they claimed surrounds the performance of the annual rifle practice of the volunteer force in Toronto. The question is one of very great importance, but it is fraught with difficulty. The point is simply this: Hon. gentlemen who take an interest in militia matters know how difficult it is in a large and growing city like Toronto, or any other great commercial centre, to find rifle ranges which are sufficiently close to be available for the purpose intended. As the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) knows when rifle ranges are only a moderate distance out of town volunteers will not go there, holding, and I think properly, that they should not be put to even a small expense to reach rifle ranges on Saturday afternoons when they are enjoying their half holiday. In Toronto the same difficulty arises. I find the great difficulty is to be able to procure a field where it is possible to establish our rifle ranges. I fully agree with the hon. gentleman that the range must be made absolutely safe, so far as life is concerned, and I think from the reports handed into my department by competent officers that it can be made absolutely safe. But I find another difficulty in the way. The great prosperity of Toronto, and I am glad to be able to congratulate my hon. friends from that section of the country on the increased growth and prosperity of that city, has led the agricultural associations and other associations to be anxious to obtain possession of the rifle range for the purpose of increasing their own properties for purposes in which we all take a deep interest. No doubt it is very important that such associations which have done so much, should be assisted to the fullest extent, but in exchange I am offered a range five or six miles, and I am told by others, 14 miles from Toronto. The hon. gentleman knows that it would be tantamount to telling the volunteer force of Toronto that they must give up rifle practice, as it would be impossible for them to find any range there. My first duty is to look after the volunteer force, and that duty I am prepared to perform, but outside of that particular duty I am willing to go as far as possible in order to accommodate those gentlemen in carrying out the objects for which they desire to obtain that property. I fully understand that it is necessary for the department to make the ranges perfectly safe, and I think there can be no difficulty whatever in making them so, according to the reports I have received, and unless we can keep a range which will be available for militia purposes within a reasonable distance of the city it would be quite impossible to keep the force up to its present position in Toronto.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does the hon. gentleman propose to make the ranges safe in Toronto?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can tell the hon. gentleman what I understand from the plan. It is to erect a kind of revetment, or an iron screen behind the ranges, which would prevent the possibility of any bullets escaping from the limited space within which rifle practice would take place.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know something of the situation, and I doubt whether that class of protection would be sufficient. It might be, but unless it were done on a very extensive scale, very high and very broad, I have very considerable doubts—I will not say positively, whether at the long range now used, especially if the Martini is allowed to be practiced with—if the thing is possible. I am not prepared to say whether, by taking precautions by way of having guard-boats and buoys properly placed, it may not be made reasonably safe, and I think the difficulty is considerable in any case. Without protection on the water I doubt extremely whether the hon. gentleman can avoid accidents in future.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Every precaution must be taken.

Mr. CASEY. A good deal has been done and a good deal can be done to make the range moderately safe no doubt, but any one who knows the situation and is a practical rifle shot must doubt very seriously whether it will be possible to make it absolutely safe, and nothing short of that is needful. The danger is not so much from competitions at rifle meetings, but from greenhorns' practice at ordinary times, and any one who has seen young men learning to shoot must be aware that they sometimes shoot over the top of the hill behind the target. I have seen shots strike 40 or 50 feet above a target on a hill side. Shots also strike too low and ricochet to an uncertain height and fall behind the target. I am very sorry to have to say anything that the Ontario Rifle Association would not like to have said, but it is our duty to insist on some change being made in this matter. The Minister says he has not been offered any good range within a reasonable distance of the city. He did not say whether he had caused particular enquiries to be made.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, I have.

Mr. CASEY. Have officers looked around in the neighborhood?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, several have.

Mr. CASEY. It seems very strange that no reasonable place can be found within a reasonable distance of the city. The present range is now almost within the heart of the city, and I do not think it is reasonable to retain it there. If volunteers are called upon to pay charges for going to a rifle range at some point on the line of railway the expense would only be trifling, much less than that formerly paid by English volunteers in going from London to Wimbledon. I do not think volunteers there are much richer than volunteers here. I do not know that the officers of the Ontario Rifle Association are eager to find out another place. They would not tell lies to the Minister of Militia, but I do not think they trouble themselves very much to find new grounds, because the present grounds are very convenient for them. I think a thorough search should be made for a new ground by some special officer sent from Ottawa or by one chosen there who can be depended upon.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I wish to know whether the claims pending against the cadets who have withdrawn from the college have been disposed of? I see a letter from Mr. Helmsley who paid \$100 when his son was taken from the college, and he was informed, subsequently, that others whose

sons had been removed had not paid that amount. Last year I think we had a return here of some half dozen of those claims that were still unsettled. Have they been disposed of and if not how many are still unsettled?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Some of those claims which the hon. gentleman refers to have been settled since last year, and others have not. I caused a circular letter to be addressed to the parents of the cadets, and, in some instances, to the cadets themselves, calling upon them to reimburse the amount, and stating that if those who had accepted commissions in the Imperial service did not reimburse the Government we would apply to the Imperial authorities to ask them to withdraw it from their pay and hand it over to us.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman bring us down, later on, a statement of those that are still pending?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total number of the permanent corps, rank and file?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We have three batteries, "A," "B" and "C," the latter is now stationed in British Columbia.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How many men in each. Are they full batteries?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We have 150 men in "A" and "B" Batteries and 100 men in "C" Battery. Besides that we have a cavalry school in Quebec, which is the only cavalry school we have in the Dominion. Hon. gentlemen will notice that I have provided for the establishment of a cavalry school in Toronto, and the intention is to take a detachment from that school in Toronto to utilise in Kingston for the drilling of the cadets. Besides we have an infantry school in Fredericton, N.B., one in St. John's, P. Q. another in Toronto, and a fourth in London, and a mounted infantry corps in Winnipeg.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many men altogether?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The total permanent force, not counting the cavalry school in contemplation, is about 1,000 men.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You are adding \$40,000 for the permanent staff. Do you think it would not be better to utilise that money in giving better drilling to the militia, and drilling the whole of them each year, than establishing a cavalry school at Toronto. They have an infantry school in Toronto, and the cavalry school at Quebec might be sufficient for the present. I venture to say that it would be much more in the interest of the country if this money were expended in Quebec than on establishing a cavalry school in Toronto.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We have estimated \$40,000 for establishing a cavalry school in Toronto. The Quebec cavalry school cost \$30,000, but we expect we will have to spend the other \$10,000 in purchasing horses and saddlery. Those who take an interest in the forces will admit that the training school for cavalry is very necessary, if not indispensable, in Toronto or some centre in Ontario. Of 1,944 cavalry which compose the entire cavalry force of the Dominion, Ontario has 1,017. Moreover we felt the necessity of having cavalry to train our cadets in Kingston, and the only way we can provide for that is by sending a small detachment from that cavalry school. We propose by that school to train for the whole cavalry force in Ontario, and also to train the cadets in Kingston. I think it is money well spent. The cavalry school in Quebec provides training for the Lower Provinces and the Province of Quebec, and it is impossible to take any larger number of men for a short course in that school. Unless we have a training

school for the cavalry of Ontario and the Upper Provinces it would be placing that very important force in a position of inferiority that I think should not exist.

Gen. LAURIE. I have spoken already on the subject of what I consider the desirability of training a larger portion of the militia proper—the militia whom we consider really our fighting force. I consider those schools as an auxiliary to the militia, but at the same time I do not wish it to be understood that I consider those schools are of little service, or that they should be done away with. Far from it. I have not always had as high an opinion of the necessity for those schools as I have since I went on active service with the militia. We who have been more particularly connected with the English-speaking portion of the militia forces, have found that we got on fairly well without appealing to the schools very largely, because we have drawn from the regular service very valuable assistance to the training, in the shape of old non-commissioned officers of the army, and these have been of great assistance to officers training their men. But it was only when, for the first time, I was associated in the North-West with the French-speaking Canadian regiments that I found how necessary it was that there should be some system for training non-commissioned officers and officers for the service. The regiment commanded by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) came under my command. They were as full of zeal and just as anxious and determined to do their duty as any regiment of English-speaking Canadians, and just as competent, so far as the means placed at their disposal were concerned; but they were deficient in that very necessary portion of a military organisation, trained non-commissioned officers; as they obtain none who have served in the English army, because it is natural that men coming out from the English army are not likely to settle in French districts, and if they did they would be of very little use, as not speaking the language. I did find in consequence that the officers had extra duties devolving upon them; and I am bound to assume that that regiment was only a type of other French-Canadian regiments. That circumstance showed me the value of the schools, not as being merely an aid, but a necessity to the force, to provide for local training in our own country. I am, therefore, fully prepared to support the position taken by the hon. Minister in strengthening this force, but I do press upon him that we must not look upon it as the force proper, but simply as an accessory of the force.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to be able to congratulate my hon. friend this year on the wonderful rapidity with which Battery "C" has filled up during the year. Two or three years ago, when we first began to call attention to the fact that there was a commandant without a school in Victoria, we were told that the school would be filled up soon, as it was impossible to get recruits in the Province, owing to the pay being so much less than the rate of wages there, and the hon. gentleman told us that he was to get recruits by obtaining the loan of some pensioners from England, who were going to be warranted as sound in wind and limb, although invalided from the English service. Last summer, I understand, an attempt was made to secure these, but, alas, for the hon. Minister's plan, these retired veterans refused to come out without their wives and families, as I understand, and that plan fell through, and the hon. Minister has had to recur to the common sense plan, which he should have adopted in the first place, of taking over drafts from the military schools in Canada. That was one plan which might have suggested itself to him in the first place; and another was that if he could not get men in British Columbia for the ordinary pay given to soldiers, he should pay the price that labor was worth in the country, and put some British Columbians into the school. However, I congratulate him on having obtained some men to

keep the guns company this year; they used to be very lonesome.

Mr. ELLIS. I called attention last year to the very large expenditure for drugs in the Fredericton school. I see it was somewhat smaller last year, but it is still very large. Fredericton spent \$698 for drugs, while St. John's, P. Q., with just about the same number, spent \$386, and Toronto, where there is a somewhat larger number, spent \$226. I think there must be some mistake about this, because Fredericton is quite as healthy as Toronto and more healthy than St. John's, P. Q. The hon. Minister told me that he would give me details of the figures, but he has no doubt forgotten them. He will, perhaps, be able to give some assurance that this expenditure will be stopped, because it is evident that it cannot all be for drugs.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am sorry to say that I did overlook the matter. The expenditure seems to me large, especially in a locality like Fredericton, which is perfectly healthy. However, I shall get all the information and let my hon. friend know exactly how matters stand.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to ask another question. Is the bread furnished to those schools the same all over the country?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, the same.

Mr. ELLIS. Then, I would like to call attention to these figures. In Quebec the rate is from $2\frac{1}{2}$ to $2\frac{3}{4}$ cents per lb., in St. John's, P. Q., $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents, in Toronto $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents, and in Fredericton 4 cents. If that proves anything, it proves that bread must be much more expensive at Fredericton than in the Upper Provinces.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We call for tenders for all the supplies, and the lowest tender is accepted.

Mr. AMYOT. I beg to thank the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) for the kind remarks he has offered about the 9th Battalion, which I had the honor to command in the North-West. I must say that I am happy to recognise his kindness to the militia there, especially to my battalion, and I am glad to have a living witness here to contradict the false impression that may have been formed, perhaps, on account of some correspondence which passed between myself and the hon. Minister of Militia. The hon. member for Shelburne knows personally under what circumstances those cipher telegrams were sent. He knows that they were not intended as official criticisms of the manner in which the war was conducted, but as private information sent from friend to friend under secrecy, and they were not due to cowardice, as has been suggested, but they were sincere expressions as to the way the war was being carried on in some respects, and as to the expenses which were being incurred. I am glad to have a living witness who is able to give those telegrams their true meaning, and I am glad to take this opportunity of saying that, by the efforts of the hon. member for Shelburne there, many of the expenses were curtailed, and his services were most valuable to the country. Now, I rise to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Militia to an important matter in connection with these infantry schools. They are most useful and indispensable, although, in my opinion, the old military schools were still better. But a great many young gentlemen, students from the universities and elsewhere, are unable to attend them because in the months of July and August, when they would be free to attend, the schools are closed, as that is the time chosen for the holidays. The hon. Minister would do a great service to the force if he would keep those schools open during July and August, and a short time in September, and allow the officers to take their holidays at some other time. I have received letters giving the names of some young men who are ready to go and qualify themselves for the militia, but

Mr. CASEY.

who cannot go except during those months. Another plan would be to send a detachment from the schools to Quebec, Montreal, Toronto and other cities to afford an opportunity to the young men to qualify themselves during those holiday months. I hope the hon. Minister will consider that suggestion.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia if the officers and men of "C" Battery get the same pay as those of the other batteries. If they do, I do not think it is fair to them, because living in British Columbia is from 25 to 33 per cent. higher than it is in eastern Canada, and if they only get the same amount of money, I do not see how they can get along on it. They are a splendid body of men, whom we in British Columbia are very proud of indeed. I know that it is a better climate than that in the east; they have that advantage; but they cannot live on climate, and I hope that the hon. Minister, if it is in his power, will give them better pay or, if he cannot raise their pay, make some allowance to them so that they will be placed on the same footing as their comrades in the east.

Gen. LAURIE. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has alluded to a matter that happened when I was not in this House or in this country; I believe I was actually at the time in eastern Europe. I do not wish to reopen the matter; I simply wish to say that when I was in the North-West I found that the expenses were far exceeding anything that the hon. Minister himself, or any other member of this House, had any idea of, and I took the opportunity of asking every member of Parliament who was associated with the force to come and see for himself the enormous transport train that we required, and to ask him when he came back to this House to stand up in his place and bear testimony to the necessity that existed for an enormous expenditure, and to be prepared to justify the Government in the outlay, after having seen for himself how it was called for. Amongst those whom I saw and conversed with was the hon. member who commanded the 9th Battalion, a battalion that I have been pleased to refer to as being most efficient. I pointed out to those gentlemen that the expenditure was enormous; and in the conversation no doubt ideas passed between us as they will between two men who compare what is with what might be, if they have any intelligence; and I believe from the conversation I had with the hon. gentleman that in the correspondence between him and the Minister of Militia, the views of each were to a certain extent misunderstood, and this misunderstanding gave rise to allusions, which, in cooler moments, would not have been made by the one to the other, and expressions were indulged in and, perhaps, conveyed in such a way that they were misinterpreted and misunderstood, and I am sure the original impressions intended to be conveyed were altogether misinterpreted.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. member for Bellechasse, I may say that the matter which he has brought under my notice, I fully acquit him of. It is very difficult, as I understand, for young gentlemen who are following their legal or medical course in the universities, to be able, during the ordinary time which is fixed for the training of the militia, to leave their ordinary avocations for the purpose of following a short course or a long course in a training school. He must remember, however, that the officers in those different schools are worked very hard. Some hon. gentlemen who have not looked into the subject, may believe they are not, but I can tell the hon. gentlemen that the officers in the training schools are worked very hard, and it is necessary they should have some holidays. But I believe, without making a definite promise, that it is possible to arrange in some way or other, so that in July and August, and possibly the beginning of September, there might be a special course, under certain regulations pre-

pared by the department. I shall give my attention to that point. To the hon. member for Victoria, I must say, that besides the advantage to "C" Battery of living in that delightful climate and enjoying the hospitality of the people of British Columbia, they have better pay than the "A" or "B" Batteries or the ordinary corps. It was considered that the labor market being very high, it was necessary to give more pay to the men, and, framing the regulation, we allowed ten cents extra per day, but the ten cents are paid at the expiration of every period of enlistment, provided the men remain in the corps. A man in leaving the corps and returning to civil life will thus have a considerable amount of money to start his new life with. Under the circumstances I do not think it is possible for the department to go beyond giving extra advantages to one battery over the others.

Military Properties..... \$97,000

Mr. BRIEN. I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Militia if in this appropriation there is any vote to supplement the amount appropriated by the municipality of Essex Centre for a drill shed there. The hon. gentleman is well aware that application was made last year, that a deed of the land was passed, and that the municipality has complied with all the requirements of the department. They are very anxious to know whether this appropriation will be made this year or not. It is very necessary in the interest of the 21st Battalion, a battalion which is second to none in the force, that this appropriation should be made, and I know that the men were very much discouraged last year at the appropriation not having been then made. If there is anything more required to be done by the corporation or by the officials in that section, I would like to know.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We have provided in this vote the money required for the six drill sheds. There was some delay, no doubt, as we had to get reports, and negotiations were going on between the Government and the municipality. However, I understand from the officers of the department that we now have all the reports we require, and I hope that in a short time, we shall be able to make the distribution of the money voted by Parliament, and to do something for that drill shed, and so meet the views of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There was some correspondence which took place in regard to the caretaker at Bedford, Mr. J. G. Corbett. I think he draws only \$176. He was under the impression that the caretakers of other rifle ranges were paid a larger amount, and I find that the caretaker at Ottawa receives \$456, at Quebec, \$391, and at Montreal—I suppose it is the one referred to as marker—\$358. It seems to me that it would be only fair that the caretaker at Bedford should receive the same amount as that given in other places. I hope the Minister will see his way to put him in the same position.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The difference is simply that the caretaker here in Ottawa works in the stores in the winter, and he is paid for that. When he is looking after the ranges in the summer, he does not receive any more than the caretakers of the other ranges. I cannot say now, positively, whether the caretaker at Bedford has any other occupation now or not, but I will look into the question, and give the hon. gentleman information on concurrence.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What about the payment of the caretaker at Quebec, \$391.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is the same thing. It may be that he has to look after stores, but the caretaker at Point Lévis is also the caretaker of the fort. He occupies the two positions.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In regard to the amount of \$75,000 for construction and repairs of military properties, I should like to ask how much of that is to go into construction, and where?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The manner in which that amount is distributed is between the different districts. London gets \$400; Toronto, \$4,875; Kingston, \$19,404; Ottawa, \$1,676.50; Montreal, \$3,900; Quebec, \$30,378; Fredericton, \$7,856; Winnipeg, \$3,745; Victoria, \$2,490, and Charlottetown, \$275. Of course, in places like Kingston, Quebec and Point Lévis, where we have these extensive forts, the expense is much greater than in other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It was merely in regard to new work that I was enquiring about.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The new works will appear in the estimates brought down by the Minister of Public Works. I merely look after the repairs of the different buildings under the control of the Department of Militia.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). But this is put down for construction.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, it is construction and repairs, but it is only small construction. Any heavy expenditure as far as buildings are concerned, will appear in the estimates of the Minister of Public Works.

Canadian Pacific Railway construction (chargeable to capital) \$190,000

M. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is this—for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a revote, with the exception of \$10,000. I explained last year that the object of that appropriation was to complete the work on the Canadian Pacific Railway which the original contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company bound us to do. The additional amounts are for an engine-house on the Pacific coast \$27,000, flattening slopes, \$153,000, and estimated balance of arbitration expenses, \$10,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I thought that, by the agreement made in November, 1886, subject to any adjustment of deficiencies which might afterwards be discovered in the Government work on the Canadian Pacific Railway, the company accepted all the work on that line, and I understood that the only question left was any possible deficiency in what is known as the Onderdonk contract, which might not be complete, and which the Government might have to supply.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. This work has always been admitted by the department to be within the terms of the contract, and this expenditure is required in order to do the work that the Government agreed to do in conformity with its contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Of course the hon. gentleman may be correct, but I formed my opinion upon the report of the chief engineer, which says:

"On the 2nd of November, 1886, an Order in Council was passed authorising the closing up of all the matters outstanding between the Government and the company, and a final agreement was signed, accordingly, on the 15th and 20th of that month, comprising the acceptance by the Government of the work executed by the company, as fulfilling the conditions of their contract; the transfer to, and acceptance by the company of the portions of the road constructed by the Government, subject to adjustment by the Government of deficiencies, if any, in respect of the construction of the western section."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Very well; the work of the Government was accepted by the company, and so all these matters were closed, subject to the adjustment of any defi-

iciencies in the construction of the western section, and I understood that was confined to the contract which is known as the Onderdonk contract, and that it was contended by the Canadian Pacific Railway that that contract was not properly carried out, or not carried out in such a manner that they felt they should accept it. The chief engineer made his report, but that question has been referred to arbitration, and I have no doubt that a large sum of money will have to be paid on that account.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that we were bound to construct an engine house; that is a part of the original contract, and it has never been constructed, and \$27,000 of this vote is for that purpose. The hon. gentleman will see, therefore, that this \$153,000 is for flattening the slopes. It was hoped that the slopes would stand in the mode in which they were taken out, but it was subsequently found that increased expenditure was necessary, which was estimated at \$153,000, to flatten those slopes in such a way as would meet the contract. That is a part of the \$190,000, \$27,000 for the engine house on the Pacific coast, which we agreed to build in the original contract, \$153,000 in order to make the slopes stand, and in order to carry out the contract as originally provided, and no single dollar of this is connected with any shortcoming on what was termed the Onderdonk contract. This was not a lump sum, the hon. gentleman will understand. The contract which was made with Mr. Onderdonk for a lump sum was for the last 86 miles. No portion of this whatever is for that contract, but for work performed on the four sections known as the Onderdonk contract, and which was paid for. Therefore, it has nothing to do with the shortcomings. It is simply for that amount of work which was not performed or paid for in the original contract, and that is now found to be necessary in order to make the road of the character we agreed it should be with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Some of the slope cuttings have not stood as well as was anticipated. We hoped it would not be necessary to expend this money, that the slopes would stand, but they have not stood as well as was anticipated when they were taken off, and this sum is for the purpose of cleaning down these slopes or cuttings, and taking down the loose rocks. An arbitration between the Government and the company is in progress in connection with the western section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the \$10,000 which forms a part of this sum, is for the expense of that arbitration. The Canadian Pacific Railway has claimed that the work is not performed properly, that the road has not been completed in conformity with the contract which the Government made with them. That question is under arbitration. But no question whatever arises concerning the contract between Mr. Onderdonk and the Government.

Mr. DAVIES. I think I understand the matter, and that my conception of it was correct, that this contract was made by the Government with Mr. Onderdonk according to certain specifications and agreements, that it was taken off his hands and certified to by the chief engineer of the Government as having been completed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Mr. DAVIES. It was then accepted by the Canadian Pacific Railway contingently.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. They say: We are not satisfied; this certificate he gave that the road was correct has turned out not to have been correct. The Canadian Pacific Railway Co. contend that the slopes have to be enlarged, and they have, I believe, either done the work, or are doing it, and the arbitration is for the purpose of determining how much you shall pay. The chief engineer of the Government took over

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

this road in a condition which the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. would not accept, and we have to lay out this money in putting the road in a condition that they will accept, and, practically speaking, Mr. Onderdonk should have done the work which we are now voting money to have done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken, and I think I will be able to satisfy him of that. Had this work been a lump sum, had we made a contract with Mr. Onderdonk for a lump sum, and taken the work off his hands as completed, then the hon. gentleman's contention would be correct. But such was not the contract. The contract with Mr. Onderdonk was to pay him for every yard of work performed, and if he had performed it, this \$153,000 now asked for to flatten the slopes would have been in his pocket. The work has not been done, he has not been paid for it. We hoped it would not be necessary to make this expenditure, and, consequently, we did not call upon him to do it. He has not been paid for doing it. The Canadian Pacific Railway Co. claiming that the work is not in the condition that the contract with us required, in order to relieve ourselves from any responsibility before the arbitration, from any claim before the arbitration, we ask Parliament for this sum of \$153,000 to flatten the slopes still more. If they had stood, it would not have been called for. But the hon. gentleman is entirely in error in supposing that Mr. Onderdonk has the slightest interest in this question whatever. He has not. If that work had been done by him, he would have been paid \$153,000 more under his contract than he has been paid. We have the money, and we are called upon to do the work.

Mr. DAVIES. I think I understand it pretty well. I want to ask the hon. gentleman if he is able to assure the House that this \$180,000 we are now voting will place that road in a condition that the Canada Pacific Railway would accept if they had no award?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. DAVIES. On what is this estimate based?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is based on the chief engineer's conviction of what is necessary to complete our contract thoroughly, so that in the arbitration the Canada Pacific Railway Co. will not be able to obtain a dollar. We admit that, under the circumstances, experience has proved that it is necessary to do this amount of work, and therefore we say that we are ready to do that amount of additional work over and above what we have done; and the hon. gentleman will see that if it went to arbitration, without our consenting to make this expenditure, to build this engine house, which was a part of our contract, to make the slopes, as we admit, under the circumstances, they are entitled to claim at our hands, we would be in the wrong, and the arbitrators would be in a position to find against us. This estimate which the chief engineer makes, is to complete the work entirely in conformity with the contract made between the Government and the company, and which he holds will entirely relieve us from the possibility of any award being found against us.

Mr. DAVIES. Then it just comes down in plain English to this: that the chief engineer of Government railways accepted the work from the hands of Mr. Onderdonk in a certain condition, and he certified that that work was perfect and complete in itself, and fit to be handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Co., that everything had been done by Mr. Onderdonk which was required from him. But now he says that he was wrong, and in order to put that road in a condition to justify him in handing it over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Co., he must ask Parliament to expend \$180,000. Now, my contention was this: that we are paying \$180,000 for an error in judgment on the part of the chief engineer. The hon. gentleman explained that this was not

a lump sum, that we were paying so much for the excavation of these slopes. I am not speaking at all about the building in British Columbia, because I do not know the facts, and I will not say anything about that. I admit that what the hon. gentleman says is correct, that by our contract we are bound to complete that road, and to build that engine house. But when the contract was entered into with Mr. Onderdonk, the cutting of the slopes was to be done in a certain way; that part of the contract was afterwards altered by the chief engineer, and Mr. Onderdonk was allowed to make the slopes very much less than they were required to be made by the original contract. If the original contract had been carried out by Mr. Onderdonk, there would have been none of those disputes existing which now exist between the Government and the company, and we would not have been called upon to pay more money.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; but the hon. gentleman will see that it would have been paid long ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will excuse me. I think I will show him that he is not exactly stating all the facts on which an outsider would form an independent opinion. Now, he lessened the slopes, and in lessening the slopes he made a certain allowance from the amount which was to be paid to Mr. Onderdonk if he had carried out the original contract. He did not pay him nearly so much as he would have paid him otherwise. Now, it is calculated by those who know, that his estimate was altogether below the mark, and that Mr. Onderdonk made a very large amount of money out of the change in that contract made by the chief engineer. It just comes back to this, that he altered the contract and allowed Mr. Onderdonk to make the slopes very much less than they were originally intended to be. He now finds that he made an improper alteration, he now finds part of the road not in a condition fit to hand over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we have to pay \$150,000 more. He now finds an expenditure of \$150,000 to be necessary in order to place the road in a condition fit to be handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. My own opinion, gathered from reading the reports and the information which has come before the Public Accounts Committee and otherwise, is that we shall have to pay a very much larger sum yet before the company will accept that portion of the road from our hands. I should like to know what claim the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have made against the Government. Is it not half a million of money? It is a very large sum and we should know what the claim is.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think there is no great advantage to be gained in discussing this matter, and I believe the hon. gentleman will agree with me. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have made a claim against the Government; the Government have resisted that claim. The Government say that this amount of money, in their judgment, will complete that road in every respect in conformity with the contract between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I have stated again and again to the hon. gentleman that if this work had been done by Mr. Onderdonk he would have had this sum of \$150,000 in his pocket, of which he has not one dollar—the money is here and has not been paid, and if the work had been done by him he would have been paid so much more than he has received. The fact of his not having performed the work does not touch the question of the public interest in the slightest degree whatever. The company have made a claim, a large claim, I quite admit that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it nearly a million?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not at this moment know what the claim is; it was made in my absence, it was resist-

ed by the Government and arbitration was granted and that arbitration is being held. The Government claim that the expenditure of this money completes everything that they undertook, and places that work in a condition that is all which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company can ask at their hands. This is a revote, with the exception of \$10,000, made last year after full explanations, and if the hon. gentleman talks all night it cannot alter the facts. He cannot change the fact that the Government endeavored to save, and that, if the slopes had remained, they would have saved, \$153,000. They have not saved, and, consequently, we agree that we are bound under the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to spend this money, and having spent it we deny that the company have a claim for a single dollar, and I do not expect they will get one.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is no use the hon. gentleman saying I can talk all night and can do no good.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said you cannot alter the facts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to get the facts properly. The hon. gentleman said that the amount was voted last year under full explanations, but that is not the case. I had not a thorough knowledge of the facts, but I have obtained it since. If the chief engineer has made as large a deduction from Mr. Onderdonk's original contract, if he had made a proper deduction and a full deduction, to cover all the costs of the work, nothing more would have been said. I know the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are making a claim to have the work done as we contracted with Mr. Onderdonk it should be done in the first instance, and the amount which they say is necessary is more than double what the chief engineer deducted from Mr. Onderdonk.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The chief engineer never deducted anything from Mr. Onderdonk. When Mr. Onderdonk did a yard of work, whether rock or clay, it was measured and he was paid for it. There was no deduction whatever. The Government did not require this work at his hands. Mr. Onderdonk complains that he was not allowed to do more work, but the Government's object was to do the work that was absolutely necessary to complete the road in the manner in which they were bound to place it before handing it over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If he had finished the work he would simply have been paid so much more. He was not called upon to do it, and he did not get the money—the money is in the hands of the Government for the purpose of completing it now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That might be all correct, and yet the country might be placed at a large additional cost in this way. Had this work which is necessary, by the Minister's own statement, been done when the original work was done, it could have been carried out a great deal cheaper than now; and in that way a very heavy loss would have been saved the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is a point in that.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice in the Auditor General's report, page 175, we paid \$29,600 for removing slides. Is that connected with work yet to be done, or will the country have to continue removing slides?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is in connection with completing the work. It was paid last year, probably, for the previous year. After the completion of the work no charge can be made on the Government for the removal of slides.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). At page 175 of the Auditor General's report, there is a payment, under the head of Canadian Pacific Railway account, of \$74,525, D. O. Mills, balance rolling stock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He was the contractor, and under the contract we were obliged to take over the rolling stock, and payment was made in connection with carrying out the contract.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that in addition to \$250,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is part of the award.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman state, within a moderate limit, the total cost of that part of the road the Government built in British Columbia?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The figures I have here are as follows: construction of Lake Superior and western sections, total expenditures up to 30th June, 1886, \$29,648,876. The items do not seem to be separated, but the Lake Superior and western sections are put together.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What the hon. gentleman means by that is that we have spent twenty-nine and a half millions on what we constructed ourselves.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, that is all expended by ourselves. We expended during the year ending 30th of June, 1887, \$471,463.41 an expenditure during the seven months to 31st January, 1888, \$18,122.11. Total expended up to 31st January, 1888, \$30,138,461.62. That covers all the expenditure of the Government in connection with the construction of the Lake Superior and western sections from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, from Port Arthur to Red River, and in British Columbia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman obtain a division of that so as to let us have it when we meet again?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I shall furnish the hon. gentleman with the exact amounts spent in British Columbia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the total amount we have paid then is roughly about \$70,000,000 is it not?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, about that. The surveys on the Dawson route were included.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That does not exactly belong to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is always a charge on the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Public Accounts as the hon. gentleman knows. In all on the Lake Superior section we spent \$30,038,461.69 and on the Dawson route \$6,611,951.88, making in all \$36,850,413.50, beside the \$25,000,000 and the \$10,000,000 for the purchase back of lands.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Have the arbitrators made any report?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They were out in British Columbia but no interim report has been made yet.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) This expenditure which the hon. gentleman asks is not on any recommendation of the arbitrators?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it is on the opinion of the Government as to what will relieve us from that charge.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) How will that relieve you? The duty of the arbitrators is to determine how much money you pay the Canadian Pacific Railway to enable them to put this road in the order which they said it should be in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman understands this question much better than I do, being a lawyer himself. We say that this amount should be paid, and that no larger sum will be required, and in this way we intend

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

to protect ourselves. We take it that it is impossible for them to establish a larger claim than that which we now ask for.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Of course I have not seen the submission to the arbitrators, but I presume they are asked how much money is required to put the road in the condition that it ought to be when handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and in the condition that Onderdonk originally undertook to put it in. I presume we will have to do the work whether it will cost \$300,000 or \$500,000. They will be required to say whether those slopes were in proper order and possibly what it would cost to put them in proper order.

Mr. THOMPSON. By the terms of the submission, the arbitrators are required to state in what particular respects there may be a deficiency, and it is at the option of the Government to make those deficiencies good.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Then this is a matter of mere speculation as to what we require?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is based on the report of our engineer that possibly this sum will be required.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The Government admit that we have to pay this amount and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company say that it should be somewhere about a million dollars. If the arbitrators award \$500,000 we have to vote it.

Mr. THOMPSON. It would be admitting too much to say that we will be required to expend any money for this purpose. Our engineer thinks that no more can possibly be needed. I do not think it is quite safe to say that we will be expected to pay this, but no more can possibly be needed in the opinion of our engineer.

Intercolonial Railway \$349,500

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is this amount required for increased accommodation at St. John?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. For filling in the spaces in the wharf, and laying tracks to facilitate ocean traffic at the deep-water wharf.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I thought that had been done before the election?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The time was too short to enable it to be quite completed.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Will the Government rebuild the freight shed which was destroyed by fire the other day?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That will be immediately rebuilt.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know, as a matter of curiosity, do the Government propose to charge the rebuilding of this freight shed to capital account?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, no; all renewals, whatever they are caused by, must be charged to revenue.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman explain the vote of \$4,000 for increased accommodation at Spring Hill?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This vote is in consequence of the output of coal at the Spring Hill mines having increased so enormously during the past few years that the present accommodation is quite inadequate for the traffic, and it has become necessary to purchase additional land, to grade it for the track, and supply rails and a freight house. No additional accommodation has been afforded at this point since the road was opened in 1870. The output of coal at these Spring Hill mines is from 1,500 to 1,700 tons per day, so that the hon. gentleman will understand the necessity of this increased accommodation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are they still carrying the coal at three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There has been no change in the rate.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then, the more accommodation you give, the more loss you will sustain.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid it is not very profitable.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understand that they paid one-half cent per ton per mile to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for hauling the cars from British Columbia to Nova Scotia, and now they are only charging three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile for hauling the coal over the Intercolonial Railway, while I believe three-quarters of a cent is the smallest rate charged elsewhere. I think it is hardly necessary to give them increased accommodation if thereby we are increasing our losses.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are not giving them increased accommodation; we are giving it to ourselves.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The chief engineer reports:

"The rate at which this coal is carried is extremely low, and in addition to this the cars are hauled back to the mines empty, a distance of 600 miles, so that this business increases the expense without an equivalent increase of earnings."

Mr. Pottinger seems to be in accord with the remark of my hon. friend, that the more you increase the accommodation, the more you lose.

Mr. McMULLEN. Last year, when the rate for carrying coal was under discussion, the subject of carrying flour from Ontario to the Maritime Provinces was up also, and the Minister objected to meeting the demands of western shippers on the ground that to lower the rate would entail a loss. But if they are willing to carry coal for the Spring Hill Mining Company at a loss, and also to extend the accommodation with an anticipated increased loss, I think it but fair, that an attempt should be made to bring the trade of the western Provinces to the Maritime Provinces instead of letting it go through the States. The hon. Minister said to the hon. member for Kent—who I am glad to say will be here in a few days to repeat what he said on that subject—that the flour, if carried to Boston, could be carried in boats for a considerable distance, instead of being carried by our own line. It has been generally stated that the construction of the Intercolonial Railway was intended as an inter-provincial line to facilitate trade between the Provinces, and if that is the case its entire earnings should not be devoted to developing a coal mine, which is a continuous loss to a part of Ontario, while flour is altogether neglected.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That question will come more appropriately for discussion when we get to charges on income.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When we get the short line through Maine, perhaps my hon. friend's views will very likely be met.

Increased accommodation at Maccan Station \$3,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A new line of railway there joins the Intercolonial Railway from the Joggins Coal Mines, and it is necessary to enlarge the accommodation at Maccan Station.

Increased accommodation at Moncton \$5,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The excess on the amounts of contracts for building, over the appropriation \$132; clearing the ground for building and track making \$700; providing freight sheds, shifting foundations, &c., \$1,200; roofing shop, &c., \$400. Steam heating for paint shops,

\$1,100; inspection, \$300; preparing floors, \$60; advertising for tenders, \$400; sundry fixings, \$1,108; total \$3,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Who prepares the plans?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The engineer engaged in the construction.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In addition to his work?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; but where the work is chargeable to capital expenditure of course you cover the whole expense.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I thought you were going to make some alteration in regard to the station at Moncton?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

St. Charles Branch.....\$ 188,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of that branch to date?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am ashamed almost to say. This \$188,000 is composed of a shed for housing the passenger cars, \$7,000; car cleaning establishment and fittings, \$1,500; building at Levis, \$1,500; lands and damages, \$170,000; legal expenses, \$8,000. The total expenditure up to the 30th June, 1886, was \$787,473.47. The expenditure during the year ending 30th June, 1887, was \$230,103.78. The expenditure during the two months ending 31st January, 1885, was \$55,042.83; total, \$1,274,619.81.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To which this \$188,000 must be added?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So it will be close on \$1,500,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the length?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Fifteen miles.

Mr. DAVIES. How much more will be required before the claims cease completely?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are some claims in addition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no tunnel on this that I am aware of.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it is an enormous cost, and principally consists of what is claimed as land damages.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yet we are told the price of property in Quebec is not improving.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government resisted the claims in every possible way. They expended \$8,000 for legal expenses, and even brought the cases to the Supreme Court.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In a sense this is satisfactory, as it shows that the value of land within a certain radius of the ancient capital is as dear as at any point of Ontario that I know of.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) What is the amount of the claims yet unpaid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A very large sum indeed—over \$500,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much represents construction apart from the land damages?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not the figures separating the two. Out of the total sum stated here, about \$600,000 is for construction, the rest is upon the land. Out of this \$1,274,000, about \$600,000 is for actual construction, and the balance is for the land.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a claim of over \$500,000 outstanding?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Altogether for land damages?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What quantity of land within the limits of the town of Lévis has been used?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A very small quantity indeed as there are no works there. I should think the railway improved the value of the property.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think so, or the greater part of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And it was undertaken under the impression that it would be a nominal amount.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman remember the estimate at the time?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The cost up to date is \$1,500,000, including this estimate of \$500,000 for unliquidated land claims.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These are claims we do not admit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, \$500,000 of possibilities. Unless my recollection is at fault, I think it was between \$300,000 and \$400,000 that it is estimated the work would cost.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was a very small portion of this, certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know if the hon. gentleman can give me information as to the width of the track and the total quantity of the land within the limits of the town of Lévis?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is 40 feet of width of track besides a very small station, and the distance is one and a half miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to have had some land in Lévis, with that railway crossing it.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will not take any suggestion from me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I shall only be too glad to do so.

¶ Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps not, when the hon. gentleman knows the one I am about to make. I say every case in which the Government appealed to the Supreme Court against the arbitrators, the Government were defeated. Whenever an appeal has been taken from the arbitrators' award, the award has been increased by the Supreme Court. I do not say it was the fault of the counsel, but perhaps the Government would change and employ new people. Every time, whether before the arbitrators or the Supreme Court, the Government have been unlucky, and the most outrageous demands made for compensation of land were acceded to. Very large amounts have been awarded, which I thought, were altogether in excess of the value of the land, though at one time, no doubt, when a large trade was carried on, the land along the track was valuable. To-day it has no value whatever.

¶ Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was all in a state of dilapidation.

Mr. THOMPSON. We have done much better than change our counsel. We have had the assistance of some of the best counsel of Quebec in all those cases, and in most of them the court decided that they were bound, on questions of fact, by the evidence given in the tribunal below. That evidence was taken in a very arbitrational

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

way, in such a way that it was difficult to get at the right testimony taken before the arbitrators. The arbitrators, in many of the cases, disbelieved the testimony given. The tribunal thought they were legally bound simply by the evidence, and considered that, as professional men, they could not get rid of the evidence even though the arbitrators had ample reason for disbelieving the greater part of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The total area is ridiculously small. Forty feet width for a mile and a-half is but little more than six acres all told, and as the Minister of Finance truly says but little ground was wanted at the time. I recollect perfectly the line this road takes going into Lévis, and unless it can be shown in the clearest way—and it did not appear to me that any real damage was done to the river property—that the property, to a great extent, on either side was utterly destroyed and rendered useless, which I do not think was the case, the Government has been fleeced in the most outrageous way.

Picton Town Branch..... \$34,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Will that complete this branch?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will both complete it and furnish the rolling stock. The total cost is \$449,872.47.

Dalhousie Branch..... \$17,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That also is to furnish rolling stock. The total cost is \$216,506.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I see that the steamer *Admiral* is charged to this railway. Does she run to Dalhousie or only to Campbellton?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Only to Campbellton.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the vote for the Indian-town branch?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is for rolling stock also.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What has been the cost of the Indian-town branch?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The expenditure up to date is \$177,612.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is that under lease, or in what way is it used?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government is operating it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Does it connect with the Western road?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It does not yet.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman state what has been done in reference to the Moncton branch?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is leased to the New Brunswick Railway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is this: construction, \$7,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is original construction. It is a land claim at Newcastle.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand from the late superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway, who, I regret to say, died a short time ago, that it was contemplated to give increased accommodation—to give accommodation worthy of the name—at Charlottetown. The old railway station there gives very bad accommodation to the general public. I believe that has been under consideration and that an improvement has been very favorably reported upon. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether it is intended to do anything in regard to that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no provision made this year in increased accommodation at Charlottetown. I

think what has been asked is mainly to get the track to run along from the terminus. That is under consideration, but it is not provided for this year.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is this at Newcastle?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is an unsettled claim for land?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is it for the main line or for the branch, and who is the man?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is a ballast pit near Newcastle belonging to Mr. J. Ferguson.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Is that settled by arbitration?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The claim is for \$20,000. It is not settled, but the amount placed here is the outside amount which the Government think should be granted.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In reference to the item of \$25,000 for heating cars by steam and lighting by electricity, does the Minister propose to light all the cars by electricity or only the Pullmans?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is proposed to light all the cars.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do you propose to divide it? How much does it cost for each car?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The details are—supplying heating apparatus to thirty cars at \$300 each, \$9,000; engines at \$75 each, \$1,500; applying electric lighting to cars, \$14,500; total, \$25,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are they 30 Pullmans or 30 ordinary cars?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Both.

Mr. WELSH. I see that the whole of this vote is to go to capital account, and there has been a great deal of capital already invested in the Intercolonial Railway, and it seems to me that the more capital we put into it, the more we lose.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose the hon. gentleman will admit that this is a capital change.

Mr. WELSH. Yes, if you admit that it should be extended to Prince Edward Island; but I do not see anything in that in regard to the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That will follow as a matter of course.

Mr. WELSH. I would like to see something in the Estimates about it, and I do not see a thing. I do not like to interfere with this Intercolonial Railway, but I would suggest to the Government that, when they find that they are carrying on a business at a loss to the country, they ought to put their rates up to a sum sufficient at all events to pay running expenses. It is all very well to develop the resources of the country, the mines and the minerals, but the Government ought not to carry things at a dead loss. I have already pointed out that they are carrying coal at rates which are a heavy loss to the country, and that coal could be carried just as well by shipping, and I understood the Minister to say that, when they got their branch constructed to Pugwash, they would carry coal more profitably. I think that this should be extended to Prince Edward Island. You surely do not want to leave us out altogether. If you left us out of the Dominion, it would be a different thing, but you have practically left us out in these Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of fact, how does the expense of heating and lighting these cars in this way compare with the ordinary mode?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is very much more expensive, but it is a question of safety.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not rise to object to it, but I wanted to know how the expense compares, apart from the capital charge.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have not had sufficient experience to decide that yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose this is supplied by the engine?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. Do I understand my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island to suggest that we should light the cars with electricity on the Island, and heat them by steam, and that we should put up the rates on the Island railway so as to make itself sustaining?

Mr. WELSH. I would reply to the Minister that the Intercolonial Railway does not pay by a long jog. It is losing nearly as fast as the Prince Edward Island Railway. But if you charge the same rates as you do on the Intercolonial Railway, in proportion to the gauge, and in proportion to the cost, I am quite willing that the Island railway should stand on the same level. But our railway is a Lilliputian railway in comparison with the Intercolonial Railway, yet the rates you charge are just about equal to those of the Intercolonial Railway, whereas the expense of conducting it ought not to be nearly as great. But put the whole thing on a level, and I am willing Prince Edward Island should bear her share. The Intercolonial Railway is now losing a large sum of money, but if you improve the accommodation on this road we shall certainly expect you to make the same improvement on the Island railway. It seems to me, in looking over these Estimates, that Prince Edward Island is forgotten altogether.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You will see, before we get through the Estimates, that it has not been forgotten.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) From the remarks made by the Minister one would imagine that that part of the Government railways which paid less and which cost most, was the Prince Edward Island Railway. Now, that is hardly fair. The hon. gentleman knows that there is no Government railway run which is not a losing speculation, and he knows that the loss on the Island railway is less per mile than on any other railway that the Government operates. I find that the loss on the Intercolonial Railway per mile is \$263; on the Eastern Extension road, which the hon. gentleman has done so much to complete, the loss is \$377 per mile, while the loss on the Island road is only \$230, which is \$147 per mile less than on the Eastern Extension. While I have been in this House the last five or six years, whenever we ask for anything, it is flung in our faces that the Island road is not paying, and the inference attempted to be drawn is that the other government roads are paying. I say that the Island railway is operated at less loss per mile than any other government railway. More than that, the Island road has been built by the people of the Island themselves, while in other portions of the Dominion, and elsewhere in the Maritime Provinces, the railways have been built at the expense of the general Government. I agree with my hon. friend and colleague that if you deem it necessary to go to a large expense in making modern improvements on the Intercolonial Railway, which I do not at all object to, because I think the public have a right to all the modern improvements of heating and lighting—but if you vote \$24,000 last year, and \$25,000 this year, for that purpose, I think the Island road should be favored in the same way.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has misapprehended me. I drew no invidious comparison between the Intercolonial Railway and the Island road. I did not say anything about which was the most profitable.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I think the hon. gentleman suggested it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I spoke solely in answer to the remarks of the junior member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Welsh) as he was asking to have these improvements extended to the Island road, and I asked him in a jocular manner whether he would like us to make the improvements and then charge such rates as to make the road pay? But I may say I do not believe we could improve the position of the country by increasing the rates on the Island railway. I believe you would lose money instead of gaining, and you would drive off the traffic we now have on that road, if you were to increase the rates materially. The object is to do the business of the country, that is the first consideration; and you do it at as small a loss as you can. In reference to government railways, I do not think we can attempt to make them pay. Our object is not to make a profit out of them, but to promote the trade and business of the country. In many instances I believe that instead of improving the position and decreasing the charge to the Government by a large increase of the rates, it would have a contrary effect, and you would not do as much business as you do now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is correct I think in that, and I should like to see the spirit of his remarks applied to the Island railway, because I know complaints are made that the rates are too high. The hon. gentleman threw cold water upon the suggestion of my hon. friend that we should have the same advantages extended to the Island on the ground that the Government could not grant them until the Island railway was made to pay. I am glad that the hon. gentleman's suggestion was more jocular than otherwise; but he is giving the Intercolonial Railway these improvements although the road is losing a very large sum yearly, and the fact that a smaller loss occurs on the Island road should not be a reason for withholding the improvements.

Mr. WELSH. I will oppose the item unless the Finance Minister will promise me that the Government will give the same improvements to the Island railway. I want a fair and square deal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is intimidation.

Mr. WELSH. Well, no matter, I want a fair deal.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Last year when the amount of \$318,000 was voted for rolling stock I enquired of the Finance Minister whether it would be sufficient to thoroughly equip the Intercolonial Railway with coal cars as well as Pullmans. The hon. gentleman told me it would be ample for that purpose. I desire to know what expenditure has been made for coal cars, because up to the present time the coal trade of Pictou is suffering as much as last year. Shortly before I left Halifax I had a conversation with several of the coal agents there, and they told me it was utterly impossible to get coal cars to bring the coal down, and the consequence is that much of the coal trade is going past them. The "bunkering" business is gradually passing away. One gentleman told me that he could have sold 20,000 or 30,000 more tons if he had had car accommodation. The hon. Minister also stated that the gondola cars were found much more suitable for coal traffic than were hopper cars. Gondola cars are, however, utterly unsuitable for the bunkering business of supplying steamers off Halifax as they cannot be used on the turntable owing to their weight, 20 tons. The small hopper cars must be used, weighing six to eight tons. The Gondola cars however are very well for the long haul or for our own local trade. The fact of having so few hopper cars is interfering most seriously with the business.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There has been a great increase in the traffic.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There has been enormous increase in the expenditure.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am now talking of the question of cars. What was a sufficient supply for the trade of last year would be inadequate this year.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is no increase in the traffic over last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is more coal carried west.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, and it is the long haul which uses up the cars. What would have been a sufficient supply of cars with a certain quantity of coal to be carried would not be sufficient if there was a large increase in the amount to be carried, and if you have to carry it a long distance that consumes the car in capacity because it takes a long time to get the cars returned.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understand that, but I was not speaking so much of that point. It is hardly worth while incurring a heavy expenditure for gondola cars to carry coal over the Intercolonial Railway at a loss. The coal coming from Pictou to Halifax for accommodation along the line and "bunkering" the steamers is carried at a much higher rate than when it is carried west.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is the short haul.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is much better for the Government to cultivate that business than to incur heavy expenditure for gondola cars to haul coal to the west at a loss. There has been a very heavy increase in the working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That will come up more properly under the head of income.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There has been a very large increase, amounting to \$338,000, extending over every branch, and that will require very considerable explanation. I may ask, for what reason is the Eastern Extension worked separately from the Intercolonial Railway? It is very inconvenient, to say the least, for any one handling freight as we do as agents for a line of steamers to England where the lines have a *pro rata* rate on freight.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Eastern Extension was not made by Act of Parliament part of the Intercolonial Railway, and its accounts have to be kept separate, although it is working under the same management.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). But not under the same rates. The hon. gentleman will see the inconvenience caused to the trade, and the matter is one that should be remedied. Inward freight from Europe coming by steamer, where the Intercolonial Railway participates in a certain percentage, is charged an ordinary rate until it reaches Pictou Landing, and when it passes over the Eastern Extension the rate is very much increased. The two roads should be run together, and there is no advantage in keeping separate accounts, where practically they both belong to the Government. With respect to the work undertaken at Richmond wharf last year, I call attention to the fact that it was postponed, that all the best part of the season was allowed to pass without the work being carried out, and when autumn came we had steamers arriving with large cargoes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The explanation is that the parties had to get creosoted piles and there was difficulty in obtaining them. If this had not occurred the Government hoped they would have been able to carry out the work as intended.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was prepared for such an explanation, but it is not a satisfactory one, because no effort was made all through the best part of the season. When

an effort was made, no doubt the Government were disappointed. If, however, they had commenced to work early in the summer, the work would have been done and the trade would have been accommodated; but they were subsequently allowed to proceed with the work, by which the trade was inconvenienced, all being on account of the lack of proper attention early in the season. The work done last year was in a measure satisfactory, although there were great complaints on behalf of the importers of sugar that their cargoes were detained there a very long time. This arose from the want of rolling stock, as the hon. gentleman is aware.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There was a large increase of traffic unexpectedly thrown on the railway.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was about to say that I would not blame the Government altogether because there was a large amount of European traffic which they were not aware of as likely to occur. Still they had not sufficient rolling stock to accommodate the inward traffic. We had no cause to complain of the despatch given to the European freight and the department made every effort in this direction and it was very successful.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear hear.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When it was represented in England, as it was by interested parties, that the Intercolonial Railway was blocked, and there was so much freight remaining to be forwarded, this was attempted to be used against the Intercolonial Railway. The agents in Liverpool were able to issue a circular to the trade, which was a copy of the letter which was addressed to them by my associates who are agents of that line, which shows the despatch given by the Intercolonial Railway to the European freight, but it was at the expense of the other freight it is true. It shows, however, what good work the Intercolonial Railway can do under ordinary circumstances. I will read the extract from the letter:

"Oregon arrived at 7 a. m. Sunday, and mails and passengers were at once forwarded by special train. This steamer commenced discharging at midnight, and finished and sailed for Baltimore at 11 p. m. Monday, which we think was very good work. The railway also handled her cargo very well, having forwarded 25 cars, containing 550 tons, between midnight and 8 a. m. Monday, and a total of 70 cars containing about 1,300 tons by midnight, Monday, and the balance was all loaded and shipped by 6 p. m. Tuesday."

I mention that to show that the Intercolonial Railway can forward freight very promptly, and so far as my information goes we have no cause to find any complaint with the despatch over the line generally. If we only got sufficient rolling stock and sufficient accommodation there for handling so that the sugar cargoes might not interfere as they did last year, to a certain extent, then the Intercolonial Railway would be able to do work very satisfactorily. I hope the Government will push that matter of the rolling stock forward so that we shall have no reason to complain in this respect in the future.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. ELLIS. As this is the last item in the Estimates for this purpose, I desire to draw attention to one or two matters which, perhaps, are not properly included in the item itself. There is great complaint at St. John with reference to discrimination in rates, and at the meeting of the Board of Trade recently,—

"Mr. Robertson, from the committee on freight rates, drew the attention of the board to some statements made before the Royal Railway Commission, with respect to discrimination in freight rates on the Intercolonial, in favor of Halifax as against St. John. As a board, said Mr. Robertson, we ask no favors from the Intercolonial Railway, the Dominion Government, or anybody else, but we demand fair play, and we intend to get it. What is the use of having a favorable geographical position if our interests are ignored? St. John is 99 miles nearer Montreal than is Halifax, and yet the same rate is charged from both places.

Halifax is blocked with freight, while St. John, with its open port and its many facilities, is discriminated against by the Intercolonial authorities, and the Government wharf is idle in consequence. It is time this Board should unequivocally and forcibly place this matter before the Dominion Government. The treatment of St. John in this matter was most outrageous."

As I understand it, sugar was brought to St. John and shipped to Montreal at a rate of 18 cents per hundred as against 20 cents from Halifax. When the Halifax people found out that, they insisted that the rate should be made equal and that is the origin of the difficulty. I regret that the Minister of Railways is not here himself, for I wish to call his attention to another matter. He says in his report:

"The mail train service during the summer has been carried on with the regularity which in the winter months, owing to heavy storms, it was impossible to maintain."

That is not exactly the fact, and if the Minister were here I could tell him from my own observation that during the early summer months the management of the road, so far as the carriage of mails was concerned, was simply shameful. The road was made to do duty to carry the outgoing population of Montreal and Quebec to the shore watering places, and their baggage—consisting of pots, and pans, and beds, and everything else—is carried along by the mail train. These were dumped at the railway stations and the train was delayed. That continued until the papers in the interest of the Government, as well as newspapers generally, took the matter up and made such remonstrances that it was to some extent improved. I think that the acting Minister of Railways should arrange that the mail trains should not carry this summer travel and freight from Montreal. Not only were the mails delayed in this way, but connections could not be made with the railways going to the United States, and a good deal of delay and trouble occurred. Again, there is a great difficulty in getting any person in authority to act. Whenever the slightest application is made by persons, at St. John or elsewhere, seeking to have business transacted with the railroad, it is referred to Ottawa, and delays occur which the merchants consider are very detrimental to trade. I wish to call attention to another subject. If you take up the accounts of the railway you will find a matter which has caused a great deal of discussion in St. John, and that is with reference to the Underhay purchases of oil; \$13,804 worth of oil was purchased from Underhay, of Boston, in 1887. Underhay is not a dealer in oil but he is a broker, and I will just direct attention to a letter which will summarise this whole matter. It says:

"I enclose a short statement with reference to oil. The figures as to dates, quantities, and prices paid are taken from a return brought down to the House of Commons in 1886. I have added the prices for identically the same quality of oil our merchants would furnish it for. Those oils are lubricating oils and the Intercolonial Railway authorities will not purchase their oils by tender but purchase from Underhay & Co., and at prices double or treble what our merchants would charge. The mode of purchasing is very unfair to our people. If one of our merchants has goods in bond, the Government will not buy without duty being paid, but if they purchase from a man in Boston the goods can be brought in duty free. This puts a premium on a man having his place of business in Boston instead of St. John or any other Canadian city. If any change has taken place in this regard it has been very lately. You will notice in the enclosed statement that they paid \$12,786.74 for what they could have bought in St. John for \$5,753.10, in other words, there is considerably more grease than oil in the commodity bought."

The returns, for a half year, brought down in answer to the request of my hon. friend from the county of St. John (Mr. Weldon) show that \$12,786 was paid for oil in six months which the St. John dealers had offered to sell for \$5,753. The answer of the railway authorities is that there are some qualities in this oil not to be found in the oil sold in Canadian cities. Some of this oil has been taken to analysts in the United States, and it has been impossible, even by the keenest analysis of the oil, to find the slightest difference between it and the Canadian article. I trust that if this has not been rectified, it will be rectified, because it is a great injustice.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. Minister what the Government propose to do with the vote of last year of \$150,000 for increased accommodation at Halifax. An application was made by the city showing the mode in which Water-street could be widened and how the increased accommodation which was desired at the deep water terminus could be at the same time obtained. But so far as I am aware nothing has been done. At the request of the merchants of Halifax, the water line along the wharves has been surveyed, and a great many are anxious to have the railway brought down along the wharves, and, although some are opposed, a great many have offered their property free of charge, provided the work is carried through. But what I rose for was to ask whether the Government propose to acquire the property at the deep water terminus necessary for the increased accommodation? It is impossible to get on there without increased accommodation, and that can only be secured by taking some of the property opposite the deep water terminus. I should like to know what the Government propose to do, and how soon they intend to undertake the work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand that there were two modes proposed—one, to take the property opposite the deep water terminus, and the other to run a railway along the wharves so as to afford facilities for doing business with these wharves. So far as I am informed, the general impression was that the latter would give the best accommodation to the city and to the people doing business, as well as be best for the railway. But while a large number of the proprietors are quite willing to facilitate that arrangement, there are other persons who would probably be disposed to take advantage of it for exacting a very large payment for the privilege of crossing their property, and the work has really been arrested with the view of getting those parties to consent to have the line run down on some fair arrangement under which the Government would not be required to pay large sums of money for what really would be increasing the value of the property and the business facilities of the persons making these demands.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am afraid that if the Government wait until everybody agrees, they will indefinitely postpone the work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think a little gentle pressure of that kind will be sufficient.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I suppose arbitrators would only allow them a reasonable sum. For myself I have signed the document agreeing to give up my property, and a great many others are equally willing. I do not think the cost of the property would be a very large amount, and those who have given their property would be satisfied to see the others paid, in order to have the railway brought down to the wharves, even if they got nothing themselves.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that \$32,000 of this has been paid for rolling stock. Is that charged to capital account?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was any rolling stock replaced last year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. Everything that is once put on the road must be maintained and kept good from revenue, that is to say, if a hundred engines have been provided, there must be a hundred maintained, and if one is worn out it must be replaced from revenue. It is only rolling stock that is required for the accommodation of increased business, in addition to what has been previously furnished, that is charged to capital.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). With reference to what fell from the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) regarding the Mr. ELLIS.

discrimination in favor of Halifax against St. John, I received a communication last week from a party in Halifax, complaining that a certain article was carried from St. John to New Glasgow for 12½ cents per 100 lbs. at the same time that the railway was charging 12 cents for carrying it from Halifax, and asking me to communicate with the department. With regard to inward freight, my hon. friend will see that it is a matter that rates do not control. The freight comes in the steamers which call at Halifax, and it would not go to St. John in any case.

Mr. ELLIS. Sugar would go to St. John.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). A small quantity of it might, but it is a question that does not amount to very much, because the great bulk of the freight comes by the steamers to Halifax under any circumstances, and would not go to St. John.

Mr. ELLIS. The complaint is not mine; it is that of Mr. George Robertson, a member of the Board of Trade, and a prominent Conservative; and I think he has some grounds for it, especially as to sugar.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I moved some time ago for some papers in reference to an accident that happened to a young man on the Intercolonial Railway. The complaint of his relatives is that after he was killed they went to the place and asked what time the inquest would be held. They were told on the following day. They retired about midnight, and in the morning they were told that a jury had been empanelled and had brought in a verdict at 2 o'clock in the morning, and they had not an opportunity of being present. I have got the affidavits to show that that statement was made to the brothers who were there, and while they were asleep in bed the inquest was held at 2 o'clock in the morning. They made application to the department for an investigation, and the answer was that an investigation had been made. The verdict was "accidentally killed," but they felt there should be more investigation, and the *Sun* newspaper spoke very strongly about it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will make enquiry into it. The only way I can account for holding the inquest at that hour was to accommodate witnesses who were employed on the train and could not attend during working hours.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The gentleman who made the statement to me is Mr. Wm. Lindsay Duncan.

Cape Breton Railway, construction \$800,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is for construction and equipment. The length of the railway, including the branch and extension, is about 100 miles, which, at \$24,000 a mile, amounts to \$2,400,000. The expenditure to the 31st January, 1888, was \$311,979. It will form part of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It will have to be run in connection with the Eastern Extension.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The whole thing, I believe, will have to be incorporated.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Which side of Bras d'Or Lake does it run?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It goes from Inverness up, running to Sydney by the Bras d'Or.

Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, construction... \$750,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will this finish it? What progress has been made towards a settlement with the company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No settlement has been made. The parties are here for the purpose of seeing if they can arrange with the Government. The Act gives them the right to obtain it in the courts or by arbitration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has been decided by the courts in favor of the Government ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not the question of compensation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). But the question of the ownership of the road ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no question of that kind.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Government took power last year to make an arrangement with them if necessary, but they led us to understand that they had no claim on the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We put in the words "if any."

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) I objected to that at the time, because I thought it might lead to trouble.

Mr. THOMPSON. It does not arise from that at all, but the Government contended at the time the Bill was introduced that the mortgage was sufficient. Then proceedings were taken for foreclosure. The court in Nova Scotia decided in favor of the Government, and that was reversed in Ottawa, and the Act of last Session had to be resorted to in order to obtain the expropriation. The question now is whether the Government is liable or not to pay for these laborers, and so on.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is the amount involved ?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it is \$150,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I thought this was all settled. The chief engineer says in his report :

" Under an Order in Council of the 14th August, 1885, a special commissioner was appointed, through whom a number of these claims were settled. In 1886, Parliament voted a further sum of \$25,000 for the same purpose, and the commissioner has obtained full receipts and assignments from the company's contractors and other parties having interest in the road, the payments made covering liabilities of the company incurred for the construction of the road prior to the cessation of works in August, 1883."

I would imagine from that that the entire matter was closed.

Mr. THOMPSON. The receipts are not from the company, but from the company's creditors, and those were the persons for whose benefit the mortgage was taken. Now, the parties seek to repudiate that mortgage as not having been made under any competent authority. An injunction was granted by the Supreme Court here, but the question of what claims the company has is still unsettled.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no proposition asking for any grant ?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) My hon. friend rather surprised me when he said this line was shortened forty miles, because I understood, in conversation with some gentlemen from New Glasgow last summer, that the distance which was shortened would be about only four miles ; that from New Glasgow to Truro, and then on by the present road to Oxford, the difference would not be more than four or five miles by the construction of this road which has cost such an enormous sum of money. If that is so, this expenditure is utterly indefensible. Of course, I am aware that the line runs through those three important counties, Colchester, Cumberland and Pictou, but it is at such an enormous expense that I think it would be better to allow the members representing those counties to be elected every time than to make this expenditure.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will get the actual measurements and give them to the hon. gentleman, either on concurrence or on some further item on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have long despaired of getting any information on concurrence.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I make the difference 19 miles.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought it was more than that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What will be the total cost of this road ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The estimate is \$1,400,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will it be in operation this year ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Eastern Extension Railway \$ 33,000

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) What is that for ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is in reference to the road from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso. It is for increased accommodation at Mulgrave. There is, for the station and siding, \$8,000, and for water service, \$25,000. When the Government bought this road, it was equipped with the Haggis water system, which works very unsatisfactorily when quick speed is required to be made.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 1.15 a. m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 7th May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LEGISLATION IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, a memorial of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Territories in Council, to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, praying for the introduction of a new method of legislation in the North-West Territories.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES REPRESENTATION.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 125) to amend the North-West Territories Representation Act. He said: The object of this Bill is merely to make the day of holding nominations and the day of holding elections in the North-West Territories uniform with those fixed for the rest of Canada. The Bill to amend the Dominion Elections Act, which was considered by the House a few days ago, is declared by one of its provisions not to be applicable to the North-West Territories in respect to which there is a special Act, and this Bill is in conformity with that Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

On the notice for the introduction of Bill further to amend the Dominion Lands Act,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In consequence of the pressure of business, I desire to withdraw this notice, and have the Bill introduced in the Upper House.

The notice was dropped.

MANUFACTURE OF CARTRIDGES.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to publish and distribute, for the information of the riflemen of Canada, the Report of the Commission appointed to enquire into the matter of the manufacture of cartridges? and if so, when may the report be expected to be published?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. member I must say that the report of the commissioners appointed to enquire into the matter of the manufacture of cartridges shall appear in the annual report of the Militia Department next year; it cannot be published before.

QUEBEC HARBOR.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, What is the total amount of the advances made by the Government to the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec, up to date, on account of harbor improvements in Quebec, and the tidal dock at the mouth of the River St. Charles.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The total amount of the advances made by the Government to the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec, up to date, on account of harbor improvements in Quebec and the tidal dock at the mouth of the River St. Charles, is \$3,241,000. While on the subject of the Quebec harbor, I wish to correct an error which has crept into *Hansard* in connection with my answer to one of the questions asked me the other day by my hon. friend as to the advances made by the Government to the Quebec Harbor Commissioners for the purpose of constructing the graving dock. It will be remembered that I was asked what was the total amount of interest which had accrued on the amounts advanced for this purpose, and I see that I am reported as replying that the simple interest thereon payable in advance from the 17th December, 1878, to the 19th April, 1888, amounted to \$204,454.32, of which no part had been paid. What I meant to say was that simple interest on the advances so made would amount to the sum mentioned. Hon. gentlemen will find, on reference to the Act 38 Victoria, chapter 56, under which the first of these advances were made, that the moneys were to be advanced to the Quebec Harbor Commissioners, to be by them expended in the construction of the dock; that the Harbor Commissioners were authorised to impose tolls upon the vessels using the dock, and that they were to pay over the net income received from such tolls to the Receiver General, who was to apply it, first, for the payment of the interest on the sums advanced by the Government, and, secondly, to the formation of a sinking fund for the payment of the principal, but if the net income received in any year from the dock was not sufficient to meet the interest, then the Harbor Commissioners were to pay, out of their general fund, a sum not exceeding \$10,000 a year, until the debt of the Government was paid.

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CAMERON asked, Whether the Government intends to grant a subsidy to the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company (Limited)? If not, why not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At this stage of the Session it is not convenient to state what railways will be sub-

sidised; but, with regard to this company, I may state that it appears from the application that the company has not shown that it possesses the means of carrying out the undertaking.

POSTAL SERVICE IN MEGANTIC COUNTY.

Mr. FISET (for Mr. TURCOT) asked, Who has been awarded the contract for the mail between Becancour Station and St. Julie de Somerset and between Inverness and St. Julie de Somerset, awarded on or about the 1st April, 1888? For what amount was the said contract made? Who were the parties that tendered, and what was the amount asked in each case?

Mr. McLELAN. The service at present is in the hands of Mr. Johnson. No action has yet been taken on the tenders sent in, and therefore I cannot give the prices nor the names of the tenderers at present.

Mr. FISET (for Mr. TURCOT) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish postal service between Coleraine Station and Bennett, in the county of Megantic?

Mr. McLELAN. It is not the intention to change the mode of postal service to Bennett.

Mr. FISET (for Mr. TURCOT) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant postal service twice a week in place of once between Lourdes and Somerset, in the county of Megantic?

Mr. McLELAN. It is not at present.

JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF MUSKOKA AND PARRY SOUND.

Mr. BARRON asked, Is the Government aware of Muskoka and Parry Sound having been formed into a Judicial District? If so, what arrangements (if any) have been entered into or made by the Government, or any member thereof, for the appointment of a County Court Judge for the district?

Mr. THOMPSON. The Government have been informed, indirectly, of the formation of a Judicial District there, but they have not received, according to the usual course, the patent creating the district. No arrangement has yet been entered into. I understand that the Act does not come into force until the 1st of July.

FISH TAKEN BETWEEN CAP CHAT AND GRAND VALLEE.

Mr. JONCAS moved for:

Copies of all reports of officers of the Fishery Department, letters and other documents, in relation to the falling-off in the quantity of fish taken near the shores of the St. Lawrence, between Cap Chat and Grande Vallée.

He said: My object in asking for the documents enumerated in this motion is to call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, of the Government and of this House, not only to the fact, that of late years there has been a large deficiency in the quantity of fish caught along the shores of the St. Lawrence, from Cap Chat to Grande Vallée, but also to the fact that the different varieties of fish which formerly frequented these waters, are now fast disappearing. Hardly any fish at all are now caught from Cap Chat to Monts-Louis and from Monts-Louis to Grande Vallée, the deficiency in the catch is every year increasing. If we consult the reports of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, we will find in them the proofs of my assertion. Let us compare the reports of 1870

with those of 1886, and we will find that in 1870 the number of fishing boats along these shores was 507, and in 1886 only 353. We will find also that the number of fishermen employed in this industry was, in 1870, 1,220, and in 1886, 489, and that the number of quintals exported in 1870 from these localities was 15,797, while in 1886 it was only 5,421. We find further that in 1870 the number of barrels of mackerel, herring and caplin caught along these shores was 11,000, whilst in 1886 it was only 82. So that these fisheries which, in 1870, gave employment to 1,240 men, now employ but half that number; and their value, which, in 1870, was about \$100,000, has now decreased to \$25,000. To this state of things many causes are assigned, of which perhaps the principal is the presence in immense numbers along these shores of white porpoises, which are seen there not only by thousands but by tens of thousands moving lower down yearly towards the Gulf. It is in my opinion most important that the Government should enquire carefully into this matter, as the principal occupation and the principal industry of the population along these shores is the fishing industry; and unless an improvement occurs, these people will be obliged to emigrate. I, therefore, hope the Government, through the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, will give this matter careful consideration, and take the necessary steps to remove, if possible, the evil.

Mr. FOSTER. Whatever papers and correspondence are in the department will be brought down. I have already made some enquiry into this matter, and have had some conversation concerning it with my hon. friend, and I will take steps to have a special investigation this year, by not only special officers but also by our general fishery agents, and I have no doubt that by means of this information to be obtained from our officers in that section, and fishery agents, we will get at the facts of the case. With reference to the porpoise fisheries, that evil may cure itself in this way. There are some gentlemen now going into the industry of porpoise fishing on a large scale, and should they be successful in their venture this summer, which is largely tentative, it may serve to diminish the evil spoken of as one of the causes for the decrease of fish.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My hon. friend, the mover of this resolution, will remember that during the course of a debate, in the earlier part of the Session, I took occasion to say, in reference to the fisheries, that the shore fisheries on the eastern coast of Nova Scotia had changed in about the same proportion as that indicated by him. Now, the hon. gentleman, I think, will have to go further than the limit he has put to his enquiry, to ascertain the real cause of the change that has taken place in the fisheries along the coast. From the best information that can be obtained, it appears to arise from two causes. The first is that the fish abound in much less quantities along the coast than formerly; and, in the next place, the mode of fishing has entirely changed. In so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, the fishermen who formerly fished in boats near the shore, now prefer to go out in bateaux into the deep waters. Those who fish in small boats along the coast find that their labors are not so well rewarded, although the toil is greater, as are the labors of those who go out into the deep sea in well equipped vessels. The latter is the mode now adopted in my Province, and I believe a similar mode will have to be adopted in the district to which the hon. gentleman refers. I can hardly imagine that the number of porpoises along the coast can have any effect in causing the decrease complained of. In my judgment, it is simply that the fish do not visit the shore as closely as they did in the old times, and therefore the remuneration is not as great as it used to be for the boats, and, therefore, they have changed their system of fishing.

155

Mr. JONCAS. The system of fishing has not changed in Gaspé as it has in Nova Scotia, and I do not think that the disappearance of the fish from the shores of the St. Lawrence is due to the fact that our fishermen have made any change in the mode of fishing. My hon. friend will find the reason why our fishermen of the Province of Quebec have not yet been able to change their mode of fishing in the remarks which I shall make on the next motion.

Motion agreed to.

PIER OR WHARF AT STE. ANNE DES MONTS.

Mr. JONCAS (Translation) moved for:

Copies of all papers, plans, letters, reports, and other documents whatsoever in relation to the building of a pier or wharf at Ste. Anne des Monts, in the county of Gaspé.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before allowing this motion to be granted, I beg to make some observations in support of it. I shall do it in as few words as possible, for I have no desire to take to no purpose the time of this House. Three or four years ago, I think, the Government, with a view—so at least they allowed us to presume—to the building, at Ste. Anne des Monts or at Cap Chat, in the county of Gaspé, of either a pier or a wharf, have caused surveys and soundings to be made by their engineers. And, if I may judge by the correspondence which then passed between my predecessor in this House, Hon. Mr. Fortin, and the present Government, they really intended at the time to provide for better facilities for those localities. Now, Mr. Speaker, these surveys and soundings have been completed since 1886 and nothing has been done yet. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will therefore allow me to enquire through him whether the Government intend to insert this year in the Estimates an amount whatsoever in order to start in those localities, the building of either a wharf or a pier. Ste. Anne des Monts and Cap Chat are two of the most important parishes of the county of Gaspé, each being inhabited by 2,000 people, but unhappily shut off from all communications. Lands in those places are excellent and very productive, but farmers, owing to want of facilities, cannot dispose of the proceeds of their farms and of their labor. They are compelled, either to consume them on the spot or to sacrifice them at ridiculously low prices. Their position becomes daily more difficult and the building of a wharf or a pier in those localities would be of an immense importance. I trust the Government will give this matter their whole consideration, for it is a painful sight indeed to daily witness the rapid depopulating of the finest parishes of the county of Gaspé, due certainly to no other cause than the want of facilities; for Gaspeia would offer to its inhabitants advantages equal, if not superior, to any other parts of the Province of Quebec, if only it were given roads of communication, if it could only get the means of reaching the great centres of the Dominion. Our lands are in no way inferior to those so much boasted lands of the St. Maurice, of the Lake St. John valley and others of the Province of Quebec. And alongside with farming, we have fisheries of an invaluable richness. In order that I may not be taxed with overrating when I assert here that the Gaspeia lands are equal, if not superior, to those of several parts of the Province of Quebec, I beg to quote some figures taken from the census of 1881. I shall take as points of comparison several counties deemed the most productive of the Province of Quebec and where farming is the more in honor. I shall, therefore, take the counties of Bagot, Megantic, Shefford, St. Hyacinthe, Rouville, Verchères, Huntingdon, and Champlain, in all of which counties the cultivated area is about the same as in Gaspeia. The following is a statement of certain products in the several counties:—

Counties.	Acres.	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Potatoes	Hay.
Bagot.....	80,000	38,086	34,017	390,848	82,901	27,707
Megantic.....	74,273	27,309	34,927	284,971	218,523	39,000
Shefford.....	77,060	27,393	13,083	264,693	196,667	49,597
St. Hyacinthe....	78,000	23,186	93,904	383,091	83,740	18,997
Rouville.....	84,000	38,610	64,012	337,449	94,319	33,601
Verchères.....	73,000	17,051	80,527	462,823	95,221	36,279
Huntingdon.....	78,000	24,215	34,988	277,576	200,117	31,985
Champlain.....	79,000	46,823	19,136	767,708	253,888	30,911
Gaspesia.....	79,000	64,000	78,952	272,021	1,128,023	34,070

As shown by these statistics, Gaspesia yields twice as much wheat, as much barley, nearly as much oats, five times more vegetables, and as much hay as any of the counties with which I have just been comparing it. It is shown by these figures, which will perhaps astonish many hon. members of this House, that this part of the Province of Quebec which, unhappily, is not known enough, can favorably compare with the other parts of the Province. And, however, Mr. Speaker, in this comparison, it must be taken into account that the people of the Gaspé district, fishermen nearly all of them, devote themselves to farming only in a secondary way. Our fishermen hasten to sow their seed in the spring, before the opening of the fishing season, and they take very little care of it until autumn time; while in the counties with which I have just been comparing Gaspesia, rural labors are in honor, constitute the main business, the principal occupation of the people, and are managed with care, ability and according to all the notions of modern science. Now, Mr. Speaker, were I to further show that Gaspesia could become an agricultural part of our country, if it were only given the means of carrying to home as well as to foreign markets the proceeds of its soil, I would have but to quote the official documents which prove that fact, and I would quote in particular, the reports of the Government engineers who state that Gaspesia, with its 400 miles of coasts, contain a sufficient quantity of fertile and arable lands to keep in easy circumstances a population of 3,000,000 souls. But, in order not to take too much of the time of this House, I shall confine myself to quoting some extracts from a pamphlet published by Mr. J. C. Langelier, who has drawn from the very best authorities the information which he gives us about Gaspesia. At page 4 of this pamphlet, I read as follows:—

"Gaspesia has at present but 56,860 inhabitants, thereby clearly showing that it is a country into which the tide of immigration might abundantly flow without encumbering it great extent.

"Unfortunately it has always been ignored by immigrants, who would nevertheless find in it incontestable advantages which are not to be found in other parts of the Province of Quebec.

"In addition to its agricultural resources, the settler has in its fisheries a safe means of providing for the subsistence of his family. The fact is that the greater portion of its population lives on the fisheries, and lives comfortably. This comfort might be considerably increased if, in the moments of leisure left them by the fishing, the inhabitants were to give more care and attention to farming. Still, notwithstanding this neglect, the people of Gaspesia cultivate all the produce required for their consumption.

"According to the census of 1871 the yield of wheat, per acre, was 8.3 bushels in Rimouski; 11.9 in Bonaventure and 15 in Gaspé, or an average of 11.7 bushels for the three counties. This equals and even exceeds that yielded by the most fertile and cultivated regions in other sections of the Province. By the same census it appears that the yield of the following counties for ever acre sown with wheat was: Maskinongé, 7.11 bushels; Napierville, 6; Bagot, 7.69; Chambly, 6.73; Verchères, 6.19; Richelieu, 7.46; Brome, 13.41; Compton, 12.89. Gaspé, therefore, greatly excels, in the cultivation of wheat, the other localities, while Bonaventure and Rimouski show a yield 30 per cent. greater than the rich counties in the valley of the Richelieu."

And at page 5 are found the following words:—

"Colonisation has there a vast field for its operations, and if all the resources, the natural riches and facilities of settlement of this fine region were well known throughout our Province, and appreciated at their proper value by those who are in a position to render valuable assistance to colonization, finally, if these riches, these resources and facility of access to the inner parts of the county were made known to immigrants from Europe, it is beyond a doubt that the current of immigration would set towards that part of the Province in preference to the others,

Mr. JONAS.

and that, at the next census, Gaspesia would have a population of at least 100,000 souls. Let Paspébiac be made a seaport by connecting it with the Intercolonial by a railway, and before ten years Gaspesia will be entirely changed and become one of the richest and most progressive parts of the Province, and even of Canada."

At page 40 of the same work, I read the following extract from a report by Mr. Alexander J. Russell, one of the most competent and best informed authorities, who says amongst other things:

"The soil of the county of Bonaventure is a rich warm loam, free from stones, even on the table lands on the mountains; and is unusable only where too steep to be ploughed. It yields heavy crops of spring wheat and of oats and barley, much superior in quantity to the acre, and in quality, to those raised in counties on the St. Lawrence."

"The coast of Gaspé is similar in soil. Its fisheries are very valuable. I found the interior, through to the St. Lawrence, on the route afterwards adopted by Major Robinson as a line for the Intercolonial Railroad, to be generally an arable, fertile country, judging from having had a hundred miles of it dug over in road making.

"This is the most healthful and romantic land within the compass of the Dominion. It has a winter temperature ten to fifteen degrees warmer than that of Quebec; and in summer its rich valleys and high swelling hills are fanned by the fresh breezes of the sea.

"Its rivers are uninterruptedly navigable by large scows drawn by horses from their mouths nearly to their sources; and freight from its ports to Europe costs about a dollar a ton less even than from Quebec; and every enterprise of sea and land is open to the settler on its shores."

Then let us see what another man says who is very well informed as to the importance of that part of the country: Commandant Lavoie, quoted at page 40 of Mr. Langelier's pamphlet:

"The counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure," says Commandant Lavoie, "should certainly be now the wealthiest ones in the country, had both the rich merchant and the poor fisherman understood formerly, as well as they do now, how important not only to themselves but to the whole country, was the cultivation of land where the soil was so fertile and so easy of culture from the facilities of procuring manure. The population of this part of the country where a large family can subsist on the produce of ten acres whilst one hundred would be requisite near the cities, are mainly poor in consequence of their dislike to farming. Experience will show them that by means of agriculture, they can become rich and independent. In his report for 1876, he adds: This region with a coast line of two hundred and twenty-four miles, offers throughout the greatest possible advantages to fishermen. The soil, which is equal to the best that can be found in our country, possesses advantages which cannot be found elsewhere, and the settler can find an abundance of food in the soil as well as in the sea and become wealthy in a few years, if he only knows how to properly divide his labor and his operations."

The conclusion of the pamphlet from which I have just been giving some extracts is particularly remarkable in point of accuracy, and I beg to read the first part of it:

"All the information given in these notes has been collected with the greatest care and things are represented exactly as they are. The data above given clearly show that Gaspesia offers to the immigrant undeniable advantages and the prospect not only of being able to live comfortably as soon as he arrives, but of acquiring a respectable patrimony within a short time, of securing the future of his children and even of becoming wealthy. How could it be otherwise when the country abounds in resources and riches of all kinds? The soil is everywhere fertile and easy to cultivate, and, as Commandant Lavoie very properly says, equal at least to the best land in the country. The forests have also their wealth and afford every opportunity of carrying on a large and profitable undertaking. The fisheries are abundant, easily prosecuted, open to all with their products which are rare of a market; they afford a revenue as sure as that derived from agriculture and which for more than a century has supported the greater portion of the population and enabled the merchants who trade in fish to accumulate millions."

To those hon. members of this House who hardly know anything of Gaspesia save the name of it, so to speak, these quotations and figures will be sufficient to show that that part of the Province of Quebec would offer real advantages if it were given the facilities it so earnestly asks for since so long a time, and which it needs so much. I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to its farming, the county of Gaspé has fisheries of its own of great richness, a mine wherefrom every inhabitant of the district can, during six months of the year, daily draw not only the feeding, but also all that is necessary for the support of his family. Well, I do not hesitate to say that, presently, those very fisheries, however rich they may be, will become a source of ruin for both the capitalists who work them, and the

fishermen who make the most of them, if the Government do not provide for energetic and immediate steps to come to their assistance. My predecessor in this House, hon. Dr. Fortin, whose zeal, patriotism and devotion to his country I am pleased to exalt here, more than once rose within these precincts to plead the cause which I am advocating just now. His voice often fell through. May be, Mr. Speaker, mine will not be more listened to, my endeavors may not be crowned with more success; I shall have at least the satisfaction of having done my duty. In several instances, and again quite recently, I had the honor of calling the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works and his colleagues, not only on the importance, but also on the urgent necessity of building on the Gaspésia coasts, at the more exposed places, harbors of refuge for the protection of our fishing boats as well as to facilitate our export trade and thus render more remunerative the so hard, so difficult, so dangerous and presently so ungrateful work of our fishermen. Let it be well known, Mr. Speaker, that our fisheries would not profit alone by the increase in wealth which these harbors of refuge would give us, for, with the increase in the products of our fisheries, the population of the Gaspé district, consumers nearly all of them,—and which presently numbers about fifty thousand souls,—would give larger orders to our manufacturers. Trade generally would profit by it as well as the public treasury, into which would pour a large sum from the duties on foreign products. But these are not the only reasons by which I am induced to insist with more force than ever, in this present circumstance, on the wants and necessities of an industry which is one of our most important sources of national wealth; an industry which yearly affords to our export trade goods to the amount of \$6,000,000 and supplies, moreover, our inland trade with valuable commodities of which we in this country perhaps form an inadequate idea. Many hon. members of this House who are just now giving me their attention know how keen competition is nowadays on the fishing markets of the world. In several countries, the Government, in order to promote the working of fisheries, grant very large bounties to their fishermen and ship-owners, bounties which in several countries reach the sum of \$1.75 for each cwt. of exported cod; and, unless our own Government extend to our manufacturers and exporters of the Province of Quebec an encouragement worthy of the importance of their labors, that industry, instead of progressing, will fall down and afford no more a living to a large portion of our maritime people, who will have to leave their country and go to the neighboring Republic for a bread always bitter, more especially so when soaked in tears one sheds when remembering the absent fatherland. From the Gaspé basin to Paspébiac, in Gaspésia, an extent of more than eighty miles of coasts, inhabited by a population of 8,000 fishermen, there is no natural shelter where our fishermen can take refuge during storms. So long as fish kept near the coasts, it required but small boats to catch it. But now that it has moved out from the shore, now that our fishermen are compelled to go seeking after it to twenty, thirty or forty miles out, boats of small dimensions are no longer adequate to the requirements of a more extensive working, and the result is a great loss of time, and notwithstanding their well-known ability and fearlessness, our fishermen are oftentimes compelled to quit the fishing grounds and give up the certainty of an abundant catch, in order not to be caught in a gale, which they would care very little of, were they manning good, large, solid boats. And when, driven away by the storm, they go back to their starting point, they have no alternative but to run their boats aground; their only place of safety is the sand of the shore. When the storm is over, a whole day glides away before they can sail out again, before the boats can be put again to sea for a new expedition, a day often favorable to fishing, but which, by the force of circumstances, is necessarily lost. And I am

not mentioning here, Mr. Speaker, the very large pecuniary losses which our fishermen frequently experience. These losses figure up, annually, to thousands of dollars, and it often happens that our poor fishermen see the produce of many years of hard labor swallowed up in a single storm, happy indeed if they can save their own life, which, unhappily, is not always the case, for often, alas, there are disasters to deplore. The reports of our Department of Fisheries show, for these last years, a large deficiency in the quantity of fish caught by the fishermen of the Province of Quebec. Now, Mr. Speaker, this deficiency is solely due to the frequent gales which have visited our coasts these last years. There is no less an abundance of fish, on the contrary; but it is impossible for our fishermen, with the boats they are compelled to use owing to want of harbors of refuge, to compete successfully with the fishermen of the neighboring Provinces. It is therefore highly desirable and important, for the future of fisheries in the Province of Quebec, that the Government should take immediate steps to remedy the existing state of things, and I trust they will grant this year a few thousand dollars for this purpose. Now, Mr. Speaker, the want of harbors of refuge not only injures the very working of our fisheries, it also tends to completely paralyse our export trade. Owing to the want of better facilities, through railroads or otherwise, the fish of the Province of Quebec is still carried to the Mediterranean, the Brazilian and the inland Dominion markets by way of sailing vessels, and from the very place of supply. Now, cod caught in July and August cannot be dried and ready for export before October and November, and it is a very hard job, if not an impossible one, for our coasting vessels to come and load at that season of the year, so productive of gales and storms. Last year again, three or four, I think, of those coasting vessels were wrecked on our coasts, in the famous storm of October, the 21st. The result of this state of things is that our exporters, who could often get a very remunerative price at autumn time on foreign markets, are compelled to winter their fish and undergo considerable losses owing to a subsequent depression on the markets, losses wholly due, I may say, to the delay occasioned through want of harbors of refuge which would allow our coasting vessels to load at any time of the year. Moreover, our exporters have to pay an additional freight which often reaches 30 or 40 cents per cwt., intended to cover the risks run by vessels along our coasts. Add to that a higher insurance rate, the necessary expenses due to the fact that vessels can only anchor two miles from our coasts, and this House will understand the difficult position in which are placed our ship-owners and traders. I beg, Mr. Speaker, to read a letter written to me, on the 29th of January last, by the head of one of the leading commercial firms of Gaspésia, Messrs. Valpy and Le Bas. Here is what he says:

"DEAR SIR,—As you are shortly leaving for Ottawa to attend the meeting of Parliament, we would suggest to you the great importance of having some public works on this coast. From Gaspé Basin to Port Daniel, a distance of over seventy miles, there is not a bay or cove where a vessel loading the produce of the country can anchor in safety. The natural consequence is, they have either to go out at sea or go ashore. If the latter it places the shipper in a bad position, as if it is late in the season, in nine cases out of ten he is not able to replace the vessel. The consequence is that he has to winter his goods for a period of not less than eight months. If a perishable article, it simply means ruination to the unfortunate shipper. If you go into figures you will find that a large amount of products are exported from this part of the country, such as fish, lumber, grain, potatoes, which we assure you is not done without a great deal of money, inconvenience and anxiety on the part of those doing business here.

"We would also bring to your notice the fact that we are unable to charter vessels to load on this coast for foreign markets after the 20th October, owing to the want of harbors, and we have, moreover, to pay an extra 25 cents per cwt. on fish to all vessels loading on the coast. That is to say, a vessel loading part cargo at Gaspé Basin (which is a harbor) will carry fish at 2s. 3d. stg. per cwt., whereas the same vessel taking the remainder of the cargo on the coast has to be paid 3s. 3d. stg. This extra charge is to cover the risk of loading on an open coast. This of itself is a serious drawback to our trade, and the extra freight

has to be paid by either the producer or buyer. It occurred to us last season (say 1886), owing to the lateness of the season and the want of harbors, to winter 6,000 cwt. of dry fish. The result was that we lost \$8,000 on the market value of this article, which was only placed on the Brazilian markets in July and August, 1887. We may add that agricultural pursuits are growing rapidly and that large quantities of farm products could be exported but for want of facilities. Speculators were loath to meddle with them.

"We remain, dear Sir,

"Yours truly,

"VALPY & LEBAS."

I need not comment on this letter, and I trust the few remarks I have just made will show the necessity of giving better facilities to the Gaspésian trade. It is a matter which forces itself to public attention, and to which, I hope, the Government will give their whole consideration.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, before answering the hon. member, may I enquire of him whether, in his remarks about Gaspésia, he intended referring only to the county of Gaspé, or to the united counties of both Bonaventure and Gaspé?

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation). I referred only to the county of Gaspé. I may remark that in my statements about the agricultural products of Gaspésia, I gave the figures for the united counties of both Bonaventure and Gaspé.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, before proceeding further, I must congratulate the hon. member on the able manner in which he has brought this matter before the House, and tell him that after the two illustrations he has given us of his fitness to deal with highly important questions, he should not, hereafter, hide his talent, but, on the contrary, he should, at the next Session, apply his researches and studies to other questions that do not relate simply to his county, and thus add to his services towards his country and his Province in particular. The hon. member has just given us figures showing how much Gaspésia,—that is to say, the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure—can yield and yields effectively in wheat, barley, oats and other cereals which are found in the most favored counties of the Province of Quebec. He has shown that in reality both the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure yield as much, in point of grains and cereals, as certain counties he mentioned and, in certain cases, four and five times as much. It is a discovery for me, and I think it is also a discovery for many members of this House, who did not expect to hear of such results from Gaspésia. Gaspé being so far from the heart of the country, we are apt to presume that it is a country of ice, frost and snow, and that nothing else is to be found there but fish. The hon. member has just shown that, on the contrary, it is a country productive of grains alike and that it could produce more, were it more settled. He was equally right in saying that what is wanting especially—or rather what was and is still wanting to that part of the country—are facilities. The fact is Gaspésia has but lately entered in the way of transport accommodations, but it shall have more of them before long, when, for instance, the railway that is being built at Baie des Chaleurs shall extend to Percé and Gaspé. Of course, the hon. member cannot expect that all these great enterprises will be completed forthwith, notwithstanding his anxious desire to see his county and Gaspésia thriving. I notice that, in this respect, he has inherited the good qualities of his predecessor, hon. Mr. Fortin, whose departure from amongst us to occupy a seat in another House has evinced a general regret; but I am happy to notice that he has been replaced by a member who seems to take an equal interest in that section of the country. As I stated in several occasions to hon. Mr. Fortin, the Government cannot possibly do all at a time. These things must be done gradually. The wants of the county are stated with much force by the hon. member, and will not fail to attract the attention of the

Mr. JONCAS.

Government and this House. It is beyond a doubt that hon. Mr. Fortin, as well as the present hon. member for Gaspé and the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel)—who seems himself to have shared a good deal in the inheritance of Mr. Fortin,—it is beyond a doubt that these hon. members have obtained, from year to year, as much as it was possible to get for those counties. And with regard to that, I take the liberty of saying that the hon. member was mistaken when he stated a moment ago that the hon. Mr. Fortin's voice had not been much echoed and he feared his would not be more so. If his voice can only get the fourth part of the echo raised by the hon. Mr. Fortin's, he may well be satisfied, for every year hon. Mr. Fortin always received a good deal for that section of the country and its fishermen. I shall not endeavor, Mr. Speaker, to follow the hon. member in the informations and figures he furnished this House with; but I must say that, as to the harbors of refuge referred to by him, it is impossible for the Government to build them all at a time. We are at work building some. There is one, I think, at the Magdalen Islands, which must be about completed. There is also a pier or a wharf, which, if not completed, will be so before long, at Percé, in the county of Gaspé. Other works of the same kind are presently carried on, on the coasts of the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure. As to Cap Chat and Ste. Anne des Monts, the hon. member is quite right when he says that the Government have caused surveys to be made there. We, effectively, have had considerable studies made in those localities for two years. The question to ascertain was the practicability of building, at a moderate cost, a pier at Ste. Anne des Monts and another one at Cap Chat. It was shown that the works would be too expensive. Then they ascertained the practicability of the building of a wharf between the two parishes, in order to see whether it was possible to build there a wharf for the use of both localities. It was shown by the report of the engineers—as the hon. member will see, for he moves for the documents and papers relating to that matter—that the estimates for those works were so large that the Government did not venture to ask from the Parliament an appropriation for the works. Any way, the voice of the hon. member for Gaspé is eloquent enough to be heard again. I am satisfied that, with his energy and perseverance, he will not fail to return to the charge and to call on his friend the Minister of Public Works, in order to remind him of the fact that his county needs public improvements. I may say, in concluding, that I do not ignore the thing, but it is well sometimes to remind it to the Minister. The papers asked for will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

CHEESE BRANDING.

Mr. SPROULE moved:

That it is expedient to provide by Bill, or otherwise, for the branding of cheese, the product of the United States, when the same is exported through or from Canada, in such a manner as to indicate the country of manufacture.

He said: My object in moving this resolution is to call the attention of the Government, and the House, and the country to a practice, I might almost say a fraudulent practice, which prevails at present, and which, if allowed to continue, must very seriously impair, if not destroy, one of the most important of the industries of our country, I mean the dairy industry. I refer to the practice of shipping United States cheese into Canada, and then through Canadian ports to Europe with our Canadian cheese. There it is sold as part and parcel of the manufacture of this country. It has been found of late years that—with the attention of our farmers to the manufacture of cheese, and the education of the people in that industry—the quality has improved very materially, and as years advance we are still commanding a higher price for Canadian cheese in

foreign markets. It has also been noticed that in consequence of the adulteration of United States cheese and butter, their market has been falling off, and I apprehend it is for this reason that the United States cheese does not command as high a price as Canadian cheese, but this is carried on, and they are trading on the good name of our cheese, and they realise nearly as much as we do when they ship their cheese with ours. If this is continued, it will materially tend to destroy the value of our cheese in the market. Some hon. gentleman may possibly be inclined to ask whether it is known in the European markets that there is any extensive adulteration of American cheese. I will read what took place in the English House of Commons on the 20th March last :

"It was announced in the House of Commons to-night that the Colonial Office is about to enquire of Canada whether the alleged adulteration of imported American cheese also relates to the Canadian product, especially as regards the practice of using animal fats in making cheese."

I believe that enquiry has gone on; and I find afterwards, in connection with that subject, that the home Government have been moving in the matter. I have another extract here on the same subject :

"HIBERNIA CHAMBERS,

"LONDON BRIDGE, S.E., April, 1888.

"In consequence of the rigid construction which has been put on the recent Act of Parliament entitled 'The Merchandise Marks Act,' by the officers of Her Majesty's Customs, the Home and Foreign Produce Exchange deem it desirable to inform the various Chambers of Commerce and Exchanges on the American continent, as well as various shippers, that it is most important that all classes of provisions should bear on the package the name of the country of production.

"The following further suggestions are offered for cheese or butter: The box or package should bear the brand 'Canadian product.' For bacon, hams, etc., the package should also be branded with the name of the town where the meat is packed. If the meat itself is branded the brand must include the name of the country of production. Goods will not be admitted if marked with any English emblem, name or sign or with & Co., unless the name of the country of production is also clearly marked thereon."

This was done for the purpose, I think, of, if possible, securing fair play for the British colonies, and also to enable the English consumer to distinguish between the products from a foreign country, which is unhappily very much inferior and very much adulterated, and the product from Canada, which, in the English market, is noted as being far superior. What grounds have we for believing that this adulteration goes on? We have the very strongest grounds. We have the report of a committee of the House of Representatives in the United States, a committee of which was appointed to enquire into the adulteration of food, and, after investigating the matter closely, that committee says :

"The subject-matter embraced in this Bill is one of great magnitude and grave importance. The jurisdiction over it by this committee was conferred by a direct vote of the House, and imposes a responsibility fully appreciated, but which the committee have endeavored to discharge fully and conscientiously."

"The Committee on Agriculture has given the subject a patient and so far practicable and exhaustive examination, and in the course of that investigation have listened to arguments by representatives of the National Butter, Cheese and Egg Association; the Iowa Butter and Cheese Association; the Baltimore Produce Exchange; American Agricultural Association; the New York Retail Grocers' Union, the American Agricultural and Dairy Association; Hon. Norman J. Coleman, Commissioner of Agriculture, and Dr. Loring, ex-Commissioner of Agriculture, of the United States, as well as the representatives of the manufacturers and dealers in oleomargarine;

"That they find in the United States that over 150,000,000 cows producing annually over 1,000,000,000 pounds of butter, and 300,000,000 pounds of cheese and that the product is worth \$250,000,000, that about an equal amount of milk is consumed as milk, so that the product of the dairy in the United States is worth \$500,000,000 annually;

"That cows were worth on an average \$40 per head until the introduction of counterfeit butter, and are now worth but \$30 each, making a total loss of \$150,000,000 in milch cattle alone;

"That during last year there were slaughtered in Chicago alone about 300,000 milch cows, or an average of a thousand per day; that

there are from four to five million American citizens engaged in the business, and that they must all abandon it and be driven into some other already overworked branch of industry unless they can be relieved from the present ruinous competition with cheap imitations of butter and cheese;

"That the dairy interest is a necessity to all other branches of agriculture, as it is the cheapest and most reliable means of producing or continuing the conditions of soil necessary to the production of crop, of grain and grass; that the cost of producing the usual imitations of butter is from 7 to 8 cents a pound, and the cost to the consumer has been and is about equal with the price of genuine butter;

"That such imitations are not only disastrous to the dairy interest directly and to all branches of agriculture indirectly, but that they are detrimental to public health, being the fruitful cause of dyspepsia and other diseases.

"From the best and most reliable information obtainable, your committee believe that about 200,000,000 pounds of spurious and imitation compounds and mixtures are now being manufactured annually, which not only takes the place of so much butter, but stops the consumption of much more by the demoralisation of the trade.

"Your committee further believe that the unrestricted traffic in counterfeit butter is demoralising in its effect upon the people; that the existence of such base counterfeits has already seriously impaired our export trade, and will result in still greater damage if not checked. It further appears, from all the information before your committee, that at least nine-tenths of the people of the United States demand this legislation."

Now, in reference to the introduction of these articles that are injurious to health, I have also before me another report from the Committee on the Adulteration of Food, and from which I will read some extracts :

"I have spoken of glueose as a giant which has grown in a few years to colossal proportions."

And I want the House to remember that oleomargarine, as it is spoken of here, does not relate to butter alone, because it is a product that is largely used to adulterate cheese as well as to represent butter. It says :

"It is not only filling our markets in the shape of butter, but also as cheese. Many creameries and large dairies, as I am informed, are now mixing 25 per cent. or more of oleomargarine oil with their cheese."

It goes on to say :

"Mr. Michels, of New York city, a well known microscopist and editor of a scientific journal, testifies that oleomargarine is simply uncooked raw fat, never subjected to sufficient heat to kill parasites which are liable to be in it; that those who eat it run the risk of trichinae from the stomachs of animals which are chopped up with the fat in making it. He states that he has found in it tissue and muscle, and cells of suspicious nature, and that Mr. Taylor has also found in it positively identified germs of disease.

"Mr. Michels further states that all they call fat of oxen brought to New York city in a week, would not supply one factory four days, yet there were then seven factories in New York city, and he asserts that there can be no doubt that fats and grease of various description are used in making oleomargarine.

"The eminent English chemist, Prof. Church, states that he has found in it horse fat, fat from bones, and fats such as are ordinarily used for making candles.

"But the gentleman whom, probably, more than anyone else has written upon this subject, is Dr. R. U. Piper, of Chicago, concerning whom the Chief Justice of the Superior Court of that city and three other judges certify that the testimony of no other scientific gentleman of that city would, in their judgment, be entitled to higher respect.

"Dr. Piper says his attention was first called to the subject by an article published by Mr. Michels before referred to in the American Journal of Microscopy. Since then he has examined a large number of specimens. He testifies that while no true butter can carry trichinae, eggs of the tapeworm, &c., he has found in oleomargarine not only organic substances in the form of muscular and connective tissues and various fungi, but also living organisms which have resisted boiling acetic acid, and eggs resembling those of the tapeworm; these he has preserved to show to any who may desire to see them, and he has also microscopic photographs of them. He thinks these may get in through the stomachs of pigs and sheep used in making the articles, though he has found in it specimens of uncooked meat. His conclusion is that it is a dangerous article, and that he would on no account permit its use in his family."

The committee goes on to say :

"In view of the great and increasing magnitude of this business, and the report of the French Academy of Medicine; and the discoveries of the scientific gentleman before named; and the danger of using the raw fats and the stomachs of diseased animals and of those that die on the

cars, which number hundreds of thousands annually; or of pleuro-pneumonia, or of cattle fever, or of hog cholera; I think we have no reason to rejoice over the erection of these enormous factories which are now supplying the tables of our hotels, restaurants, boarding houses, private families, with oleomargarine, butter and cheese. A new article of butter and cheese has recently made its appearance in western markets containing from 50 to 75 per cent. of hogs' lard."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I only give this for the purpose of drawing the attention of the Government to this feature of the case, and I think the evil can be reached by the law that provides for analysing foods that are supposed to be adulterated; and if these spurious compounds are being brought into our country and cannot be reached in any other way, and if, on being analysed, they are found to be adulterated to anything like the extent represented here, they ought to be kept out of the country, or at least dealt with by such restrictions as will enable those using them to know that they are not of Canadian manufacture. Now, I will point out what the effect of this is upon the Canadian manufacture. We find that for a great many years the product of the United States in cheese and butter have ruled in the English market much the same as ours, but of late years ours has been gaining the ascendancy very largely. For the last few years the best brands of American cheese and Canadian cheese have stood pretty much the same in the foreign market, but the large quantity of this spurious product of these vile compounds that are so much adulterated, that has been sent over, has reduced the price of American cheese in foreign markets to that extent that when mixed along with ours and sold in a lump lot, it very materially reduces the price of our cheese. I find, according to the report furnished me by Kirkpatrick & Cookson, Montreal, that in 1886 the best brand of American and Canadian cheese realised 50 shillings per hundred in Liverpool, last year they realised 63 shillings per hundred, and the Canadian product realised one shilling a hundred more than that of the United States. But I say that this is not a fair test of the injurious effect on prices of these vile compounds being sent in along with our products, because it only represents the price realised for the very best parcels of ours that are sent out of the country, and the very best of theirs. They manufacture, no doubt, a great deal of cheese that is comparatively good and free from adulteration. I find that in the month of April last year we realised in England, 65 shillings per hundred for our cheese, in July we realised 47 shillings, and in October, 57 s.; but all through last year we realised one shilling a hundred more for our best cheese than were realised by the Americans. Now, this only applies to the very best parcels of our cheese that have been sent over separate from the cheese manufactured in the United States. If we look at this industry we must consider it a very important one, and therefore one demanding our earnest attention, in every line, for the purpose of preserving to the Canadian farmer all the advantages he may reap from it. It is an industry that has this indirect advantage connected with it: the farmers who engage in it keep on their farms a large number of cattle; that means a constant improvement of the soil that has been worn out by grain growing. This means the constant enriching of the soil by manure, and the indirect advantage to the farmer of keeping the soil in a rich condition by which he is able to raise more grain than he otherwise could do had he not kept that large number of cattle. Again, as an industry it is very important because it has been a profitable one to the farmer. The direct return has always shown a profit to the farmer; if such had not been the case, the industry would not have grown to the large proportions it has attained at the present time. I have a return showing the increase from year to year of the products of cheese manufacture in Canada, and with the permission of the House I will give the statistics in order to show the importance of the industry:

Mr. SPOULL.

Year.	Quantity.	Value.	Value of Exports to Great Britain.
	Lbs.	\$	\$
1868, we exported.....	6,141,570	620,543	548,574
1869 do	4,503,370	549,572	543,524
1870 do	5,827,782	674,486	667,541
1871 do	8,271,439	1,109,906	1,099,052
1872 do	16,424,025	1,849,284	1,817,857
1873 do	19,483,211	2,280,412	2,207,779
1874 do	24,050,982	3,523,201	3,348,840
1875 do	32,342,030	3,886,226	3,681,296
1876 do	35,024,090	3,751,268	3,639,629
1877 do	35,930,524	3,748,575	3,447,310
1878 do	38,054,294	3,997,521	3,810,643
1879 do	46,414,035	3,790,300	3,589,317
1880 do	40,368,678	3,893,366	3,772,769
1881 do	49,255,523	5,510,443	5,471,362
1882 do	50,807,049	5,500,868	5,471,676
1883 do	58,041,387	6,451,870	6,409,859
1884 do	69,755,423	7,251,939	7,207,425
1885 do	79,685,367	8,265,240	8,178,953
1886 do	78,112,927	6,754,626	6,729,134
1887 do	73,604,448	7,108,918	7,065,983

If we look back to 1860 when we exported only 6,000,000 lbs. of cheese, and look at last year when we exported 73,000,000 lbs. and brought back in return for that product \$7,108,918, we see at once the importance of this industry. I find during the last two years the Americans have shipped cheese in considerable quantities through this country to England. In 1873 they sent into this country, and shipped from Canadian ports to England, as we believe for the purpose of mixing it with the Canadian product and thus enhancing the value of their product in the English market, 5,299,000 lbs.; in 1884, 6,080,000 lbs.; 1885, 6,924,000 lbs.; 1886, 7,074,000 lbs.; 1887, 5,176,000 lbs. This cheese was brought into this country by way of Brockville, or Kingston and other ports, and sent to Montreal, from which port it was shipped to England with a large quantity of our Canadian cheese. I understand that some of our own people are engaged in this business, because they can buy American cheese cheaper and bring it over here and ship it with our own Canadian cheese, and thereby realise a profit. In Ontario last year we had 770 cheese factories in operation. We had, according to Mr. Blue's report, 750,000 milch cows in the Province, and if we take half the estimate given by the Americans, and I do not believe they over estimated it, because they appear to have gone into the subject exhaustively and very minutely, if we take half the estimate that shows a loss in Ontario from the evil complained of, not taking the other Provinces into consideration, of not less than \$3,750,000 annually. I hold it, therefore, to be of the utmost importance that we should do something to protect, as far as possible, this important trade to our farmers. I would suggest, as a means to accomplish that result, that we should compel the branding of all United States cheese entering this country as the product of the United States, and we should not use the word "American," because that is not sufficiently distinct for European buyers, but it should be branded as United States cheese. That could be accomplished either by legislation or otherwise. It should be provided that Canadian cheese be branded not only on the packages, but also on the cheese itself, giving the Province in which it is made, and stating that it is a Canadian product, and then no misapprehension could exist. This would be in harmony with the suggestion of the Board of Trade of England, and it would enable foreigners who buy our Canadian produce to understand where it is made, and to be satisfied that they obtain Canadian cheese, and therefore an unadulterated article. The same system should

apply to butter. Whether it would require legislation to accomplish this or not I cannot say; but I think the Minister of Customs, and the Minister of Inland Revenue, perhaps, without legislation might be able to make regulations in their different departments to accomplish this result. If the evil cannot be attacked in any other way it can be attacked under the regulations of the Act for examining foods supposed to be adulterated. The American product can be analysed, and if it is found to be injurious, as it is alleged to be, and I believe it is, then it can be kept out of the country. The evil can also be attacked by the customs regulations providing that any article brought into this country must be branded as the product of the country in which it is produced, and that on leaving the country it must bear the same brand, so that no mistake can be made. This provision indeed might be extended to other lines, as was suggested by the Board of Trade of England; it could be extended to hams, meat, butter, cheese and all other lines of food produced in our country and shipped to England. I believe that, just as we found it necessary to preserve the English market for our cattle trade, it is necessary to preserve that important market of the Canadian farmer for his butter and cheese by some such regulations, because if we do not adopt such measures to meet the necessities of the case we shall find in a few years our farmers will be suffering from the consequence of our inaction in a similar way to the manner in which the American farmers are suffering to-day. I hope, understanding as the Government must do the importance of this industry to this country, and knowing as they must know that the farmers all over the country, finding other lines of agriculture not so profitable are engaging largely in the line of dairy products, not only for the purpose of getting a direct compensation for their labor but also an indirect benefit from their being able to keep up the condition of the soil so as to produce profitably other crops. I hope the Government will take action at a very early date and provide means for protecting this important industry to the Canadian farmer, so that it shall not be destroyed by spurious compounds brought into this country and shipped from our ports ostensibly as Canadian products, and sold as such when they reach Liverpool. With the permission of the House I beg to amend the motion so as to make it read as follows:—

That it is expedient to provide by Bill, or otherwise, for the branding of cheese, the product of the United States, when the same is exported through or from Canada, in such a manner as to indicate the country of manufacture, and also for the branding of cheese made in Canada as Canadian product.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I shall not occupy the time of the House further than to say that I endorse every word spoken by my friend the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Living as I do on the banks of the River St. Lawrence, just opposite the State of New York, I am able perhaps to speak more authoritatively than my friend from East Grey in reference to the shipment from Canada of American cheese. Nearly every week last year I saw from one to two cars laden with cheese manufactured in the State of New York, carried across the river by steamer, loaded on board the Grand Trunk, and shipped to Montreal for the purpose of export to England, I have no doubt as the product of Canada. As soon as reference was made to this, by the press drawing the attention of the Canadian Government to the fact that an enquiry was being instituted in the old country as to whether Canadian cheese contained the product of animal fat, a number of men in my section of the country interested in the business, held meetings and passed resolutions on the subject. Many of these resolutions have been forwarded to me, and I intend to read a few of them to the House. I sincerely trust that the Government will deal as effectively with this question

of cheese as they did with the question of oleomargarine, which I had the pleasure of introducing to the notice of this House some two years ago. I have also on the notice paper a motion dealing with the question of lard in the same connection, and I trust the Government will deal with it at the same time that they are dealing with the matter now before the House. I do not know that the motion in reference to lard will be reached this Session, and while we are discussing this, a somewhat kindred subject, one or two words may be said on it. I will read a letter which I have received from the president of the Gananoque Board of Trade on the subject:

"GANANOQUE, 14th April, 1888.

"GEORGE TAYLOR, M.P.

"DEAR SIR,—I have been requested by the president of the Gananoque Cheese Board of Trade to forward you a resolution passed at a meeting of the Board and to ask if you would be so kind as to bring the matter before the notice of the Minister of Agriculture and ask that some action be taken that cheese manufactured in Canada will be known as cheese manufactured and shipped in bond from New York State, when shipped from Montreal to Europe.

"I have the honor to remain,

"Your obedient servant,

"JOSHUA LEGGE."

"Moved by Charles Gray, salesman of Gananoque Cheese Factory, seconded by Edward Emerson, salesman of Woodburn Cheese Factory: "Whereas, it has come to our knowledge that a large quantity of cheese manufactured in the United States, of inferior quality, is brought into Canada, in bond and shipped from Montreal to the Liverpool market and there sold as Canadian cheese thereby materially affecting the reputation and standing of Canadian cheese and the price thereof.—Be it resolved that this Gananoque Cheese Board of Trade resolves and authorises the secretary of this Board to communicate with the hon. Minister of Agriculture, for the purpose of having such action taken as may be deemed expedient to prevent this serious grievance to our cheese producers and dairymen. This Board would suggest the stamping of all cheese boxes by the customs officials at Montreal containing American-made cheese and that all Canadian manufacturers should be obliged to stamp their cheese boxes before shipment.—Carried.

"ALEX. RICHARDSON, President.

"JOSHUA LEGGE, Secretary."

"CHEESE BOARD OF TRADE HALL,

"GANANOQUE, 14th April, 1888.

"Moved by J. R. Dargavel, seconded by E. V. Halladay, that in the opinion of this meeting the Parliament of this Dominion should be asked to pass such legislation as will prevent the United States cheese passing in bond through this country without being branded as such, and would further recommend that all Canadian cheese be stamped in such manner that it will be known to be of Canadian make.

"At a meeting of cheese manufacturers and cheese factory patrons held at Elgin in South Leeds on the 16th day of April, 1888, the foregoing resolution was passed, and a copy ordered to be sent to the member of Parliament for this riding.

"B. L. HALLADAY,
"Chairman."

"Moved by William Dargavel, seconded by John Singleton, that the Dominion Parliament be asked to enact such legislation as will compel all American cheese being shipped from Canadian ports to be branded as such, and that in the opinion of this meeting all Canadian cheese should also be branded as Canada cheese.—Carried.

"I certify the foregoing to be a correct copy of a resolution passed at a public meeting of cheese manufacturers and cheese patrons held at Newboro', this 17th day of April, 1888.

"T. C. SINGLETON,
"Secretary."

I may say that it is of the utmost importance to Canadian cheese makers, that only Canadian cheese should be sold on the English market as the product of Canada. It does the Canadian trade a great deal of injury that cheese from the United States should be shipped from Canada, going into England as it does free of duty, and placed on the market there and sold as Canadian cheese. The only way I see in which we can deal with the matter is either that the customs authorities insist upon all cheese passing through Canada in bond, being branded both on the cheese and on the boxes at the port of shipment for England, in either Montreal or Quebec as the product of a foreign country, or if it is necessary that legislation should be enacted,

which would compel all cheese manufacturers in Canada to brand their cheese as a Canadian product. As my friend the member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has made some remarks in reference to oleomargarine, I may say that I received a letter a few days ago from a friend of mine who now lives in Michigan, and which tells of the manner that oleomargarine is affecting the farmers in that country. I will read the letter:—

“SANLON CO., MICHIGAN, 23rd April, 1888.

“MY DEAR TAYLOR,—I am glad to hear you took such an interest in the welfare of Canada. I understand that you brought a Bill before the House of Commons to prevent the making in Canada, or the importation of oleomargarine. If the Government had not stopped it the farmer would not get more than 10c. or 13c. per lb. for their butter while now they get 20c. to 25c. In Michigan in 1886 we only got 10c. per lb. for our butter, in 1887 we only got 13c. per lb., and I do not expect it will be any better this year. This oleomargarine butter is ruining the farmers of the United States, for dairying is our principal business out here. It would be well for the United States if we had a few more members that would take such an interest in our affairs.

“I am, yours truly,
“HENRY McPHERSON.”

I may say that Mr. McPherson, who is a farmer, lived in my county for a number of years and emigrated to Michigan some three or four years ago. We have here what he reports as being the state of affairs in that country owing to the farmers having to compete unfairly with oleomargarine. He tells me that this oleomargarine is sent all over the country in prints of a-half, three-quarters, and one pound and that the result is that farmers can only get 12 or 13 cents for genuine butter. The same state of affairs would exist in Canada if oleomargarine had been allowed to be made or brought into this country. I again express the hope that the Government will deal as effectively with the cheese and lard questions as they did with the oleomargarine.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House, because this subject has been fully discussed and a statement of the case has been made exhaustively and forcibly by my friend the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). In supporting the motion, I wish to say that we in the North-West take a great interest in this question, and desire to see a conservative policy pursued in regard to our Canadian cheese. It will interest the House to know that at Moose Jaw we have a cheese factory that turns out a large quantity of cheese, which, in quality, will compare advantageously with any cheese manufactured in any part of Canada. As you know, Sir, our grasses are rich, and it has been proved by tests that the milk of a good yielding cow in the North-West will produce 6½ or 7 pounds of butter to the 100 pounds of milk which is a very high yield indeed. I merely wished, Sir, to give the support of my district to my hon. friend in pressing this matter upon the attention of the House.

Mr. BROWN. I wish to take the opportunity of reading a letter which I have received from a constituent of mine in relation to the adulteration of lard. I am sure that the country is greatly indebted to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) for the manner in which he has brought this subject before the House. I do not propose to make any remarks at all on the question, seeing that it is the desire of all hon. members at this stage to expedite legislation; but I desire to let the House know what the large packing firm of Thomas Lawry & Son, of Hamilton, have to say on this question:

“The question of lard adulteration now before you in the House is of great importance to Canadian packers. In reference to same, we would request you to use all your influence in either prohibiting the importation of adulterated lard or allowing Canadian packers the privilege of bringing in such adulterations as are used free of duty. Under the present state of affairs it is impossible for us to make any money in this line, as American packers fill our markets with adulterated goods at prices we cannot touch. In fact, at the present time Toronto and Montreal are full of this so-called lard, at prices 1½ cents per lb. less than we can make the pure article for without any profit. In our estimation a great deal of this lard imported is not lard at all, but a mixture sold

Mr. TAYLOR.

as lard. In the States the same question of lard adulteration is before Congress, and upon analysis of some lard they find no traces of hog's product at all.

I have simply to join in the hope that has been expressed by hon. gentlemen who preceded me, that the Government will take hold of this question with the determination to see that our country does not suffer by the adulterated lard which is brought in as a competitor against the honest production of Canada.

Mr. HESSON. I desire to add a few words to what has been said by the gentlemen who have preceded me on the subject of this resolution. I think, Sir, that the House and the country are very much indebted to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) for having brought this very important subject before the House. I am satisfied, that the importance of the question to the agricultural interest of this country is a sufficient excuse for occupying the time of the House in its consideration. If, as has been stated by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), the Americans are exporting cheese through this country for the purpose of having it placed upon the English market as a Canadian product, while its quality is inferior to that of our own cheese—if the great cheese product of this country is to be imperilled by the bad manufactured cheese of the United States, which is continually sold at a lower price in the British market than our superior cheese, I think it is high time for the Government to consider whether it is possible for them to find a remedy for the difficulty. I understand the difficulty that stands in the way is requiring that an article in transit through our country should have a certain brand upon it; but I feel that it is quite possible for the Government to insist that Canadian manufacturers of cheese shall stamp their own brand upon their product in such a way as to make a guarantee in the British market that the cheese is an honest Canadian product. The hon. member for East Grey has taken a great deal of trouble to give the House the evidences of the enormous growth of that great industry; and we know how necessary it is to guard and protect that industry, in view of the fact that the production and export of grain and animals has not proven to be as profitable to the farming interest of this country as the export of cheese. I feel that we shall have to depend more and more in the future on our exports of cheese and butter, for as far as grain is concerned we are likely to have great competitors. But we have the home for the production of the best quality of cheese and butter, and I trust that the Government will devise some means by which the article under consideration, so very material to the success of the farmers of this country, shall be protected in the British markets under its own name and character.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire to say a few words on this subject. I have no doubt whatever that adulteration in the manufacture of cheese has been the practice in some parts of the United States for some time past; but I doubt very much whether in the region from which importations into Canada are chiefly made, adulteration is practiced. My hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who lives very near the border, must know something of those counties in northern New York from which the importation into Canada is mainly made, and I suppose he knows what takes place there. I suppose he knows that buyers representing large Montreal houses are constantly there during the cheese making season, attending the weekly meetings of what are called the boards of trade, at Ogdensburg, Canton, Little Falls, in Herkimer County, and some other towns in the northern counties of New York; and he must know that the prices paid there by Canadian buyers, who I am sure know their business, and know good cheese from poor cheese, rank equal with those paid in Canada.

Mr. TAYLOR. Generally half a cent less.

Mr. SCRIVER. Sometimes half a cent more; and I speak from personal knowledge, for I have watched the market very closely, and I have seen the reports in our local and other papers of those sales. I think my hon. friend knows that those are very fine dairy districts. I do not know whether he is acquainted with the factories and the methods of manufacture pursued there, but I can say that I do. In St. Lawrence County, a man named Crapen introduced the practice into factories controlled by him of adulterating the cheese with lard. The hon. gentleman may know that he did not find the business profitable, and he has discontinued it, I think, altogether. My own belief, both from my personal knowledge and from the fact that the prices which I have mentioned are paid in that region generally, is that the cheese made in that region will compare, upon the whole, favorably with that made in Canada; and that cheese forms the bulk of the exportation of the American article, from Montreal at least. I am not aware that in any other part of Canada there is much importation of American cheese. Therefore I believe the evil, so far as the exportation of American cheese from Canada to the United Kingdom is concerned, has not been very great. What may be done in the future it is impossible to say, and I can see no harm, though I cannot see much good, to be derived from such a regulation as that suggested by the mover of this motion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I agree, to a very large extent, with the remarks of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). The cheese industry in Canada is undoubtedly very important, and it is highly desirable that the Government should this Session, do something in the interests of the farming community by protecting this industry. I am rather surprised that the Government have not taken steps in this direction before now. It is quite clear, from the remarks of the hon. member for Leeds, that he has been aware of the fact that cheese has been imported from the United States into Canada for the purpose of exportation to England as Canadian cheese, and I am sure he must have communicated his knowledge to the Government and the Government must have been aware for some time that this practice is in existence. I am disappointed, therefore, that the Government did not introduce this Session some measure for the purpose of protecting the Canadian farmer in this particular line. I am glad to say that our cheese has, in England, secured a very high reputation, and hon. gentlemen will admit that it is desirable we should prevent that reputation from being diminished by American cheese of inferior grade being allowed to be shipped to England as the Canadian article. I hope, therefore, this resolution will pass, and that the Government will bring in some legislation on this subject before prorogation. Every one must recognise the great desirability of our passing a measure that will prevent our farmers being injured by the export of American spurious cheese as the Canadian product. I do not wish to detain the House longer, but felt it my duty on this important question to urge the Government, even at this late hour, to bring down a measure that will protect this important Canadian industry.

Mr. MARSHALL. I rise merely for the purpose of corroborating the remarks of the hon. member for East Grey and the hon. member for Leeds with reference to this most important agricultural industry. As this subject has been gone into thoroughly by these hon. gentlemen I will not detain the House by discussing it at length, but I feel it my duty to read to this House a resolution which has been forwarded to me by the London Cheese Association, and which this is an opportune moment to lay before the House. The following is the resolution passed at a meeting of the London Cheese Association on the 14th April, 1888:—

"Moved by John Geary, Esq., seconded by James O'reighton: 'That the Dominion Government be asked to have all dairy products of the United States of America as soon as it arrives at a Canadian port for shipment to Europe branded as a product from the United States of America; in the case of cheese, both on the cheese itself and on the box containing it, and in the case of butter on the package containing it; and that an Act be passed compelling all manufacturers of Canadian cheese to brand it as such with the words 'Canadian Manufacture,' and the name of the Province in which so manufactured on the outside of each cheese and on the box containing it with indelible ink, and in the case of butter the package containing it to be branded in a similar manner, and that a copy of the resolution be forwarded to J. H. Marshall, Esq., M.P., for East Middlesex.'"—Carried.

I do not think it is necessary that I should discuss this matter further, as I believe the House are fully aware of its importance. The hon. member for East Grey has shown that our Canadian cheese is worth a shilling a hundred pounds more in England than the American product, even when handicapped by the exportation of the adulterated cheese made in the United States as Canadian cheese and by its being mixed up with our cheese. It is time that this should be put a stop to, and the Government should take steps to protect in some way this important industry by having the cheese branded as suggested by the hon. member for East Grey, and I hope the Government will, during this Session, bring down legislation in that sense, if in their power to do so.

Mr. BOWELL. Before this motion is adopted, I desire, on behalf of my constituency, to thank the mover for having brought this subject before the House. It is gratifying to every Canadian to learn the extent of this trade and its importance, and how necessary it is that every step should be taken to protect the Canadian manufacturer of cheese against the spurious American article. But the request made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to stop and demand the branding of all products of American dairies when they reach Canada is altogether impracticable, and it is a grave question whether it would not, in addition to the fact of the difficulty of stopping American cheese, interfere with the arrangements that exist between the United States and Canada regarding the transport of American products through Canada in bond. It is well known that over any articles sent from the United States in bond through Canada to any foreign port, we have no control further than to prevent its entering into consumption in this country, and that all we can do is to see that the bonded car, when it enters a Canadian port, is properly locked and sealed by the customs officers, and that the seal is only broken when the cheese is transferred from the cars to the bonded warehouse and thence on board vessel for transportation to a foreign country. So far as that request in the resolution is concerned, it cannot well be adopted. The suggestion, however, that all Canadian cheese and butter should be stamped so as to indicate the country of production, is in the hands of the manufacturers themselves. They could by rules and regulations provide that in all cases the Canadian cheese which is made for exportation should bear not only the name of the factory, but also the words "Canada," or the words "the product or manufacture of Canada." When I was in Liverpool last summer, in looking through the warehouses there, I found that in many cases the boxes were not properly marked or stamped, and my attention was called to it by our agents in that city, who pointed out the absolute necessity, not only in order to give Canada the prominence it should have in the markets, but also to secure that no spurious article from other countries should take the place of the superior qualities manufactured in Canada and so obtain a ready sale in that market, that our packages should be marked. Having pointed this out, and having made it clear to my hon. friend, and he having had the opportunity of bringing it under the notice of the House and of the country

and of the Government, I have no doubt he will be satisfied and will not press his motion. The fact of lard coming into the country and being adulterated can be dealt with by my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue. If the cheese which is imported from the United States is adulterated and is entered for consumption, it would immediately come under the control of the officers of the Department of Inland Revenue, but when it is entered in Canada only for transportation to another country, it is a matter over which the Government could not have control unless they took the very violent step of interfering with the transport trade; and, if we did that, no doubt the same course would be followed in the United States, and that would interfere very much with the transport trade of Canada to foreign countries. I can assure my hon. friend that, as to the question of lard or any other article which is not what it is represented to be, it will be closely looked after by my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, whose officers will receive instructions to confiscate the articles or to punish the parties who are placing them upon the market and attempting to sell spurious articles.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is when entered for consumption?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I have already said that, although the Canadian manufacturer might choose to stamp the article, if any article was not stamped, nothing would be accomplished; but a law might be passed compelling the manufacturers to stamp all packages of this kind. In regard to cheese passing through Canada in bond, the hon. gentleman knows that they must break bulk in Montreal when they put these packages on the boats, so I would suggest that this compulsory stamping should be carried out.

Mr. BOWELL. That question will receive the consideration of the Government. Of course, that might be done in regard to Canadian cheese, but we have really no control over the cheese which is sent from Montreal and transhipped for carriage to England.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. One would almost think that the interests of the Canadian manufacturers would induce them to mark their own manufactures in this country, without the necessity of passing a law, as it is so evidently in their own interests. Still, if it is thought that the cheese manufacturers will not put the stamp of their own native Canada upon their cases or boxes or whatever vehicles they may be, we can easily pass a law to compel them to do so, though it seems to be a somewhat violent measure.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does the hon. gentleman think that this Legislature has any power in this matter to compel the marking of such boxes?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I doubt that very much.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not believe we have any power whatever in the matter.

Motion withdrawn.

NORTH-WEST REBELLION OF 1885.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That it is desirable that the claims of those who were engaged, either as scouts or police or volunteers, in putting down the rebellion of 1885 in the North-West, or guarding places liable to attack, while holding themselves in readiness to march to the front, should occasion demand, should be reconsidered.

He said: This is changed from the motion of which I gave notice at the suggestion of the Minister of Militia. I have already, in committee, taken the occasion of expressing what might be said in support of this motion.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is the extent of these claims?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are we to pledge ourselves to by this motion?

Mr. MACDOWALL. In supporting the motion of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) I desire to say a few words which may explain the question as to the extent of these claims. I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister of Militia the claims of the Battleford home guards, wrongly so called. They were authorised to enroll at the time of the outbreak, under the highest authority then in the North-West, for there was no militia authority at that time, under the authority of the mounted police officer to enroll, and they did so enroll. Their homes and their property were destroyed during the trouble. They might have gone out of the country, but instead of that, they came and enrolled themselves as a militia regiment, though they are erroneously called a home guard regiment. They acted under the police authority until Colonel Otter came in there in command of the militia, and they then connected themselves with the militia force. Some of them were detailed for the Cut Knife fight. They were not allowed any artisan pay. During the time they were under arms they were regular militia. They were not dismissed or disbanded, but they received a notice to the effect that their services were dispensed with until further required. Up to this time, three years after this occurred, these men have retained their arms and have never been disbanded, and they have been paid as regular militia, and the amounts so paid can be found in the report of the Auditor General. They were not protecting their own property, because that was already lost, but they were simply acting as valiant and patriotic citizens, fighting for the establishment of law and order in the North-West. They were erroneously called home guards, and because of that, it has been decided that they were not entitled to the same reward as the other militia who fought in the North-West. They did regular militia duty. It is true that they were not in the field, though they were detailed for the expedition to Cut Knife; and, simply because it was found that too many had been detailed for that expedition, these men were left out. They were and they still are in every respect regular militia up to to-day. I think these men ought to receive scrip. They ought to receive some reward for their patriotic conduct, as well as every militia man who left the older Provinces of Canada to fight for their country. I myself am familiar with their daily life and habits, and I know that no more intelligent men could have been employed for such duties. They were familiar with the country, and on this account were especially useful. They did their duty, as the militia did theirs, and therefore I think that the Minister of Militia should recognise their services by granting them scrip in the same manner as scrip has been awarded to other militia men. I also desire to say a few words in favor of the mounted police, which force supplied a certain number of men who were in the field. I consider that the North-West Mounted Police has a special claim on the Parliament of Canada for recognition, because many years ago when the force only consisted of some 350 men, they went across the whole of that wild territory and encountered what were considered as the most dangerous tribes of Indians, the Blackfeet and Piegans, and established with them such friendly relations that they were enabled to enforce the law of the white men amongst them without the shedding of blood. The newspapers of that day throughout Canada were filled with accounts concerning a single officer of the mounted police with, perhaps, two or three men at the outside, who had gone into a large Indian camp of two or three thousand Indians, and arrested some of the chiefs who had committed an outrage against the law of the coun-

try, but these policemen have not received any scrip, although they did their part in the field at the time of the insurrection, in common with the militia and the volunteers, who have received their reward. It may be urged that the police are not entitled to scrip because they are organised and paid for defending the interests of the country in the North-West, whereas the militia was sent from the older Provinces, and therefore, as it were, sent into a foreign land. But I believe that if we look at the custom in England we shall find that, when any great vote is taken in Parliament, the officers and men of the Indian army participate in the reward as much as the officers and men of any of the regiments which are sent out to India, therefore, on the same ground, I think the mounted police ought to participate with the regular militia in receiving scrip and medals. I am also in favor of recognising their services on the ground that to the mounted police, to a great extent, is due the credit of having kept the peace of the country for so many years. The Indian Department was not established for many years after the mounted police had gone into the North-West, and to that small body of men is due the sole credit of having preserved the peace among the Indian population; therefore I hope the mounted police will also be considered whenever the case is re-opened.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I object to this on the point of order. It involves a public charge if the motion succeeds.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My impression is that it is merely an abstract affirmation, not proposing a definite charge. In that sense it cannot be objectionable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think Parliament pledges itself to anything.

Mr. WELSH. The Government, no doubt, will take the matter under consideration. I shall support any motion for rewarding the services of any person having a just claim against the country. Although I do not know the particulars of this case, I think it ought to be well considered by the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The point of order which the hon. gentleman raised, it seems to me, is a little more than an abstract motion. As the motion was originally submitted to the House it read:

"That it is desirable that no delay should take place in settling the just and honorable claims of those who were engaged, &c."

Now, it has been amended so as to read "That it is desirable the unsettled claims of those who were engaged should be reconsidered," the hon. Minister having previously stated that he had considered and rejected them. The House now affirms that it is desirable his decision should be reversed. I think if we look at the amended form of the motion, there is a little more in it than a mere abstract affirmation of an abstract principle. It really and practically pledges the House to the proposition that the judgment already given by the hon. Minister is a wrong one, and the House thinks that the claims ought to be reconsidered in the sense which the House is now affirming, that is, by allowing them. It would be tantamount to an instruction to the hon. Minister to pay these claims.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, the motion states that the best consideration should be given to the subject again, otherwise it would mean that the previous decision was wrong and should be reversed. This does not say so; it simply says that the question should be reconsidered. I do not suppose there is any harm in reconsidering it. It certainly does not bind Parliament to anything, although I must say that abstract resolutions, generally, should not be encouraged.

Mr. LAURIER. What are these claims for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. DAVIN. I may inform the leader of the Opposition that in one case there is an alleged legal claim under 48 and 49 Victoria, for scrip, and in the other case there are claims on behalf of scouts and teamsters for land warrants and scrip. These claims have not been acknowledged by the Minister, and the resolution affirms that the question as to whether these claims should be admitted or not, should be reconsidered. It does not pledge the House to any charge whatever.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know on what principle the hon. gentleman who moves this motion, proposes that teamsters who, if I remember aright, were engaged at daily salaries, should be entitled to scrip for their services in putting down the rebellion. Our scouts, police and volunteers have good grounds to be considered, but the hon. gentleman just mentioned the class of teamsters. Well, I for one, unless better advised, would object to allowing teamsters—who, as I say, received daily wages probably, four or five times in excess of those of the volunteers—scrip for their services. I do not see on what principle it could be defended.

Mr. DAVIN. If they have no claim, the claim would not be allowed. But there is the case of a teamster who was actually under fire, who fought as gallantly at Cut Knife as any of our soldiers, and I say that a case like that ought to be considered. Of course, if the Minister is bound by the Act, he cannot go outside of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume the question of order will not be seriously pressed. In regard to the point raised by the hon. gentleman in the motion: as there appears to be some discontent, or rather some claims which it is said have not been fully considered, I do not see any harm that can arise from having those cases reopened and reconsidered, and if a good case in an individual instance or cases covering a number of individuals can be established, and if it is shown that just claims have been neglected they will be granted.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman has changed his tactics: there is disallowance in the North-West.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE AT INGOLDSBY STATION.

Mr. BARRON moved for:

Return of all petitions and correspondence asking for or relating to establishing a Post Office at Ingoldsby Station, on the line of the Victoria Railway, in the Township of Snowden, in the County of Haliburton.

He said: My object in submitting this motion is not only to obtain the papers requested, but to draw the attention of the House and especially of the Postmaster General to what the people of North Victoria consider to be a grievance, the fact of their having been neglected so far as postal facilities are concerned. In the particular case covered by the motion I am told that the post office at Ingoldsby has been moved to a distance of two or three miles nearer the other post offices, the consequence of which has been that the people who hitherto have been accustomed to have the post office at the station have no accommodation without going a considerable distance. If that was the only case in North Victoria I would perhaps be inclined to think that the fault rested with the people themselves—that they were complaining too much, as I am afraid some people are in the habit of unnecessarily complaining; but I find that in several other cases in North Victoria, since I have had the honor of representing the riding, the people have not received the attention they should have obtained in so far as postal facilities are concerned at the hand of the Government and especially of the Postmaster General. In regard to this particular case I request permission of the House to read a

portion of one of the letters I have received, for I have received a great many on this particular subject, from a very prominent gentleman in that locality. He writes :

" We petitioned the Postmaster General about the 1st November. A paper was sent me by Mr. Griffin, of Kingston, Post Office Inspector, asking certain questions which I answered, but we hear no more about the matter. Our Ingoldsby post office is now half a mile further removed towards Minden, and is of little use to us, Haliburton and Gelert being more in the line of business. Ingoldsby Station is the proper place for a post office, and it is only a matter of time as to its being located there. From this point the mail should be carried to Ingoldsby and also to Allsaw post office. It would accommodate about thirty-six families, and since the post office at Ingoldsby has been removed west, a large number on the telegraph road are as anxious as those in Egypt to have the new office established."

Not only have the people reason to complain at not having their request complied with, but they have special reason to complain that they can obtain no reply to their petition. One would suppose that the Government, acting like business people, would say yes or no to any request sent in. It would be imagined that the Postmaster General would have the matter investigated, and if it was a proper request to be granted he would accede to it, and if not he would decline; but it appears that the petitioners have not been able in this case, and I know the same has occurred in other cases, to obtain any decision one way or the other. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be perfectly dumb so far as answering requests made by the people are concerned, at all events so far as regards granting better postal facilities. I do not think that is a proper course to pursue. I do not say that all the complaints made from time to time are justified, I am free to confess that people are apt to complain sometimes when there is no ground for complaint; but when the people ask for better postal accommodation they should be answered one way or the other, either yes or no, as business men would do in their own private transactions.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman has read a letter referring to the post office mentioned in the motion, and I may say the matter was referred to the inspector to make inquiries respecting the post office at Ingoldsby. All applications that come to me for increased postal facilities or new offices or new postal routes are sent to the post office inspectors to report upon, and if the reports are at all favorable the petitions are granted. The report in regard to this post office has not yet been laid before me; when it is I will give a decision either yes or no.

Mr. BARRON. You have had it since last November.

Mr. McLELAN. It was in February when the petition was sent in.

Mr. BARRON. No; it was in November last, and the letter was written in February.

Mr. McLELAN. The inspector may have delayed it until the time of the writing of that letter. However, the papers will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

FRAUDULENT PRACTICES ON FARMERS.

Mr. BROWN moved :

That a special committee be appointed to enquire into the fraudulent practices which have prevailed, and still prevail, in various parts of the Dominion, by which farmers have been and are induced to give their promissory notes and securities to a very large amount in the aggregate, for seed, agricultural implements, and other goods and merchandise, by various false pretexts; the goods in some cases never being delivered, and in other cases being comparatively worthless, the makers of such promissory notes being obliged to make payment, while the perpetrators of these wrongs evade justice; and that such committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records, and be instructed to report what remedies exist in such cases, or what further remedies should be provided,—said Committee to be composed of the following: Messrs. Amyot, Barron, Brown, Carpenter, Cochrane, Desjardins, Fisher, Hill, Henderson, McMullen, Marshall, Mills (Annapolis), Montcrieff, Rowand, Smith (Ontario), Wells, Wood (Brockville).

Mr. BARRON.

He said: This resolution speaks for itself. The press has taken up this subject of frauds on farmers. It is very well known that frauds to an enormous extent are perpetrated on farmers all over the country in respect to seed wheat, farm implements, hay rakes and goods of all descriptions. These persons evade the law with great ingenuity, and the object of my motion is to appoint a committee with a view to endeavor, if possible, to ascertain some means by which this evil can be remedied and the farmers be saved from being swindled by these rascals going through the country. I would have offered remarks at greater length except for the fact that it is almost six o'clock and I desire the resolution to be placed before the House and allow the Committee to get to work.

Mr. LAURIER. Before this motion is adopted I should like to know if the Government has anything to say on this question. First of all, I do not know how far we would have jurisdiction in this matter. Of course, if the offence is made criminal, that would bring it within the scope of our powers. I think it will strike the hon. gentleman and the Premier himself that we cannot appoint this committee at this late stage of the Session, with any hope of a possibility of making it a success, or even satisfactory.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not know if the First Minister is aware that a commission has been appointed by the Ontario Government to examine into this matter as far as the Province of Ontario is concerned?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was not aware of it but I am glad they have done so. I do not think that the appointment of this commission would interfere with the Ontario Commission. My hon. friend seems to think that at this period of the Session the committee cannot do much. They could enquire at all events into the extent to which those fraudulent practices prevail. I understand from information that has come before me, although it has not been specially pressed on my notice, that those fraudulent practices do prevail to a very large and lamentable extent, and that our farmers are being continually robbed and plundered by such practices. I think it would be an assistance to any commission that is sitting, if the extent of those fraudulent practices was ascertained. If they are frauds of course they are misdemeanors and they can only be dealt with as such by this Legislature.

Mr. LAURIER. If the motion is to be adopted I would suggest that Mr. Barron should be placed on the committee, with the consent of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) If this question is to be examined into I may say that those regrettable practices to which the hon. gentleman refers, prevail to a large extent in Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman has hardly a man from the Maritime Provinces on the committee at all, and I think it is desirable that the Maritime Provinces should be more extensively represented on it. Unless you have a member from Prince Edward Island, you cannot get any information as to the extent to which the evil prevails there.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I wish to make the same remark as regards New Brunswick. Extensive frauds prevail in that Province, but in something of a different line from those in Ontario.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Hale and Mr. Mills of Annapolis are on the committee. We can put Captain Welsh on, and have the rule suspended so as to add those additional names.

Mr. WELSH. I wish to make a few remarks, Mr. Speaker. Since the intention of the Government is to sail ships on dry land, I am going to drop my naval title and take that

of major—major in the army, as there are quite a number here, and really I think I could put my claim for colonel.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You are a young man, you have not attained your majority yet.

Motion agreed to.

After Recess.

CLAIM OF JAMES KING.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On 16th April last a committee was appointed on a motion made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) in the absence of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), to investigate the claim of James King. According to the motion, the mover was to be a member of the committee. Of course, it was the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) who was intended, and not the hon. member for Pictou. Therefore, I move that the name of Mr. Weldon of St. John, be placed on the committee instead of that of Mr. Tupper.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. TISDALE moved that Bill (No. 6) to amend the Canada Temperance Act (Mr. McCarthy) be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the object?

Mr. TISDALE. The object, so far as I am concerned, is to make some verbal amendments in section 9, which was added to the Bill on my motion. It was drafted rather hurriedly, and it is necessary to change some words in it, which will not change its principle, in order to give it effect.

Mr. HAGGART. The further object, of course, is to add the amendments, of which I gave notice, to the Bill of the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). I propose to move the addition to this Bill. Its object is to allow chemists and druggists and doctors to sell certain official preparations.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. HAGGART. I beg to move the following amendment:

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

1. The official preparations of the authorized pharmacopoeas when made of full medicinal strength, and sold only for medicinal purposes.
2. Physicians' prescriptions containing spirituous liquors if sold in quantities of not more than ten ounces at any time.
3. Any patent medicine, unless such patent medicine is known to the vendor to be capable of being used as a beverage, the sale of which is a violation of "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878."
4. Eau de Cologne, bay rum, or other articles of perfumery, lotions, extracts, varnishes, tinctures or other pharmaceutical preparations containing alcohol, but not intended for use as beverages.
5. Alcohol or methylated spirits, for pharmaceutical, chemical or mechanical uses.

Each such sale to be recorded in a book kept for the purpose, giving the name and address of the purchaser, the quantity and name of liquor, the medical man prescribing the same, the purpose for which it is required, and the said book to be open for inspection by the county inspector under the Canada Temperance Act at all times.

Mr. EDGAR. Does the hon. member for North Lanark consider the amendments desirable and proper?

Mr. JAMIESON. I have voted against these amendments before and am still prepared to oppose them, because I think that the facilities for the sale of liquor now are too great, and they ought to be curtailed rather than enlarged. The first amendment, that which allows medi-

cal men to dispense liquor in shops, is directly opposed to the spirit of the Act. The Act provides that when liquors are required, (sub section 4, section 99) for medical purposes, they can be procured on the certificate of a medical man having no interest in the sale. Under the proposed amendment, a medical man can prescribe in violation of the spirit of this clause of this Act, and I fear it will open the door to abuses much wider than it is opened at present. The committee should hesitate before opening any wider door, under the Scott Act, for the purpose of permitting the sale of intoxicating liquor. Now, with regard to the sale of pharmaceutical preparations, I am not aware of any case, nor do I know that the hon. member for South Lanark is aware of any, where difficulty has arisen under the law, as it now stands. I am not aware that any chemist or druggist, in Ontario at all events, has been prosecuted for the violation of the Act. It seems to me that the better authority is that at present many of those preparations can be sold without constituting a violation of the Canada Temperance Act. I am informed that, some years ago, an opinion was procured by some of the chemists of Ontario that the sale of some of the preparations mentioned in this amendment would be a violation of the law, but I do not think that there is a single instance of a prosecution having been had under the Act, and it will be time enough, when a difficulty arises under this section, to discuss the advisability of an amendment such as the one proposed. Throughout the whole Dominion the contention is that there are too many facilities for the sale of liquor; and in the interest of the Canada Temperance Act, it would not be at all wise to pass the amendment suggested.

Mr. FISHER. I must take upon myself to oppose the amendments proposed by the hon. member for South Lanark. I am not aware whether that hon. gentleman gave notice that they would be introduced into this Bill at this stage, but I was under the impression that they were to be introduced into the Bill of the hon. member for North Lanark, which we are not now discussing. I do not believe, therefore, that these amendments are in order, but still I do not care to meet the hon. gentleman on that point, and would rather discuss his amendments on their merits. I fully endorse the words of the hon. member for North Lanark, who has just said that those who desire to violate the Scott Act have too great facilities for doing so, and that if there is any change to be made in the Scott Act, it ought rather to be made in the direction of giving those who wish to enforce it greater power to do so. Should the amendments of the hon. member for South Lanark be carried, every licensed chemist and druggist in a Scott Act county will be able to sell liquors for medicinal purposes, and a medical man will be able to sell them even on his own certificate. That I certainly take to be a monstrous proposition, and one which is unfair in every possible way. I do not know exactly how it is in Ontario, but I venture to say that, should these amendments be adopted, there would be a large increase in the number of druggists who have obtained that license or who have procured clerks that have obtained it. I believe this is not intended to supply the people with more chemicals or more drugs, but is simply intended to supply them with more liquor. I think this amendment is against the spirit of the Scott Act, and would be very detrimental to the working of the Scott Act. I believe it is the opinion of this House that the Scott Act should remain on our Statute-book, and, that being the case, I believe it is the duty of the House to maintain that Act in its integrity, and not to impede its working. I believe the result of this amendment would be disastrous to the working of the Act. We know that we had a very strong expression of opinion in the Province of Ontario not long ago against the Act, and I believe that that result is largely

due to the fact that the people have found that the Act has not been properly worked, that they have not been able to enforce it; and I think, in view of that fact, this House should do nothing which would impede the working of the Act, or make it of less force. Therefore I call upon the committee to reject this amendment. I have no desire to interfere with trade, and, if it could be done without interfering with the working of the Act, I should be glad to allow upright druggists and chemists to carry on their business. That class of man thinks it is not fair that one druggist or chemist should have the right to sell these liquors for certain purposes when another, who is his rival, is not allowed to do so. When a deputation of those chemists and druggists came to me a short time ago, and asked me to support these amendments, I suggested to them that the best way to avoid what they complained of was that there should be no druggist or chemist given a license at all in any Scott Act county, and that in that case no one could complain that his rival had been unduly favored. I believe that suggestion has not been favorably received, and, therefore, I believe that the chemists and druggists are not in favor of what I suggested. While a large number of these gentlemen, no doubt, are honestly and rightly endeavoring to carry out the principles of the Act, there is a danger that this amendment may contribute towards the drinking of liquor in Scott Act counties, and, therefore, I cannot support it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I cannot agree with my hon. friend as to the effect of this amendment. The hon. member for North Lacombe (Mr. Jamieson) has admitted that in Scott Act counties the druggists have been selling large quantities of liquor, but none of them have been fined. I understand that these amendments simply provide that it shall be legal for druggists to sell these preparations. As I understand the object of these amendments, it is that medical men may have liquor to be used in the preparation of their medicines and may prescribe the use for their patients only. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Fisher) thinks this may interfere with the working of the Scott Act. I have had letters from prominent supporters of the Scott Act in my county who have a different opinion. At present, one vendor has a license to sell liquor, and he is not allowed to sell anything less than 10 ounces. You can see that, where 1 oz or $\frac{1}{2}$ oz of liquor is prescribed, it becomes necessary to purchase 10 ozs. and that is kept in the house, because the Scott Act requires that a small quantity cannot be purchased. My hon. friend has referred to the unpopularity of the Act in many of the counties of Ontario. I feel that this is one of the reasons, because the Act has been found to work unfavorably in this respect. The committee will remember that, when this question was discussed on the same amendment in the Session of 1885, a legal opinion was furnished from a very distinguished legal firm in Ontario stating that, under the provisions of the Act, all druggists were liable to be prosecuted for selling the preparations referred to in these amendments, and that Mr. Blake at that time, in speaking to these amendments, stated that he was not prepared to disagree with that opinion, and for that reason he voted for the amendments which were similar to those now moved. Those amendments were then carried in this House by two to one, after being very carefully and fully considered. I think it would be in the interest of the community generally if these amendments were supported by temperance people in Scott Act counties and I hope the House will support them, as they did before, by a large majority.

Amendment negatived by 59 to 34.

Mr. HICKEY. I wish to propose another amendment. In some Scott Act counties where the Act has been repealed, there remains a large sum of money from the fines collected, and the counties have no authority for using the money

Mr. FISHER.

under the law except for the enforcement of the Scott Act, and I move the following resolution to meet that difficulty:—

In counties in which the Canada Temperance Act shall have been repealed, such moneys as have been or shall be hereafter paid to any municipality for the purposes of the Act, under the provisions of the Order in Council dated 15th November, 1886, made in pursuance of the Act, 49 Vic., chap. 4, intitled: "An Act respecting the application of certain Fines and Forfeitures," shall be appropriated, first, to the payment of any expenses which may have been or may be hereafter incurred for the enforcement of the Act, and the balance, if any, shall be disposed of for county purposes:

(a) Such moneys as have been or shall be paid to the officers of any union of counties shall be distributed among the united counties for the payment of such expenses as aforesaid, *pro rata* according to the proportion of fines collected in each of the united counties."

Mr. ROOME. Would it not be well that that should apply to all counties? In the county of Middlesex there is a large sum of money in the hands of the treasurer, and we want some way of distributing it among the people from whom it was taken. Why should our case not be included in that motion, until that Act is repealed in the county? I hope the Scott Act will be so amended that it will not require to be repealed in Middlesex; at the same time we want some way of disposing of that money.

Mr. SCRIVER. If I understand the meaning of that amendment, I do not think it is framed so as to meet the hon. gentleman's object. He says: "in the counties where the Act shall have been repealed." I understand him to refer to the counties in which the Act has been repealed as well.

Mr. HICKEY. Where the Act has been repealed; I do not say anything about the counties where it is to be repealed. In our counties there is a sum of money that cannot be appropriated until we have power from this Parliament to dispose of it. It must remain there for the enforcement of the Scott Act, and there is no Scott Act in force.

The CHAIRMAN. It is proposed to make the amendment read "in counties in which the Canada Temperance Act has been repealed, or shall hereafter be repealed."

Mr. JAMIESON. I do not know how that will consort with the statute passed last Session in the Ontario Legislature. I do not remember just now the provisions of that Act, but there was an Act passed last session providing for the appropriation of money which was paid in under the Canada Temperance Act. Of course that amendment goes this far, that before there is any surplus to be paid over to the county for county purposes, all claims upon the funds for the enforcement of the law must be fully met. It is only, as I understand, with reference to the balance which may remain in the hands of the county treasurer after all these claims are met. As the money came from the people of the county it was not an unreasonable proposition that it should be returned to them, that is provided there is a safeguard.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It strikes me that, however this money came into the hands of the county treasurer, this Parliament has no jurisdiction to legislate as to how the money should be applied. It is wholly a matter that falls within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature.

Mr. HICKEY. The Act of 1886 provided that fines under the Scott Act were payable for the public use of Canada. Then an Order in Council provided that municipalities should make use of the fines for the enforcement of the Act, and they must be relieved and authority obtained to expend it for other purposes.

Mr. TISDALE. From the discussion that has already arisen there is evidently some doubt in regard to this amendment. While I have no objection to any amendment being fully considered by the committee, I hardly think it is fair to the Bill that, when all the clauses up to the ninth have

been passed without any serious objection being offered, anything should be done that would tend to prevent the Bill passing both Houses, so that it might come into force immediately. A discussion has arisen on the amendment, and doubts have been raised as to the jurisdiction of this Parliament. Under these circumstances I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw it, and have it discussed on the Bill next on the Order paper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is of importance that this Bill now before the committee should pass, and there should not be attached to it any resolution of this kind. I do not mean to speak in favor or against it, or say whether it is good or bad; but there is considerable doubt in respect to it, and it perhaps may lead to the Bill being lost. I think, therefore, the hon. gentleman should withdraw his motion for the present.

Mr. FISHER. I hope the First Minister will not act differently now from the way he acted a few minutes ago in regard to the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). He allowed clauses which were protested against most emphatically to pass without remonstrance, and now, when an amendment is moved by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey), he objects to its passing, while the only objection raised has been a purely technical objection, not an objection against the principle of the Bill, whereas in the other case there was a most emphatic protest against the principle, not only by members on this side, but from hon. gentlemen opposite. That motion the hon. gentleman allowed to pass without an objection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because I was in favor of it.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman is quite willing to support the introduction of amendments when he is in favor of them, but when he is not in favor of them he objects. I understood the First Minister was not going to express an opinion as to whether he was in favor or against this amendment, but that he objected to it on the general principle that it was introducing extraneous matter, which was apparently quite within the power of the House. The hon. gentleman has made fish of one and flesh of another.

Mr. TISDALE. Hon. gentlemen have mistaken my suggestion. In regard to this amendment there is a doubt as to whether we have jurisdiction.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where is the doubt?

Mr. TISDALE. There is a question as to our dealing with the funds, there is a doubt raised as to whether we have the right to interfere in that matter—I am not saying whether we have the right or not. In the other case it was purely a question of principle, and that amendment was therefore one which the committee could deal with. In this case, however, the question of jurisdiction has been raised.

Mr. LISTER. How do you argue any doubt in the matter?

Mr. TISDALE. Not any further than that one hon. gentleman has doubted about the disposition of the money and another member has pointed out that in the Province of Ontario there is already some law dealing with the funds. I am not deciding whether these doubts have any foundation or not, but hon. gentlemen have raised them and have raised the question of jurisdiction. For these reasons I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the motion so as not to have in the Bill any provisions about which there is question.

Mr. JAMIESON. I referred a few moments ago to an Act passed at the last Session of the Ontario Legislature. The statutes are not issued yet, but I read a copy of the Bill a few days ago. My recollection of it is that all moneys which were paid in for fines and forfeitures to the county

treasurer under the Canada Temperance Act were appropriated under the Act for certain purposes, one of which was payment for a police magistrate for the county for the purpose of enforcing the law and the balance was applied for payment of the inspector and certain other purposes. I am sorry I cannot place my hand on the Act, but its terms might perhaps be seen in the *Ontario Gazette*; but the most serious objection I see to the amendment is the fact that these moneys are already appropriated specially in Ontario under the law to which I have made reference.

Mr. HICKEY. In deference to the opinion of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), who I greatly respect, I withdraw the amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Committee reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The effect of that amendment has hardly been considered by everybody. I think the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill might say it will be read to-morrow.

Mr. TISDALE. That would do, if the hon. gentleman is prepared to take the responsibility of saying that this Bill should not pass this Session.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why?

Mr. TISDALE. Because there is no other day. The Government have all the other days.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not object if that is the case. Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

PROTECTION OF RAILWAY EMPLOYÉS.

The Order being called, House in committee on Bill (No. 5) for the protection of railway employés.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. McCarthy had charge of this Bill, but I believe it was understood it would be taken up in connection with the Government Bill on railways. I move that the Order be discharged, and that said Bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 24—the general Bill on railways.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 10) to amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. Jamieson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 5,

Mr. JAMIESON. There has been an amendment inserted in the Bill of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), which renders this amendment unnecessary, and I will therefore ask the permission of the committee to strike out that clause, and re-number the other clauses in the section.

On section 6,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. member explain the change?

Mr. JAMIESON. In this clause there are two changes from the original text. One change has reference to the quantity of liquor which may be prescribed. Under the Act not less than one pint can be prescribed, and we propose to leave the quantity in the discretion of the medical man. There is no necessity I think for limiting the prescriptions to a pint, because in many cases much less than a pint would be sufficient. The next change in this clause imposes a penalty on a medical man giving a colorable or fraudulent

certificate. Those are the two changes from the original text.

Mr. TISDALE. If the hon. gentleman proposes that the law shall remain, that there shall be no appeal from the decision of a magistrate in offences under the Scott Act, as there is in every other class of offences, I shall object to this clause. If he consents to eliminate this from the Bill I shall not oppose this clause. I do not believe that the class of men, such as the physicians and surgeons of this country are, should be subject to be taken up, and fined or imprisoned on the decision of magistrates who will have absolute jurisdiction in those matters if there be no appeal. If the hon. gentleman will consent that we may amend the original Act, by giving the same right of appeal as there is in all other offences under the general laws of the country, then I have no objection to this clause. If he will not do that I must move that part of it which proposes a penalty on physicians or surgeons shall be struck out of the Act. I contend that if the general laws of the land are not sufficient to ensure justice in all classes of offences of a like nature, then we should amend the general laws of the land. I do not believe that in temperance, or any other legislation, exceptional laws should put power that may injure the character and reputation of a man, in the hands of a class of magistrates who under this class of legislation would be the sole judges. From such experience of judgments and decisions as I have seen to my personal knowledge, where according to any light that I have, and that any reasonable man would have, of what the law of evidence should be, that a doctor should be, without appeal, taken up, and fined, his reputation blasted and in some cases sent to gaol if he does not pay the penalty, solely at the will of the magistrate, whether there is any evidence to support the charge or not. If the hon. gentleman will leave this Canada Temperance Act as it is, I shall do as I did last Session; I shall vote that it remains on the Statute-book, in all those counties where it is declared by the will of the people to be in force, until they have a chance to repeal it, as I believe they will do, as they did in my county after an experience of three years. I object to giving this star chamber power, and I will oppose any clause that gives such special power to any court, without the same right of appeal that is to be had in other cases. Therefore, I move, unless the hon. gentleman will say that he will consent to have that struck out of the other Act, that all that part of the section that imposes a penalty on these physicians shall be struck out of the Act.

Mr. JAMIESON. I do not quite understand the drift of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down in reference to the right of appeal. If the hon. gentleman examines the Canada Temperance Act, he will find that when a conviction is made before two ordinary magistrates or justices of the peace, there is the usual right of appeal. It is only where the conviction is made by a stipendiary magistrate or a police magistrate, who ordinarily has the power of two justices of the peace, that there is no appeal. Now, I think that the safeguards which are already thrown around the rights of parties who may be prosecuted under the law are quite sufficient. I grant that if one ordinary justice of the peace had power without appeal to convict, there would be something in the contention of the hon. gentleman; but inasmuch as there is an appeal from the decision of two justices of the peace, and in other respects the prosecution must be before a stipendiary magistrate or some officer having the authority of two justices of the peace, I think the hon. gentleman's contention falls to the ground. So far as the medical profession are concerned, this is not a slur cast on respectable medical men. I have no doubt that every medical man in this House, who occupies an honorable position in his profession, will fairly consider this amendment, and say that it is not unreasonable;

Mr. JAMIESON.

but there are in the medical profession, as well as in every other profession, black sheep, and we have to provide against them. Why, not longer ago than this afternoon I was informed of a case in the Province of Ontario, of a medical man who had lost caste in his profession, who was in the habit of giving certificates for two or three gallons of liquor to persons keeping houses of public entertainment. It is for the purpose of meeting cases of this character that this amendment is required, and I earnestly hope that the committee will stand by it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I support entirely the view taken by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). The hon. gentleman who has just spoken says there is an appeal from two justices of the peace, and that there is no appeal from a stipendiary magistrate. If the principle is good in the one case, it is in the other. I know from my own personal knowledge that stipendiary magistrates have decided on evidence which the judges of the Supreme Court declared did not afford the slightest foundation for a conviction. If a stipendiary magistrate who is strong in his views chooses to enforce the Act strictly, and without due regard to the evidence, the party who fails has to bear the consequences; and we all know that when a case goes before a higher tribunal, although the judges themselves may feel that they would have come to a different conclusion if they had tried the case in the first instance, they generally do not interfere with the judgment of the court that had the witnesses before it. I think it is in the interest of justice and the liberty of the subject that that section should be repealed, and I will cordially support the motion of the hon. member for South Norfolk. But I agree with him in his suggestion that, if the hon. member for North Lanark will agree to that section being struck out of the Canada Temperance Act, this section might go as it is.

Mr. TISDALE. With the permission of the committee, I will withdraw the amendment, because it would, perhaps, be wiser and fairer, on the whole, that to these clauses should be added a clause, which I will draw afterwards, giving the right of appeal which is provided for ordinary proceedings by the Summary Convictions Act, in all cases of penalty under the Scott Act. I have no objection to fining anybody who offends against the principle of the Act, provided that the fine can only be enforced under the ordinary laws of the land. In moving such an amendment, I am quite prepared to take all the responsibility of it. I believe that in the Legislature, as in other places, a man should have the courage of his convictions; and while I wish to be understood as being a temperate and a temperance man, I am not a total abstainer, and I think there are thousands of men in this community who are as earnest in their convictions in one way as I give the hon. gentleman credit for being earnest in his way; and in this or any other free country, where exceptional legislation is attempted on the ground that it is necessary to the Act, you may depend upon it that the sentiments of the people are so much against that Act that you cannot enforce it under the ordinary laws of the land. That being the case, I ask the temperance men to pause, in the cause of temperance, because, as the recent nine elections have illustrated, the majority of the people believing in temperance, many of them in prohibition, have found by experience, by attempting to enforce the Act by this class of magistrates, by star chambers, as I call them, by such scenes of perjury in the courts, and riots in the community, such going back on the quietness and the temperance that had existed before, that they rose in those counties and repealed the Act that had operated so badly. I believe that freedom is guarded by making general laws for the enforcement of crime. Therefore, if I were alone in my contention, I would say, change the general laws of the country if they are not sufficient to punish crime; do not give excep-

tional powers, for the moment you do you impair the liberty of the general classes of the community by allowing any one class to say that exceptional offences shall be enforced by other than the ordinary safeguards which all free countries say should be open, namely, the ordinary right of appeal. I feel this strongly for this reason: I have given some attention to the question of jurisprudence, and I have always found, as far as I have been able to examine it—and particularly in the history of this temperance question as illustrated in the neighboring Republic where the same kind of legislation has been tried—that the result has been that, in the end, the general tendency to settle difficulties on broad general principles has been more effective than any exceptional legislation entrusted to any special class of men. Therefore, if the Scott Act can be enforced by applying the same general principles to it as are applied in the enforcement of any other class of criminal offences, surely it is a mistake to try and restrict the application of those principles by any special provision of this sort. If the general laws of the country dealing with crime are not strong enough to meet the class of offences enumerated in this Act, let us then discuss the advisability of changing the general law, but let us not have one special law applicable to one class of offences and another to another.

Mr. LISTER. Will you submit your amendment?

Mr. TISDALE. I submit the spirit of it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The first proposition of the hon. gentleman, if applied, would render the whole section null, and I understand him to withdraw that proposition. If the hon. gentleman would confine himself to an amendment declaring that an appeal should lie from a conviction under this section, I would perhaps feel inclined to support it; but his argument, if good for anything, went to show that the Act should be entirely repealed. If his amendment, the spirit of which, he says, he has given to the House, should carry, the result would be to strike a severe blow at the enforcement of the Act altogether. The hon. gentleman knows that witnesses, who can be obtained for summary conviction, are not the class of people who will wait three or four months until an appeal can be heard; and if you give an appeal in all cases, you will find that in fifty per cent. of them the witnesses will not be forthcoming, as they will either have been spirited away or will have business elsewhere. Experience has shown that where an appeal lies from a summary conviction, it is almost impossible to get, after a delay of three or four months, the witnesses at all. We have had some experience of the working of the Summary Convictions Act before stipendiary magistrates, and I think that the people, in the Maritime Provinces at any rate, have sufficient confidence in those magistrates as judges of the fact to dispense with the necessity for an appeal. Should these magistrates go beyond their jurisdiction, the proceedings can be reviewed by means of a writ of *certiorari* in the Superior Court; and it would be a great mistake to adopt the amendment suggested by the hon. member unless we would repeal the Act altogether.

Mr. TISDALE. As far as this particular offence is concerned, I will accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion, but I wish him to understand that at a later period, I will, if some one else does not, move to repeal that section.

Mr. JAMIESON. I wish to say in reply to the hon. member for South Norfolk that, as stated by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., it would be more advisable for him to move for the repeal of the law altogether. Any person who has anything to do with the enforcement of the law, knows that a very great difficulty arises in procuring the attendance of witnesses and in securing a conviction at all; and even if an appeal should be permitted from the decision of the stipendiary magistrate, or police magistrate, in

ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, there would be scarcely a witness procurable at the time of the appeal. If the magistrate exceeds his jurisdiction or acts without jurisdiction, there is already, on general principles, the right to remove the conviction by *certiorari*, and have it quashed if it is in any way irregular, and, as a general rule, the police magistrates and stipendiary magistrates are men versed in the law and of considerable experience in the working of the law, so that in very few cases has there been any injustice done by them. The fact of the matter is that great difficulty has been experienced in securing a conviction, even in cases in which everybody is convinced that an infringement of the law has taken place. So far as cases where the character of a medical man is involved, are concerned, I would not object, although I have not heard of any cases of that kind, to an appeal being had to the judge sitting in Chambers; as regards the Province of Ontario, and in the other Provinces, with whose legal machinery I am not familiar, there might be an appeal to some court of appellate jurisdiction. But I am certainly opposed in *toto* to allowing an appeal generally.

Mr. ROOME. Being one of those who would be affected by this clause of the Act, I must say I agree to a great extent with the hon. member for Lanark. It is evident that the Scott Act has not been working in the interests of the temperance cause or it would not have been repealed, as it has been a few weeks ago, in so many counties. Therefore it is right this House should try to amend that act so as to make it workable. In this case, I admit there are some medical men who assist in the violation of that Act. I have seen during the past year many cases in which physicians had prescribed liquor by the gallon at a time, which liquor was afterwards sold by the parties who had obtained it. We ought therefore to put some clause in the Act whereby such physicians will be amenable to punishment. Such a clause would not apply to physicians who carry out the law, but there are in the medical profession, as in every other, men who endeavor to evade the law, and with these we should have some mode of dealing. I propose to move the following amendment in respect to the offences by this clause enacted:—"appeal will lie as in the ordinary cases under the Summary Convictions Act." That will give us a chance to prevent this abuse of which I have spoken. I would not like to place myself in the hands of the magistracy of the country to any great extent without a chance of an appeal. There are some of them whom I do not consider trustworthy and at times it might not be safe for medical men to be placed at their mercy if deprived of that right. By an appeal we would have some safeguard against an unjust decision. One of the great drawbacks to the working of the Scott Act has been the arbitrary action of justices of the peace and stipendiary magistrates, and I venture to say that, if it is carried out in that way, it will be repealed in every county in Canada. It is on that ground that I move this amendment.

Mr. FISHER. I think it would be dangerous to introduce a clause by which the trial of medical men would be made appealable from the decision of the stipendiary magistrate. We have a good deal of difficulty in carrying out the provisions of the Act, and I think it is most important that the working of the Act should be as simple as possible. If an appeal is allowed in certain cases, and no appeal lies in similar cases, it would be very difficult to decide in which case it should be allowed and in which case it should not be allowed. I think the present provision is quite sufficient, that there should be an appeal from the decision of two ordinary magistrates, but it is a different thing when the case is tried before a stipendiary magistrate. The stipendiary magistrates are generally men who are well known as lawyers, and their ability to try such cases is well known. They are generally of the

same class as that from which police magistrates are chosen in cities to try cases under the Summary Convictions Act, and I think that is a sufficient safeguard to prevent the necessity of an appeal. I am not a lawyer, and I do not propose to deal with this from a technical or legal standpoint, but, knowing the difficulties which exist in regard to prosecutions under this Act, I should be sorry to see any weakening of the mode by which these prosecutions are carried out. The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Roome) has admitted that many medical men have lent themselves to the breaking of the Act, and I think it would be in the interests of the profession to have any such men punished for such a heinous crime as a deliberate breaking of the law.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My hon. friend speaks of the stipendiary magistrates being lawyers, but, in my Province at all events, except in the city of St. John, as a rule they are not. Perhaps they are superior to and more experienced than justices of the peace, but at the same time they have extreme views in many cases; and cases have occurred, where, in spite of clear evidence to the contrary, they have convicted parties in a way which would not stand in any ordinary court of justice. If the principle of appeal is correct in one case, it is correct in all cases, and no man should be deprived of that right unless in some matter of exigency, where the private right should yield for public reasons. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) speaks of an appeal involving a re-hearing. I do not agree with him in that, but I think the party should be allowed to have the decision revised by a superior tribunal. The general rule is that the Superior Court will not interfere with the decision of the magistrate except where the evidence is of such a character or is so weak as to show that the magistrate had wrongly convicted. When we come to the case of medical men and make them amenable to a fine, I do not think they should be subject altogether to the decision of one magistrate without any appeal or without any opportunity to have the decision revised by a superior tribunal. The question is, is the power to appeal a right one? If it is in other cases just that the parties should have the right to appeal to a higher tribunal, surely it is just in this case also.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I would suggest this amendment:

Provided that the 119th section of the said Act, taking away the appeal, shall not apply to any such conviction of a medical man.

Mr. LANDRY. Will that allow the appeal to go before the County Court, or will it necessitate the question going again before the jury?

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) It simply takes away the prohibition contained in the 119th section, declaring that no appeal shall lie from the decision of a stipendiary magistrate. The other clauses declare to what court the appeal lies, if it lies at all. There is another section of the Act, section 103, which declares how the prosecution shall be brought, and the subsequent sections declare how the appeal may be taken.

Mr. LANDRY. That is the Summary Convictions Act, and that will cause it to go before the jury again.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Not in our Province.

Mr. WELDON (St. John.) It might be by a writ of *certiorari*.

Mr. JAMIESON. We propose to repeal sub-section 4 of section 99, and that amendment might be held to apply to the whole section.

Amendment (Mr. Davies) agreed to.

Mr. HICKEY. I beg leave to move that the word "two" in line 31, be struck out and the word "one" be substituted

Mr. FISHER.

therefor. At present the law requires that a man wanting liquor must get a certificate signed by two justices of the peace. This is frequently found to be very inconvenient, I propose that one justice of the peace be sufficient.

Mr. JAMIESON. This is a part of the original Act, and we do not propose to change that. I think it ought to be allowed to remain in the state it is.

Mr. ROOME. I agree with the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) that this should be changed. In many cases in rural sections of the country, a man may have to drive ten or twelve miles to find a second magistrate before he can purchase three or four ounces of alcohol. This inconvenience prejudices many men against the Temperance Act, and if it were removed the Act would be more popular.

Mr. FISHER. I must protest against this change in the Act. The original Act provided there should be two magistrates so as to give greater respectability to the court, and also to make sure that on no occasion should a magistrate be chosen who would be especially in the interest of the liquor party. It is very essential that a safeguard should be thrown not only around those who are prosecuted, but also around those who are prosecuting.

Mr. LISTER. There is no difficulty about working this section. There is no reason why the act should be changed from two magistrates to one magistrate, because if liquor is required for medicinal purposes the certificate of a magistrate is not required at all; if it is required for the purpose of art or manufacture, then and then only is a certificate required.

Mr. HICKEY. What is the good of two? Sometimes farmers come in and want to get whiskey to make whiskey pickles. I have been applied to frequently by people who do not know where to go, who do not know where the magistrates live, and perhaps they have to go two or three miles to hunt up two magistrates. Why bother people and compel them to hunt up two magistrates.

Mr. LISTER. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that the Act does not contemplate whiskey pickles at all.

Mr. HICKEY. It says art.

Mr. FISHER. At first I misunderstood the scope of this amendment, but I still object to it, although it has not the same force that I supposed at first. I think it would be very easy indeed, in many districts, to get one magistrate who would give a certificate for almost anything. We know that many magistrates are appointed without any particular care, and it would no doubt be easy to get a single magistrate to sign a certificate for anybody to get liquor.

Mr. HICKEY. If you can get one, you can get two.

Mr. LISTER. It is hardly likely there would be two of that kind of magistrates in the same district.

Amendment negatived.

On section 7,

Mr. JAMIESON. I find the courts have construed the law in such a way as to obviate the necessity for this section, and I would ask that it be struck out.

Section struck out.

On section 8,

Mr. JAMIESON. In this section we have made one general rule over the whole Dominion. Under the law as it at present stands there is a special rule for each Province. Now, I think the only official whose name has been omitted, of those before whom a prosecution can be brought, is that of the sheriff. In the Province of Ontario I am not aware that the sheriff has any judicial function, but I am told that in the Province of Quebec he has the authority of two justices of the peace. If that be so, they would still

have jurisdiction under this section. It has been found that in many cases in the Province of Ontario, one officer named in the Act has ousted the jurisdiction of another. For instance, the mayor in a town has been held to oust the jurisdiction of a county magistrate, and this has led to a great deal of confusion, at all events in Ontario. I cannot speak with reference to the other Provinces.

Mr. LISTER. What is the nature of the section for which this is intended to be a substitute? I have explained that the original Act provides a special rule for each Province; it sets out the name of each magistrate, and this provision is to apply a general rule for the whole Dominion, at the same time making very little change in the law. I think the only change is omitting mayor and sheriff, and the mayor in Ontario has been held to possess a magistrate's jurisdiction.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The old section was specific and well understood. It was provided in each Province that prosecution should be brought before some civic officers named in the section. We knew exactly who they were, and no doubt had arisen as to jurisdiction. Now we are making a general provision to apply all over the Dominion, and it is very difficult to use such apt language that doubts cannot be raised in regard to its meaning. I see several points that might be raised.

Mr. LISTER. I agree with the hon. member who has just spoken, and I think it is a mistake in the interests of the Bill to press this section.

Mr. JAMIESON. I have gone carefully into the matter, in which I have had the assistance of some eminent legal gentlemen, and this section is the result of our deliberations, and we consider it will be a decided improvement.

On section 10,

Mr. MASSON. I object to this section in its present form. It is carrying the rule laid down in section 104 a little further, and to that I object. In Ontario—I cannot speak for the other Provinces—a few years ago a large number of magistrates were appointed at the request of the temperance people. By allowing the prosecutors to select from the magistrates of the county any two before whom to lay an information, and to confine the trial to those two magistrates so chosen, is to allow the prosecutors to select those whom they consider prejudiced in their favor, and the effect would be to shut out all the other magistrates of the county who have equal jurisdiction with them. Under section 104, where officials are of higher standing, such as the recorder and the police magistrate, they having in themselves the authority of two magistrates, information can be laid before them, as in section 104, a provision to which I have no objection; but where the prosecutors have power to go over a whole county and select two magistrates before whom to lay information—and I know of instances where information has been laid before magistrates twenty miles distant from the place where the offence was alleged to have been committed and the parties were dragged from one end of a large county to another—I think great injustice will be done. In such a case great hardship would be done if a prosecutor was allowed to select his own judges even though distant twenty, thirty or forty miles before whom the case should be tried, without there being an opportunity to ask other justices of the peace to sit with them.

Mr. LISTER. I do not think this section is at all necessary. It has been held, at all events in Ontario, that the justice of the peace before whom the information was laid is the justice who has the right to determine the subject-matter of the information; that while, as a matter of courtesy, he asks his brother justices to sit on the bench, still any judgment they may come to, if opposed to the one he

arrives at, must fall and his judgment is the one that governs. I cannot agree with the contention that when an information was laid before one or two magistrates it would be wise to permit other magistrates to come in and sit on the bench with the magistrate before whom the information was laid. I remember cases in which justices of the peace—it happened more than once—who issued the information were overruled by magistrates who took seats on the bench in the interests of the accused, and who discharged a man who ought to have been convicted. One can readily see that, if what the hon. gentleman suggests is carried into effect, it is possible such a state of things would occur again, and it is infinitely better to entrust magistrates who have issued information in the case to deal with it rather than permit the accused to have his friends on the bench for the purpose, perhaps, of frustrating a proper decision. At all events I do not think the section is necessary.

Mr. MASSON. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman that the section is unnecessary, and if it remains at all, the latter part should be struck out. If this was an ordinary case, there would be no reason to find fault, but if special legislation is to be enacted for the benefit of the prosecution in cases under the Act, the accused should have the same rights as in other cases.

Mr. JAMIESON. I do not quite understand the contention of the hon. gentleman, but every party who has any grievance and lays an information before a justice of the peace has the selection of his own tribunal. This is, therefore, not any innovation. You cannot oblige a man in case of an assault or any other case, to go to certain magistrates and lodge the information; he can go to any magistrate or justice of the peace in the county and lodge it. This clause is simply for the purpose of preventing a grievance which has occurred time and again, when attempts have been made to pack the bench for the purpose of frustrating the ends of justice. It is simply to avoid anything of that kind, but so far as giving a party a right to select any magistrate in particular the prosecutor has that right at the present time, and it is impossible to deprive him of it. This section is simply to prevent the frustration of the ends of justice.

Mr. TISDALE. I agree with the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) that the clause is quite unnecessary and that the law is already settled in regard to it. I, therefore, move that the clause be struck out.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I agree with the opinion just expressed by the hon. member. I have had this section before the Supreme Court of New Brunswick and the Supreme Court of Canada, and the judges differed as to what was the meaning of the clause.

Mr. FISHER. I think the opinion given by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) is a very strong argument in favor of the clause. My hon. friend has just said that he has had that section before the judges of New Brunswick, and that they could not make head or tail of it, or words to that effect. If that is so, it is very important that some amendment to this section should be made. The section in the present Bill has been carefully gone over, by my friend from North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) and Mr. Maclaren, counsel for the Alliance, in the framing of this Bill. I think it would be dangerous, at all events so quickly and on the spur of the moment, as has been shown by this slight discussion, to deliberately strike out this section. I think it would not be safe for us to allow the motion of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) to pass.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it would be better to leave it in the Act, and there is no harm anyway.

Mr. JAMIESON. I think not.

On section 11,

Mr. JAMIESON. I believe doubts have arisen in some courts as to the power of the magistrates to enforce the penalty, after the conviction. The section is intended simply to remove that doubt.

On section 12,

Mr. JAMIESON. I want the committee to permit me to make a slight change in this section. After this section was framed I ascertained, on looking into the law, that the courts had interpreted those words which occur in the fourth line of the section: "in respect to which an offence has been committed" to mean an offence for which conviction has taken place, and I simply ask to strike out those words: "in respect to which an offence against the second part of the Act has been committed," and to substitute those words, "are kept for sale in violation of the second part of the Act." If the Act is allowed to stand in its present shape without this change, it will be quite useless so far as facilitating the enforcement of the Act is concerned. I would explain further, that the courts have held, especially in Ontario, that the search warrant under the Act shall issue only after a conviction has taken place, and the object of this clause is to amend the law so as to permit a search warrant to issue in the first instance, which was undoubtedly the spirit of the legislation. After a conviction has taken place, the issue of the search warrant would be quite ineffectual to prevent an infringement of the law. I propose that in the 35th line the words "in respect to which an offence against the Act," and in the 36th line, "has been committed," be struck out and the following words inserted, after the word "liquor" in the 35th line "as kept for sale in violation of the second part of this Act." I propose also to add "or the Temperance Act of 1864." That amendment was in the Bill which was passed by this House three years ago, and was accidentally omitted in drafting the Bill. I believe there is only one county in which the Dunkin Act is in force, and the object is to apply the search clause of the Canada Temperance Act to the Dunkin Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman will see that this will make a great change in the Act. Under the Act as it now stands you must obtain a conviction for having sold liquor or having liquor for sale. Immediately you get a conviction they can seize the liquor for any offence for which the defendant has been convicted and you can destroy the liquor. The hon. gentleman proposes to add the words, "that any liquor is kept for sale." You may go and seize it, but when you seize it what are you going to do with it? You cannot destroy it until you have a conviction, and you must have a conviction with respect to that very identical liquor. As the clause is now it may be defective in a sense, but it is clear that if you have a conviction you can immediately issue a warrant. You may find no liquor, and I dare say you will not, but if you do find it you can destroy it.

Mr. JAMIESON. The destruction can follow. It is a *prima facie* case if you find the liquor.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that it is interfering with the rights of property. If you can seize, on the statement of any person that he suspects there is liquor in a private house, it looks like an encroachment on the subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) He can seize the liquor, but what is he going to do with it afterwards? I do not see how you can make those two sections agree.

Mr. JAMIESON. If the hon. gentleman will take the 109th section he will find that any kegs and barrels can be destroyed, so that I do not see any difficulty would arise under this.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. TISDALE. I move to strike out the words "at any hour." Under the general law relating to this class of offences you cannot search a man's house at night time, and, I think, following out my amendment, that this class of offences should be treated under the general law. Under this clause, if a search were permitted at night, all that would be necessary would be for an informer to swear that he believes there is liquor in a man's house, and the police could go at night and turn him out of bed and search his house. The Act as it stands merely says that a search warrant shall be issued, and I suppose that the advocates of this amendment are not satisfied with that. It is the general law that search warrants shall only be issued in the daytime; but I suppose this amendment is in pursuance of the general argument that the law cannot be enforced without some arbitrary power that the general law does not recognise.

Mr. LISTER. Where is the law that a search warrant can only be issued in the day time?

Mr. TISDALE. It can only be issued in the day time for petty offences; in cases of crime and felony it is different; but my knowledge of the law is that in this class of offences a search warrant cannot be issued in the night; if it can, why is it necessary to ask us for this power?

Mr. LISTER. The courts have held that every class of offence is a crime.

Mr. TISDALE. Will the hon. member for Lambton tell me the cases in which he has known search warrants to be issued at night for petty offences?

Mr. LISTER. I think they have a right, if they can get into a man's house, at any time.

Mr. TISDALE. On the contrary, I have known many search warrants to wait until morning in order to be enforced. I am distinguishing crimes and felonies from misdemeanors or petty offences; and I say that by asking us to give the same right of search that exists in the case of a felony, the advocates of this amendment confess that they have not that power now. No case is made out for this arbitrary provision, and it is a case in which we ought not to allow it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the Summary Convictions Act no hour is named. It says that where any larceny or felony is committed, the warrant shall issue.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria, N. S.) I quite agree with the promoter of this Bill that it is quite necessary, for this Act to have any effect at all, that there should be a clause providing for a search, and I think it is necessary to leave in the word "dwelling house." But I think the hon. gentleman requires a little more machinery than he has now. In the case of the Nova Scotia License Act, which was passed by a House in which the extreme temperance element was represented far more strongly than it is in this House, they did not go quite as far as the hon. gentleman proposes to go in this bill. That Act gives the right to search in any dwelling house and take away any liquor found there; and if the quantity found is more than is needed for the use of the family, it is quite competent for the defendant to come forward and show that it was not kept for the purpose of sale. If he does not do that, he is liable to a fine. I think the promoter of this Bill will find it difficult, with the clause as it stands, to carry out the purpose of the Bill, and I would suggest that some such provision as I have mentioned should be added to it.

Mr. JAMIESON. As I understand the Canada Temperance Act, the finding of liquor under a clause of this kind, is simply *prima facie* evidence, just as it is under the provincial statute to which the hon. gentleman refers. The hon. gentleman did not tell us whether he had looked into the

law and seen whether the right of search was simply in the day time. I cannot speak in reference to other Provinces, but I know that in the Province of Ontario the right of search exists under the Crooks Act at any time, and that without any search warrant at all.

Mr. LISTER. Legislation is necessary to grant that power. The question here is whether an officer has a right to enter a dwelling or other place after night with a search warrant?

Mr. JAMIESON. I quite understand the reference made by the hon. gentleman, but I am told that this is innovation in the law. The fact is that such a provision is one of the most essential requirements for the enforcement of the law. I suppose it is as true now as it was when the book was written that "men that are drunken are drunken in the night." Liquor is consumed and carousals take place in the night time, and when the daylight comes the liquor disappears, and it is utterly impossible, under the Canada Temperance Act, as it is at the present time, to get at the perpetrators of these infringements of the law; and I hold that this provision is absolutely necessary, and is no innovation, but a much milder provision than that contained in the license law of Ontario.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to enter my protest against this provision, along with the hon. member for South Norfolk. I quite agree with him that the very arbitrary provisions of the Scott Act have done more to make it unpopular than anything else, and I believe this provision to allow constables to go to a man's house at night, and rouse the whole household out of bed, in order to see whether there is liquor there or not, is a very arbitrary one. My impression is that if you adopt this, you will make the Scott Act still more unpopular.

Mr. JAMIESON. It would popularise the Scott Act, if we are enabled to enforce it, and we cannot possibly enforce it under the present procedure. I would like any hon. gentleman to point out a single instance of hardship under the Crooks Act in which the provision is much stronger than this.

Mr. THOMSON. I am in favor of improving the Act in any way in which those gentlemen who have so well studied the subject will suggest, but I would seriously ask their attention to the question whether it is desirable to insert this provision with regard to a search warrant. It is giving, in relation to an Act which does not certainly attempt in any part of it to give to an offence against it the character of a felony, a procedure which ought only to apply to cases of felony, and a procedure which, as far as my recollection serves me, is at present only applicable to cases of felony. It would subject the Act to more odium than it has yet had to suffer from, and would make its operation exceedingly unpleasant.

Mr. FISHER. I think that the fact that such a power as this is contained in the Crooks Act, which is constantly being held up to this House as a model license law of the Dominion, and on which the Dominion license law of 1883 was largely modelled, is sufficient to show that this is not an unusual or extreme provision, and I think that the hon. member for North Lanark has sufficiently pointed out that it is really necessary a search warrant should be allowed during the night time.

Mr. THOMPSON. Of course, in all Licensed Act there must be the right to visit a suspected house for the purpose of finding out whether the license law is violated or not. But this does not provide for a mere visit. It is a kind of search warrant and allows the property to be seized.

Mr. JAMIESON. The provision in the Crooks Act is to the effect that any justice of the peace, upon information given by any officer that there is reasonable ground for

belief that spirituous liquor is kept for sale in any house contrary to the provisions of the Act, may grant a warrant and it shall be lawful for the person named in such warrant, at any time within ten days from the date thereof, to enter by force the place named and examine all the premises, and for this purpose he may, with any assistance necessary, break open any door or lock. We simply want the same provisions in this Act. We want that the officer may have power to enter at any time with a search warrant and search the suspected premises.

Mr. LISTER. No doubt the section proposed here is not as strong as the section in the Crooks Act. The section of my hon. friend has the same effect as this, but in this the additional power is given to the officer to enter at any time without a search warrant at all. The plea of the temperance people is that they are not able to enforce the Act because the evidences of guilt are made away with by the time they have succeeded in getting a search warrant. Taking everything into consideration, the committee ought to rise in view of the fact that Russell has been carried by over 400 majority

Mr. THOMPSON. This provision in the Crooks Act does not change my opinion as to the desirability of the clause at all. It appears that the Ontario Legislature, with the view of enforcing its license laws, has inserted a provision like this. But this Parliament, which has charge of the whole criminal law, has not thought it necessary to adopt such a provision in the class of offences created by this measure; and the action of a Local Legislature with regard to mere petty offences ought not to be taken as a precedent here for the insertion of a provision like this in a statute of a criminal character, especially when the policy of this House has been declared otherwise in the whole course of its legislation.

Mr. MASSON. In the Crooks Act, the justices of the peace can only give a warrant on the information of an officer, policeman or constable or inspector. But under this provision, he may issue a warrant on the affidavit of any credible witness, so that a person who has a spite against his neighbor may lay information against him and have his house searched in the night. Such a provision, I believe, would do more to embitter the people against the Scott Act than anything else that could be done.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the Crooks Act, form 9, and in the schedule, a search can only be made in the day time, and the warrant can only be given on the information of some official. Here, however, anybody who is credible, may obtain a warrant on his own certificate. This puts great power into the hands of irresponsible people. Under the Crooks Act, the affidavit must be made by an official who must give the reasons for the asking this extraordinary power.

Mr. TISDALE. These officials, under the Crooks Act, the Local Government are responsible for. The two classes of legislation are naturally different. In the one case, the Ontario Government regulates the enforcement of license inspection by their officials, who are responsible for them. The other is an attempt to apply the punishment for felony to a class of offences which this law has created, and I think the whole clause should be struck out.

Mr. JAMIESON. I cannot accept the distinction that has just been made. I think the clause which has just been proposed is necessary in the interests of the temperance law. So far as the inspector or other officer laying the information is concerned, I apprehend that it makes very little difference, because in a great many cases, at all events, the inspector or other officer will have very little knowledge of what is going on in different neighborhoods in the county, and some persons who have that knowledge

will have better knowledge of the fact. The Ontario Act is very much stronger than anything we propose in this Bill, and I cannot see any reason why this should not be adopted, nor have I been convinced by anything which has been said in opposition to it, and I insist upon it.

Mr. TISDALE. Moved that in the 39th line of the clause the words "at any hour" be struck out.

Amendment carried.

On section 13,

Mr. JAMIESON. The change is this. Under the Act, it is provided that the amount of liquor confiscated, or 20 gallons thereof, may be destroyed. We think that all the liquor confiscated under the Act should be destroyed. I also ask to amend this by adding after the word "Act" the words "or the Temperance Act of 1864," as was done in the preceding clause.

Amendment carried.

On section 14,

Mr. JAMIESON. That is simply to conform the law to the amendments already made to the Bill.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I move that the 119th section of the said Act be hereby repealed. That section provides that there shall be no *certiorari* and no appeal. The sense of the committee has been already shown in favor of this provision applying to this Act as to any other, and I can state from my own knowledge that the clause which gave the magistrates this power has been abused to a very large extent. I think the revising power should exist and that the parties should have the right to appeal.

Mr. JAMIESON. I will not argue this matter, but I suggest that the hon. gentleman had better introduce a clause repealing the Scott Act.

Mr. MASSON. I certainly agree with the motion to repeal this section. As has already been stated, the clause is entirely exceptional and we have already passed very exceptional provisions in this Act. I desire to correct a remark of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) as I have here the authority. I find that, in *Regina vs. Milne*, 27 U.C.C.P. page 74, an information was laid before a magistrate who had called in two other magistrates to join with him. The case was heard, and the magistrate thought the man should be fined while the other magistrate thought he should be dismissed. The one magistrate signed a conviction and issued his distress warrant. The matter went up by *certiorari*, and it was held that the men who were called in had made the judgment and not the other magistrate.

Mr. LISTER. This is not the point at all.

Mr. MASSON. I think the hon. gentleman, in saying that any person has a right in other cases to choose his own judge, is not exactly correct, not according to the holding in that case. Reading from the digest I find the principle was clearly laid down, "that the conviction was clearly bad and must be quashed, Sing having no exclusive right to deal with the case merely because he had issued his summons." Now, this is an exceptional right of dealing with the case; the law has been amended by one of the sections already passed. If they have the right of choosing their judges, surely they have the right of appeal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It must be remembered that the right of appeal is only taken away in case a man sues before a stipendiary magistrate, and it is taken away because these men are supposed to be skilled in the hearing of evidence.

Mr. MASSON. We know they are not very skilled as a rule.

Mr. JAMIESON.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They may not be in the Province the hon. gentleman comes from, but in my own Province they are skilled and good men. I think myself that the hon. gentleman for Lanark was not very far astray when he said that you would defeat the operation of the Act by this amendment. If you sue before a stipendiary magistrate, and get a witness on whose evidence you can base a conviction, and there is an appeal for three months, when you come to look for that witness you will find that he will be *non est*, and the appeal will be dismissed for want of evidence, unless you make a provision that there shall be an appeal on the evidence of the magistrate, and not a rehearing at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman is "that section 119 of the said Act is hereby repealed." I am inclined to think that it is not competent for the hon. gentleman to propose that amendment. The committee have already affirmed in an amendment to the 6th clause the existence of the 119th section, and the amendment now proposed by the hon. gentleman is quite inconsistent with the action taken previously by the committee, and I do not see that it can be properly entertained by the Chair. Of course it is competent for the hon. member to bring it up in the House, or at some other stage, or by instruction of the House to refer it back to the committee.

Mr. TISDALE. I made a reservation and the committee assented to my reservation. I confess I am not skilled in the rules of procedure. I said that I would move the main motion, and an hon. gentleman asked me to confine it to this section, and I said I would do so upon the understanding that when we came to the proper place, I should move the main motion; and that having been accepted without objection, I think it would be hard to prevent me from doing so now. I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to change your ruling, as the committee understood we were to have a vote upon this section.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know how far the committee can be bound by understandings, or conversations, or incidental remarks made by gentlemen across the House, as to what they might do at some future stage; but it is very evident that this proposition is quite inconsistent with the formal and definite action of the committee.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman is hardly fair in supporting his case. I stated that when a man had issued his warrant, and the person charged was brought before him, other magistrates had no right to go upon the bench and outvote him and discharge the accused against the authority of the magistrate who issued the conviction. I hold that to be good law still, and the statement made by the hon. gentleman upon the strength of this decision does not prove the contrary. These other magistrates came to the court and sat upon the bench. The case was being tried before three magistrates as bench of magistrates, and therefore the conviction of a majority of them would be a binding conviction. It is not an analogous case to the one cited by me at all. The minutes of evidence taken down by the clerk were headed as in a case before three justices, and "it was held that the conviction was clearly bad."

Mr. MASSON. Read on.

Mr. LISTER. There is nothing more to read.

"That the conviction was clearly bad and must be quashed, S. having no exclusive right to deal with the case merely because he had issued the summons."

Mr. MASSON. And the judgments bear that out.

Mr. LISTER. The judgment bears nothing of the kind. They sat with him as associate magistrates. It was a bench, and the decision of the majority governed. It has been decided in our courts that wherever other magistrates come

upon the bench without the wish of the magistrate who issued the warrant, the conviction of that one magistrate is the conviction.

Mr. TISDALE. I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to reconsider your ruling when I came to consider the reference to that section. We said that if that section became law, 119 should not apply to it. Now, that is not recognising section 119. We do not say that 119 is law, we say that amendment shall not be applied to 119. Surely referring to a section is not recognising it as law?

Mr. SCRIVER. I think it must be evident to any one who has seen anything of the working of the Scott Act that if the motion for a repeal of that section is carried, we may as well carry a motion for the repeal of the Act itself. I will venture to say that if that clause is repealed, the Act cannot be made effective, and the only effect of repealing that clause would be an attempt in the House to restore it when the House is full. I think a good many friends of the Act are absent just now, and I doubt whether the Act is getting fair play; therefore I would appeal to the hon. gentleman not to press the Act now, but if he does this and carries, it will be necessary to bring the question up again on the motion for the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to emphasise one point which has been brought up in the course of the debate and that is this, that this clause against which the amendment is proposed is the essential clause in the Canada Temperance Act so far as the carrying out of the Act is concerned, and no one knows that better than the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon). I am quite conversant with the history of the Act and especially with its adoption in the Maritime Provinces, and I have no hesitation in saying that there is no one clause which was more powerful in carrying that Act than the 119th, which takes away the indiscriminate power of appeal, not the power of appeal if a case is tried before two magistrates, but when a case is tried before what is generally supposed to be, and what I think is, a competent authority, a stipendiary or a police magistrate. I have simply to repeat what has been said by several other hon. members already, that if section 119 is repealed the House might as well repeal the Canada Temperance Act. I think we should not rush to a conclusion too rapidly from the result of two or three elections in Ontario. This Parliament has had several discussions on the Canada Temperance Act, and it has time and again refused to repeal this Act or to impair the Act to any extent. It is not at all conclusive that because seven of the counties in Ontario have repealed the Act the other fifty or sixty counties may not retain the Act, and speaking for the Canada Temperance Act so far as adopted in the Maritime Provinces, I believe the sentiment is there so strong that the Act will be retained. They have adopted it, they have refused in every case to repeal it, although that has been tried time and again, and they have a vested interest in that Act and will keep it on the Statute-book; and I ask that the committee will calmly and reasonably consider whether it will be wise to strike the Act in so vital a part and take it away from the large number of counties which have adopted the Act because of their faith in that one strong essential clause. My deliberate opinion is that it would not be well to do it, and I ask hon. gentlemen, reasonably and calmly, to think over this matter before they decide to, as I believe, render the Act totally ineffective by repealing the section under discussion.

On section 15,

Mr. JAMIESON moved that it be withdrawn.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. JAMIESON moved that the following be added as a clause:—

“That the forms M and N in the Schedules of this Act are hereby substituted for forms M and N in the schedule of the Canada Temperance Act.

He said: It is simply to make the form conformable to the alterations which we have made, and we have to substitute such new forms or make such changes in the old as to render it intelligible.

On section 16.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I object to this, that one half the penalty shall be paid to the prosecutor. It is a temptation to prosecute, and I hold that the entire penalty should be paid for the benefit of the public treasury.

Mr. FISHER. That may work very well in certain instances, but not in this, whereas frequently is the case the onus of the enforcement of this Act is thrown on the ordinary public. I believe that the properly constituted authorities should carry out the provisions of the Act, but this has not been done, and ordinary individuals have to enforce the Act. It is very essential that they should be allowed some means by which they can enforce it. One of the greatest difficulties in the enforcement of the Act has been the want of money. While private prosecutors, if successful, can have their expenses covered by the court inflicting costs on the defendant, yet cases may arise where the prosecution fails perhaps through no fault of their own. Even when the prosecution is successful, they have to pay the fees of their counsel as well as other expenses. When private individuals undertake to enforce an Act, the enforcement of which I believe to be the duty of the properly constituted authorities, they should be allowed, not heavy expenses but a just and fair division and at least one half of the funds should be paid them. As a matter of fact the Order in Council under which the fines are paid gives the entire amount to the county council, and I know of many instances in which the county council being in favor of temperance have put the fines wholly into the hands of the prosecutors, in order that they may enforce this Act.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). By what authority?

Mr. FISHER. By the Order in Council they can apply the fines any way they choose, and by passing a resolution in the county council, in certain instances I know of, the fines have gone towards the enforcement of the Act. Unfortunately the councils are not always in favor of temperance, and sometimes they have refused to give the fines, and have thus aided and abetted those who break the law.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I agree with the member from St. John (Mr. Weldon), as I believe the funds should be paid into the treasury of the county council entirely, and not be held up as a reward for this one and that one to prosecute the rum sellers. It would result in a great deal more hard feeling, litigation, and, perhaps, pistol shooting than anything else you could put on the Statute-book in regard to this Act. In Annapolis county, where the Act has worked very nicely, the county council has taken hold of the matter, and has authorised the prosecution of all those who infringed the Scott Act. It has authorised the inspector to employ counsel, and they are paid out of the treasury of the council. It looks more as if the temperance people were in earnest when they put their hands into their own pockets, and carry on the prosecution of the infractors of the Scott Act by some sort of association, if the Local Government or municipal council will not do so; and then the opponents of the Act cannot accuse the temperance people of any selfish motive like a desire to obtain filthy lucre from these prosecutions. I entirely agree with the hon. member for St. John that the whole of the fines should be paid to the county council. Then there would be a chance for temperance people to get the sentiment of the people up to such a point as to compel the county councils to enforce the Act as they should.

Mr. KIRK. That would do very well if all the county councils in the Dominion of Canada where the Canada Temperance Act is adopted were in favor of the Act; but unfortunately that is not the case. In the county from which I come there are two municipalities. The council of one of these has proven itself favorable to the Act, and it has furnished all the means necessary to carry on the prosecution; but the other council has refused to do so, and private parties have had to furnish money to carry on the prosecutions, and the work has cost them pretty severely. If we were sure that the municipal councils would appropriate the money for the purpose of enforcing the Act, then I should say that the money should be paid into the treasury of the county council; but I fear that many of the councils would not use the money for that purpose. Therefore I think it better to leave the clause as it is in the Bill.

Mr. FREEMAN. I beg to differ from my hon. friend from Annapolis. He thinks the temperance people should be forced to put their hands into their pockets and work up their temperance enthusiasm in order to do what? To carry out the laws which this Parliament has put on the Statute-book. This Parliament has given the people a law to suppress vice, to suppress an evil which it declares exists in the country; and instead of the makers of the law enforcing it, they leave its enforcement to the people. I am sure that the temperance people of my county have spent hundreds and hundreds of dollars which they have taken out of their own pockets to enforce this law, and I think that those who do spend their money for this purpose should have a little return from the fines collected. I therefore think the amendment proposed by my hon. friend should pass.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I cannot see why a distinction should be made between this fine and other fines. Other fines are not divided with the prosecutor.

Mr. FREEMAN. This is about the only law that the lawmakers do not enforce. There is an invidious distinction with regard to this Scott Act, the people are left to enforce it, and there should be some distinction made in respect to the disposal of the fines.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for Annapolis said that the enforcement of this Act ought to be in the hands of public prosecutors, and that private individuals ought not to be encouraged to act as prosecutors. If he examines this section, he will see that where there is a provincial or other proper officer to carry on the prosecutions, the fines will be paid to him, and he will be able to use them for that purpose. It is only where there is not a proper official to do this work, and where the public are called on to do it, that it is proposed they should obtain such remuneration out of these fines as to pay their expenses. I do not think it at all likely that such cases will arise of people carrying on these prosecutions to make money out of them.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I have known dozens of them to arise.

Mr. FISHER. The experience of those who have done so is that they have lost money. I know that in my county the temperance people have had to put their hands in their pockets to pay the expenses of prosecution. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to call on people to show their interest in the law by doing this; but I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is willing to put his hand into his pocket to enforce the license law and other laws, and if he is not, I do not see why temperance people should be called on to put their hands into their pockets to carry out this law.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not want to vote for the clause as it stands, and I do not want to vote against it. I think the whole difficulty could be met by striking out that part

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

of the clause which provides that in one case the whole penalty shall be paid to the prosecutor, and in the other case only one-half shall be paid to him. The hon. gentleman who have spoken in favor of the clause plead that that is the only way in which the expense can be met. Anyone who looks at the end of the clause will see that the part paid to the municipality in which the offence was committed is to be applied to the enforcement of the Act. Why not provide that the whole penalty shall be paid over to the municipality for the enforcement of the Act? It is said that it is necessary that these prosecutors or informers should have this money for their compensation; but if it is provided that the money shall be paid over for the enforcement of the Act, the person who is entitled to expenses will be paid out of it. I object to placing a premium on informers. We have had experience in the past of men who have perjured themselves and resorted to the most infamous means to secure convictions in order to get their share of the fines; and if this clause passes, you will be just placing a premium on the most worthless people in the community, and encouraging them to perjure themselves in order to make money. Now, I think, the whole difficulty can be met if the promoter of the Bill will consent to have the whole fine recovered paid over to the municipality to be expended in the enforcement of the Act.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I hold that where an informer has one-half of the penalty, it is an inducement to him to inform in order to make money. I had a party come to my office and ask me to undertake the solicitorship of a Scott Act case on condition that if he succeeded he would pay me out of the share of the fine, and that if not I should be paid nothing. I, in effect, kicked the fellow out of the office, and when my election came on some of the temperance people, who were opposed to me in politics, brought that circumstance up as an argument why the temperance people should not vote for me, saying that I refused to assist the temperance people to prosecute the Scott Act. That is one instance, and I know where the same thing has been done in other instances. The first fine is \$50, and if the informer gets \$25 out of that and has an easy prosecution, it pays him very well. Should the whole fine, however, go into the municipality, it would work some good; otherwise it will not.

Mr. FISHER. If the fine goes into the county council, as proposed by the hon. member for Annapolis, some safeguard should be provided, so that the fund thus created may be drawn upon by anybody who undertakes a prosecution. I know that in my county the county council, for some time, would not pass any resolution authorising the distribution of these fines. The fines were paid into their hands and remained there, and it was only last winter that I obtained the passage of a resolution which enables anybody who has been instrumental in getting a fine inflicted to draw upon the fund for the payment of his expenses. If this plan were adopted, there would be no difficulty in the way of a man getting his expenses, as he would be assured of having a fund to draw upon to meet them. But to accept the bald proposition that the money should be put in the hands of the council to dispose of as they like in the enforcement of the Act would be a dangerous proposition, and would lead to defeating the intention of the Act.

Mr. BOWELL. Why give the whole of the penalty to a public prosecutor and not to a private one?

Mr. FISHER. Because the public prosecutors are appointed by the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. I could understand if the hon. gentleman provided that a part of the penalty should be paid to the prosecutor and the balance be paid into the funds of the

municipality; but in this case you give the whole of the funds to the prosecutor.

Mr. FISHER. That first part of the section is not what I am discussing.

Mr. BOWELL. If he is a public prosecutor why should he get all the money, and if a private prosecutor only one-half?

Mr. FISHER. The provincial authority which controls him, will make him apply the fines to a proper purpose.

Mr. BOWELL. No provincial law can take the money out of his pocket.

Mr. MASSON. I agree with the hon. member for Huron that the centre part of the clause should be struck out. I think it meets the objection raised by hon. gentlemen in support of the clause introduced, the principal objection being that there were some local municipalities which were not in favor of the Act. I do not think there is much in that objection, because if the Act is in favor in a municipality or county, it is not at all likely the officers of the municipality, who conduct its business, would not be in accord with the majority of the county; but if such an objection has any weight, it is met by the last clause introduced. I would move that clause 17 be amended by striking out all the words after the word "shall," and inserting the following instead thereof:—

Be paid over to the treasurer of the county council or the city council of the place in which the offence has been committed, to be applied to the enforcement of the Act.

Mr. JAMIESON. I do not see the necessity for that amendment, because it is the law already. The statute gives the Government authority, under Order in Council, to appropriate these fines just in the manner indicated by the hon. member for Grey. What we propose is very reasonable and simple. We propose that where the provincial authorities undertake the duty of enforcing the law, they should have the benefits derived from these penalties, and, in other cases, where the provincial authorities and their officers will not take steps to enforce the law and it becomes necessary for the temperance people to do so by the appointment of a private prosecutor, they should have the benefit. I think that is a very reasonable proposition. I know of no case where a prosecution has been instituted by a private prosecutor simply on his own motion. They are appointed by associations and are amenable to those associations, and the funds are used for the purpose of enforcing the law and do not go into the pocket of the private prosecutor.

Mr. KIRK. Who does the hon. gentleman mean by public officers?

Mr. JAMIESON. In the Province of Ontario—I cannot speak for the other Provinces—the burden of enforcing the law has been undertaken by the Government, and in the other Provinces perhaps the county council or some other body may appoint a public officer for the purpose of enforcing the law, and in that case the amount would be paid to him.

Mr. KIRK. Then it will mean somebody appointed by the county council?

Mr. JAMIESON. Yes, or by some competent authority.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think the promoters of this bill have given any reason why the officer should receive the whole penalty. In some of the Provinces, the inland revenue officer is appointed, but, supposing a postmaster were appointed or a customs officer, or any officer not directly connected with the enforcement of the Canada Temperance Act, why should he put into his pocket the fines, amounting in some cases to thousands of dollars? It

is said that in one county, the fines for one year amounted to \$8,000. This provision would make the whole of that amount the absolute property of that officer. It may be said that the Provincial Government might dismiss him unless he refunded the amount or unless he paid over a certain proportion of it, but, with that in his pocket, he might very well afford to say good-bye to the Local Government. I do not think it is any answer to the point which has been taken to say that, after we have put that amount in his pocket, he is to be made amenable. We ought to remember that such an officer is supposed to be sufficiently remunerated for his duties by the Government or municipality which appointed him.

Mr. JAMIESON. I know simply that in Ontario—and I know nothing about the other Provinces—there is a statute declaring how the fines shall go.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If the fines are to be handed over to the prosecutor, under this statute, they must go to him. The result will be that, where there is a public prosecutor and a private prosecutor, there will be a race between them as to who is to get the fines.

Mr. FISHER. I think the municipal order or the Provincial Act appointing the public prosecutor could instruct him to keep these fines for the purposes of the Act, and so enable a fund to be created for the purposes of the Act. I do not pretend to say whether that is a matter which is competent to the local authority, but if it is not, there should be an amendment to this Act, I think, so as to provide that the prosecutor should not put the fines into his own pocket for his own purposes. In supporting this clause, my object was not at all that the prosecutor should receive the fines himself, but that they should create a fund under the local authority which chose to undertake that work, out of which a public prosecutor could be paid by the local authority.

Mr. JAMIESON. I suggest that, after the word "prosecutor," there should be inserted the words "to be applied for the enforcement of the Act."

The CHAIRMAN put the amendment of Mr. Masson.

Mr. JAMIESON. That is the law already. There was an Order in Council passed by the Government under the authority of the statute.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the hon. gentleman got the Order in Council?

Mr. JAMIESON. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can he tell us what the effect of it is?

Mr. JAMIESON. Surely the Minister of Marine can tell us.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This section as it stands now would not suit the Province of Prince Edward Island at all. The Act is in force in the two cities and three counties in that Province, and the fines are paid into the city treasury in the cities, and outside of the cities they are paid to the Provincial Government, because we have no municipal councils at all. The Act works very well there, and I should be very sorry to see the present arrangements disturbed in that island. This section could not apply to us at all. I think that paying these fines to the prosecutor personally is a mistake. With us, he is paid a salary, and the fines go into the city treasury or the provincial treasury, as the case may be. I think as the matter stands now, the Act works very fairly, and in regard to Prince Edward Island, the clause would have to be amended in any case.

Mr. JAMIESON. This change is proposed in order to meet cases where the inspectors do not enforce the law. There are some county councils in the Province of Ontario

which have thousands of dollars in their treasury, but have never taken one step to appropriate that money for any purpose. Only the other day, I was told by the treasurer of the county of Lambton that he has thousands of dollars on hand, and has never been called upon to pay anything.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. They all obey the law in that county, so there would be nothing to pay.

Mr. HAGGART. I move that clause 17 be struck out, and leave the law as it is.

Mr. DAVIN. In regard to this proposal I can give the committee some information of the way this law is carried out. We have this system in the North-West, and the result is that the informer sets traps with a view of getting half the fines. We have had some very detestable instances of treachery, and I should be sorry to see any such law introduced in any part of Canada where it does not now obtain.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The matter was considered very fully before in the House, and the Government framed an Order in Council very carefully, which applies to all parts of the Dominion, and I think it is unnecessary to legislate anew about it every Session.

Mr. JAMIESON. We consent to let it go. I now move that forms M and N, in the schedule to this Act, be hereby substituted for forms M and N in the schedule to the Canada Temperance Act. I would explain shortly that owing to the change which has been made in the law of search, the old form of information for search warrants, and the search warrant itself, are not suitable, and I propose to add two new forms, "M" and "N," as substitutes for the forms in the original Act, with the changes which are made necessary by the altered state of the law. The search warrant simply follows the information.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I understood the hon. gentleman to put in his new form M the cause of suspicion. It is very important that a man should set out in his information on what he grounds his suspicions.

Mr. JAMIESON. "And the causes of suspicion." That is in, but it is in parentheses.

Mr. TISDALE. I move that section 114 of the Canada Temperance Act be struck out. Under the general law of evidence a husband and wife are excluded from giving evidence for or against each other. As long as the general law is in here, it is objectionable that in this class of offences a man should be compelled to give evidence against his wife and the wife against her husband. Further, it is contrary to the general law that a person shall convict himself. I may say to those gentlemen who are strongly in favor of the Scott Act, that I do not know of any one thing that more embitters the people against that Act than this clause.

Mr. JAMIESON. This Bill is for the purpose of amending the law, not for the purpose of destroying it. If the hon. gentleman had the faith which he professes to have in his amendment, he would have put it in the form of a Bill, and given us an opportunity to fight the matter out. This Bill is for the purpose of amending the law and making it more workable; the amendment proposed by the hon. member for South Norfolk is for the purpose of destroying the efficiency of the law. This feature of it is the law in the Province of Ontario, and will soon be the law in the county in which the hon. gentleman resides after they have repealed the Scott Act. It is the law under the Crooks' Act, and it has been found to be very necessary for the enforcement both of the license law and the Canada Temperance Act. It would be a most unfortunate thing if the amendment of the hon. gentleman should receive the sanction of the committee, and I trust it will not.

Mr. JAMIESON.

The CHAIRMAN. I am informed that the vote is a tie, and I will give the benefit of the doubt to the promoter of the Scott Act by voting against the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have an amendment that section 100 be amended by adding the words "purchaser or" after the word "who" in the first line.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. THOMPSON. I wish to call attention to the section that has been adopted in regard to prescriptions by medical men. That section conflicts with the section inserted in the other Bill. We have already passed a Bill, and it has gone to the Senate, permitting every chemist and medical man to give the full prescription, and in this section of the present Bill we have limited the prescription and imposed heavy penalties if the chemist or medical man should obey the provision of the other Bill. I think it would be better to drop the section out of this Bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If this section is allowed to pass the Act will be simply useless as a temperance measure, as it will be unworkable. It is desirable that the suggestion made by the Minister of Justice should be carried out.

Mr. HAGGART. I intended to move on the third reading that the clause should be struck out.

Mr. JAMIESON. I do not take the same view as the Minister of Justice. Perhaps I am wrong, but here is the amendment: "Provided nothing in this Act shall prejudice the sale of by legally authorised physicians or surgeons, &c."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That applies to qualified druggists, licensed by the colleges.

Mr. THOMPSON. The amendment the hon. gentleman has just read refers to medical men who sell articles of this kind, if they form part of a prescription. This section which he proposes says: If that is done, he is liable to summary conviction under a penalty.

Mr. HAGGART. It seems to be the unanimous wish of House that section 6 should be reconsidered. I move it be struck out. It seems to me a perfect farce, that in the same evening within two hours, we should pass one Bill contradictory to the other in reference to giving power to druggists and physicians to sell.

Mr. JAMIESON. There is a great deal in this sub-section which does not conflict. It will not take long to remodel it so as to make it conform.

Mr. HAGGART. I move that clause 6 be struck out, as it is provided for in the other Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is now placed at a disadvantage, and I think it would be well to give the member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) time to consider it.

Mr. JAMIESON. The disadvantage is that our Bill was framed first, but I hold there are some things in the sub-section that should be retained.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not quite sure, from closer examination that those two Bills conflict at all. When the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) moved his amendment the effect was to give legally qualified physicians power to sell medicines composed in part of liquor in the manner he prescribed in the section. The Bill has reference to the sale of intoxicating liquor when mixed with other medicines. This clause in the Bill now before the House relates entirely to the sale of intoxicating liquor pure and simple.

Mr. JAMIESON. I think the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) is quite correct.

Mr. HAGGART. Read the 6th clause and you will find that druggists cannot sell even a bottle of *eau de cologne* without a prescription.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) It is quite clear that that does not prevent the sale of *eau de cologne* because that is provided for in the Bill. If a medical man sells brandy, rum or gin he must have the certificate provided by this section. If on the other hand he sells brandy, rum or gin without mixing in the manner prescribed by the Bill passed in the early part of the evening he is exempt.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Of course the Bill is contradictory.

Mr. FISHER. Instead of repealing the section why not make it apply to everybody who by this other amendment were allowed to sell? We can in this way make the two sections coincide.

Mr. BOWELL. The former resolution does not provide for licensing every one it gives the absolute right to qualified physicians.

Mr. JAMIESON. I move to strike out of the 6th section the words, "by such licensed druggists and vendors," and substitute therefor the words, "by any person duly authorised to sell the same."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. When the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) moved his amendment, there was a condition added to it that is not printed here, so that the conditions passed in the other Act will vary from the conditions here.

Mr. HAGGART. The amendment just moved restricts the clause to those who are licensed to sell, for they are the only parties who are duly authorised to sell.

Mr. FISHER. By your amendment you have authorised them all.

Mr. HAGGART. This is not an amendment to my Bill. It is an amendment to the Canada Temperance Act.

Mr. THOMPSON. That would be so undoubtedly, as this section is to be read into the Canada Temperance Act, and form part of it; but inasmuch as the Act we have passed to-night is an amending Act, it seems to me that it removes that difficulty. I would like to study the two in order to harmonise them; but as this is probably the last opportunity we shall have to consider this Bill, I think that we had better pass these amendments. I do not think there is any harm in them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think there is either.

Committee rose and reported, and Bill read the third time and passed.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all complaints made respecting the right of certain Indians on the Kettle and Stoney Point Reserves to occupy land on the said Reserve, and to participate in the annuity moneys; a copy of all instructions given to any person or persons appointed by the Government to investigate such claims, and a copy of all evidence taken in support of such complaints and in opposition thereto, and any report or reports made to the Government respecting the same.—(Mr. Lister.)

Copies of all correspondence and telegrams between the Department of Railways and Messrs. Sims and Slater, contractors for the eastern section of the Cape Breton Railway, between Grand Narrows and Sydney.—(Mr. Flynn.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and village of Midland, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or other parties, in reference to the harbor improvements at Midland, and all letters, reports, or other papers connected with such harbor improvements.—(Mr. Lister for Mr. Cook.)

Copies of all correspondence respecting the construction of a lighthouse at the north end of Stag Island, in the River St. Clair.—(Mr. Lister.)

Sr HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. EDGAR. I wish to mention to the Government that I intend to bring before the House in going into Committee of Supply some day after to-morrow the question of the grievances of the half-breed settlers of Breslau in the North-West Territories.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m., (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 8th May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE TERRITORIES REAL PROPERTY ACT.

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

Resolved, That the salary of the Inspector of Land Titles office to be appointed in connection with the carrying into effect of "The Territories Real Property Act" shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament for that purpose.

Resolved, That it is expedient to substitute the following for subsection two of section 133 of the Act above cited:—

"2. Except as herein otherwise provided, there shall be paid, together with the fees under this Act which are from time to time fixed by the Governor in Council, of one per cent. on the value of the real property registered, if such value amounts to or is less than five thousand dollars, and one-tenth of one per cent. on the additional value, when such value exceeds five thousand dollars."

Motion agreed to.

SATURDAY SITTING.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That when the House adjourns on Friday next it do stand adjourned until the following Saturday at one o'clock, and that Government measures have precedence on that day.

Mr. LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to adjourn at six o'clock next Saturday?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not if we can induce the House to sit after six.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objection.

Motion agreed to.

THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved:

That the House resolve itself into Committee on proposed Resolution (p. 1136) to authorise the raising by way of loan such sum or sums, not exceeding \$25,000,000, as may be required for the purpose of paying the floating indebtedness of the Dominion.

He said: It will be in the recollection of the House that when making my financial statement a few days ago, I explained to the House that, owing to the changes made in the regulations affecting deposits in the Government savings banks, reducing the amounts that depositors were allowed to deposit there, and owing to a certain amount of stringency that prevailed in the money market, causing increased inducements to be offered by the banks to depositors to place their funds in the banking institutions of the country, the Government did not receive nearly so much money as they otherwise would have had reason to expect. And, consequently, we were obliged to meet the capital expenditure which would otherwise have fallen on the money raised in that way from the current revenue, and in

order to meet the difficulty by a certain amount of floating indebtedness, which was incurred to the extent of about one million pounds sterling. I might say that a very interesting question arises in connection with a motion of this kind in regard to the public indebtedness of this country, and I wish to draw the attention of the House, for a few minutes, to the fact that our indebtedness would not seem to be so great, relatively, as it might at first sight appear to be. I regret that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is not in his place on an occasion of this kind, especially as I stated to him that I proposed, on this resolution, to call the attention of the House to what he referred to as the great increase of the indebtedness of this country since 1878. Of course, the debt of Canada is tolerably large, but it must not be forgotten that, with the exception of a single item, this indebtedness is represented by valuable public works and by the development of the country. That single item is the amount of \$5,897,256.66, which was caused by the unfortunate outbreak in the North-West. While the national debt of England and the national debt of the United States have been to a large extent caused by disastrous wars, Canada is in the fortunate position of having its debt caused only by the efforts of successive Governments to develop the country and to place its public works in such a position of progress that they would contribute in the future to the greater development of the country. It is true that we have a large indebtedness, but we are able to point to most valuable assets for our expenditure; we are able to represent by those public works the amount of that indebtedness, because these amounts of indebtedness have been incurred in such a way as to add to the revenue of this country. I am sure that every hon. member of this House will find it a matter of gratification that, if the indebtedness of this country has increased, as it undoubtedly has between 1877 and the present time, we have the best evidence that that increase in the indebtedness has contributed to the construction, or in fact has caused the construction, of a great national work which must in the future, as it has done already, tend to the development and progress of the whole country. But I desire to point out that the indebtedness of Canada is not as great as it would at first sight appear to be. I mean the actual indebtedness, because hon. gentlemen are aware that the borrowings of this country are not intended to be paid, that is, that when an amount becomes due, when a loan is floated for the purpose of constructing public works, we go to the money market of the world, and put our securities on the market, not with the expectation that this comparatively new and young country will be able to pay the debt at present. What is understood is that, when these obligations mature, the country will put other securities on the market in their place, and so it may be regarded as a continuous indebtedness, to be replaced by putting a new loan on the market. The House will therefore see that everything relating to the actual indebtedness of Canada is to be measured not by the nominal amount of the debt, not by the actual sum represented by the debt, but by the sums which the country has to pay in the way of interest, and the amount of the interest which has to be paid is an indication of the credit of the country. It might have been anticipated that the credit of the country would have been strained by the construction of one of the most gigantic public works that any people of our numbers have ever attempted in any part of the world; but, instead of our credit being injured, although many were afraid that the enormous expenditure required for that work would result in loss of credit to the country, the credit of Canada has steadily increased and has kept pace with the advancing indebtedness of the country. Consequently, as the actual liability of the people of Canada is not to be measured by the amount which we owe, but by the annual charge on our revenue which it

Sir CHARLES TUPPER

entails, if our credit has steadily risen instead of falling, if it has steadily risen as the indebtedness of the country has risen between 1877, the year to which attention was called by an hon. gentleman on the other side, and the present time, we have nothing to fear. I think I shall be able to demonstrate to the House, that we will actually save fifty-three millions of dollars of our indebtedness out of the amount of the increase between 1877 and the present date, on account of the enhanced credit of the country, which enables us to replace our maturing debts with securities which will effect an actual saving to the country of over fifty-three millions of dollars. In making this comparison in such a way as to render it plain and clear, not only to every hon. member in this House, but also to the general public, who are so much interested in this question, I propose to deal with what it cost us to borrow money in 1877, and what it costs us to borrow money now, and in order to deal in the most practical and clear way with that important point, I propose to leave out the question of commissions and everything of that kind connected with the floating of a loan. I propose to take the price which we had to pay for money in 1877, in consequence of the then position of the credit of the country, and the position in which we now can go to the money market of the world to float any sums we require in that way. When the loan of 1876 was floated in England, taking away altogether the question of commission, it may be stated that the charge for interest upon that loan was about $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. While money can be obtained at our present credit—I am not speaking of what our securities are at this moment bringing in London, but I am speaking of what we could float any loan for, such as we would be likely to require, at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; I say that the enhanced credit of the country represents the difference between $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., which Canada was obliged to pay in 1877, and $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the rate at which, at this moment, she could obtain money. If all our debt of 227 millions on the first of July last, was in England, and if we were not committed to any rate of interest for any time, it is evident that the result which we are endeavoring to obtain, would be reached by multiplying 227 millions by $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and dividing the sum thus obtained by $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. in order to make the contrast between the period at which the loan was floated in May, 1877, and the present time, the debts being in proportion to the actual charges. The result is \$155,300,000 instead of 227 millions; that is to say, the enhanced credit of Canada practically reduces the indebtedness of Canada to the difference there would be in that case, assuming that the debt was all due in England, and it would make the difference between 227 millions and \$155,300,000. Now, to illustrate this mode of reasoning by figures which will bring out even results, and place it in the power of any ordinary arithmetician to make the calculation for himself, I propose to take, as an illustration, a debt of £7,600 with interest at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in perpetuity, which is the same as a debt of £5,200 with interest at $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. in perpetuity, both entailing an interest charge of £247 per annum, and £5,200 is obtained from £7,600 by multiplying by $3\frac{1}{2}$ and by dividing by $4\frac{3}{4}$. Consequently an individual who can borrow money, assuming that it is borrowed as our loans are, practically in perpetuity—a person who could borrow money at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. could obtain £7,600, if his credit would enable him to borrow at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., with the same facility that another person could borrow £5,200 at $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. But the debt of 1877 was, as the existing one is, only partially held in England, and, unfortunately, what is now held in England does not mature for twenty years on an average, and almost all of it bears 4 per cent. in the meantime. The debt of 1877 may be considered as having been composed of 116 millions of money borrowed in England, 8 millions Dominion notes held above the amount of specie,

7 millions held in the Savings Bank, and 2 millions of Trust Funds, beyond current balances due on other accounts, making a debt in 1877, of 133 millions composed of the various sums. Now, Sir, our present debt is composed of the following items: 1st, money borrowed in England, 150 millions; 2nd, Dominion notes above specie, 12 millions; 3rd, Savings Bank, 40 millions; 4th, 12 millions, Canadian Pacific Railway guarantee, the amount of money deposited by the company with the Government, and on which we agree to pay, for a certain period, 4 per cent. interest, and to pay it out to the shareholders as their dividends become due; and 5th, 13 millions, the amount due to the Provinces and Trust Funds, making a total of 227 millions in these five different clauses. I shall now proceed to deal with each of these clauses by itself, and to show what the actual indebtedness is, as represented by these various amounts. First, the 150 millions now due in England, considering that it has twenty years to run—I am speaking of an average—at 4 per cent., I shall assume that it is obtainable at not more than $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. thereafter, and I think we may assume that seeing that the credit of Canada has steadily risen until our securities stand third among the various securities of the world, considering that it has risen step by step while we were obliged to make enormous expenditures for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and other public works, considering that our credit has risen until we can borrow money now at $3\frac{1}{2}$ with the same ease that we borrowed it before at $4\frac{1}{2}$, in fact with much greater ease, I think we may fairly assume that our credit will continue to improve, and that instead of being obliged to borrow on less favorable terms, we can borrow on more favorable terms hereafter, I take it, at the present value of our securities, and the rate at which we could now go into the market to effect a loan; so that 150 millions, considering that it has 20 years to run, at 4 per cent. interest, and that it can be replaced by money obtained at not more than $3\frac{1}{2}$, is, by actuarial calculation, equivalent to 114 millions; so that our actual indebtedness in regard to that amount may be treated not as 150 millions but as practically 114 millions.

An hon. MEMBER. Strike out some more.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am quite certain there is not a member of this House but must listen with the most profound satisfaction to this statement. I am not dealing with this matter as a party question at all; it is above and beyond party. I am not saying that this improved credit of Canada is in any manner due to the present Administration. I am leaving out everything but the gratifying fact that such is the enhanced credit of Canada that we are enabled to stand before the world, not as having increased our indebtedness, valuable as are the works for which that indebtedness was incurred, not as having increased the actual indebtedness to the amount that would appear at first sight, but I say that, taken in connection with our improved credit, our increased indebtedness is much less. I am sure that is a statement in which, dealing with it purely as a financial question, purely as regards the financial credit and standing of Canada, in which we all have an equal interest on both sides of the House. I am making the statement, I hope, in a manner not to challenge party criticism in any sense of the word, either in one case or the other. I am making the statement in such a way as to assure the House and the country that we have great reason for the most profound gratification that in incurring such a large indebtedness for purposes that we believe warranted that indebtedness, our credit has so appreciated as practically to render that indebtedness a great deal less than it otherwise would be. I hope that the view I am taking of this matter will not be misunderstood by any hon. member, because it is put forward solely with a view to its influence and effect upon the credit of

Canada in the money market of the world, and if the statements I am making are sound, if the deductions I am drawing from the actual state of things are legitimate deductions, they will be of great advantage to Canada in relation to its credit, and the terms upon which we can go to the money market of the world for the purpose of floating a loan. Now, as I have said, the sum of \$150,000,000, capable of being replaced by money borrowed at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., only represents \$114,000,000, which would bear $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in perpetuity. That I state as a mathematical problem actually demonstrated, and placed beyond any controversy or beyond any question; and I invite the attention of the most able accountants and actuaries on both sides of the House to the most close analysis of the calculations I am submitting to the House, because if there is any error I should be very glad to know it, in order not to commit myself to a statement which may be found not to be thoroughly sound and reliable. I now take the question of Dominion notes. Dominion notes bear no interest. The only charges on the country are interest on the specie reserve and cost of management, and consequently, as the cost of management is less than one-half per cent., the House will see that every Dominion note we are able to float is money obtained without any cost to the country whatever, that is that every note we are able to float over and above the specie reserve that Parliament has decided must be held for the security of that money is actually found money, free from anything except a charge of less than one-half per cent. for management; and therefore, as we have increased the amount of Dominion notes, maintaining the specie reserve required by law by a considerable amount since 1877, and as no doubt in the future that will go on increasing, so in order to make an exact calculation, as I am endeavoring to do, as to the whole charge on the country of the present indebtedness, I am quite right to take that into consideration. Any change that would occur in regard to that item would strengthen my argument necessarily, because as the country develops and population increases there will naturally be an expansion, and we will go on floating Dominion notes upon the specie reserve to a larger amount as the case may be, so that will not be subject to any deduction, but it will be an item presenting a better aspect in future than it does now. You take that question: the cost of management is less than one-half per cent.; as the Dominion notes floated in 1887 were \$8,000,000 above the specie reserve and as the Dominion notes to-day are \$12,000,000 above the specie reserve, so the House will see that although we have increased our indebtedness nominally by those \$4,000,000, the amount between \$8,000,000 and \$4,000,000, instead of its costing the country $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., it is costing the country only one-half per cent.; consequently \$420,000 is the entire charge resting upon the country for that increased indebtedness of \$4,000,000, as will be seen at a glance. We get an additional \$4,000,000 for a sum which at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. would be \$4,000,000 multiplied by one-half and divided by $4\frac{1}{2}$, or for \$420,000 a year; that is the entire charge resting on the country for that difference between the Dominion notes over and above the specie reserve at the present day as compared with 1887. The difference between that sum of \$420,000 and \$4,000,000 is therefore no less than \$3,580,000, which represents the reduction that is to be made on that class of indebtedness; that is to say, that although nominally you have \$4,000,000 of increased indebtedness, you have practically for all purposes, measured by the cost to the country, the burden on the people for that debt, instead of \$4,000,000 only \$420,000, making a clear difference and saving, when you come to deal with the actual indebtedness, of the country as compared with the nominal indebtedness, of no less on that item of \$3,580,000. The increase in the deposits in the savings bank of \$33,000,000,

if changed as it may be to a debt bearing $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest, and at any time Parliament wishes that amount for which we are paying 4 per cent., \$33,000,000 may be obtained at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., or we could require the depositors in the savings bank to accept that rate which it now costs to obtain money, $3\frac{1}{2}$, instead of 4 per cent. which the depositors are now receiving, and the difference will at once be seen to be very considerable. The increase in the deposits in the savings bank of \$33,000,000 if changed as it may be to a debt bearing $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest, would be represented by the result after multiplying by $3\frac{1}{2}$, and dividing by $4\frac{1}{2}$, or about \$22,500,000. The \$12,000,000 of Canadian Pacific Railway guarantee has six years to run at 4 per cent.; the money to meet it will be borrowed at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., an average of three years from this date. This amount will be represented by not more than \$8,300,000. The difference between the charge now borne, paying 4 per cent. on that amount—and I separate it for the reason that I am dealing with all these items as the amount of charges that actually rests upon them—will be shown by the reduction to \$8,300,000 by paying it off, as we can do it, at an average of three years, with money borrowed at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. There will be no change in the fifth class of debts, because, as the House is aware, this class amounting to \$33,000,000 is due to the Provinces under a statutory guarantee that we will pay 5 per cent. on the money, and therefore there will be no deduction made on that class because whatever may be the terms on which we can borrow money we are obliged to continue to pay to the Provinces, under the statutory agreement made with them, 5 per cent. on whatever amount belonging to them is in our hands. That item of \$13,000,000 is, therefore, unchanged. The result of these statements I may summarise as follows. The nominal debt of \$150,000,000 represents a real debt of \$114,000,000, taking it in connection with our increased credit. The nominal debt of \$12,000,000 represents a real debt of \$8,420,000—that is to say, the \$12,000,000 of Dominion notes floated above the amount of specie reserve which Parliament requires to be held.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). At what rate?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At one-half per cent. for management, and the increased indebtedness of \$4,000,000, for I have only been dealing with that, which stood at \$8,000,000 now stands at \$12,000,000, and that \$4,000,000 would possibly increase the management only in this one-half per cent. All those sums, whatever their character, whether Dominion notes, for which we are answerable, whether money in the savings banks or money deposited for any cause whatever, all appear in the actual amount of indebtedness; and those Dominion notes for which we practically pay nothing, for the amount we float over and above the specie reserve, while it only costs us half per cent., it stands in the nominal indebtedness just in the same position in the public accounts as the money we borrowed in England. The nominal indebtedness of \$10,000,000 in the savings bank, as represented in the calculations which I have made by a real indebtedness of \$29,500,000. The \$12,000,000 of the Canadian Pacific Railway guarantee, which is payable at an average of three years from the present date, and which will be replaced by money at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., represents practically only \$8,300,000. The \$13,000,000 which we owe to the provinces, and for trust funds, over and above balances on the other side, is susceptible of no reduction because we are obliged to continue to pay it. Therefore the \$227,000,000 of nominal indebtedness—the amount that the public accounts show we are indebted—practically represents, taking in connection with the present rate on which Canada is able to borrow money in the markets of the world, \$173,220,000, or a difference of \$53,780,000, as I said before.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would the hon. gentleman state at the end of his speech, how he manages to reduce the savings bank debt from \$40,000,000 to \$29,500,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I have explained that to the hon. gentleman and I will repeat the explanation. That is done by the fact that the \$33,000,000 of increase in the deposits of the savings bank, if changed to a debt bearing $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest; that is to say, to-morrow we can say to the savings bank depositors that all that money costs us is $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Do you propose to notify them to that effect?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman asks me if we propose to notify them. At this moment certainly not, but I do propose to ask the sanction of the House to a measure that will enable us to deal with that question as the interests of the country may require, and I do not think that any fault can be found with the Government if we say to the parties who deposit their money with us for safe keeping: We think it is in the interests of the country to reduce the amount of interest, provided we pay you the same amount as that for which we can borrow money.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The reduction must be solely by reducing the interest to the depositors.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, it would be.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You convey a wrong impression to the public as to the value of the debt.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid my hon. friend has not exactly understood me. What I have stated to the House is this: that when we speak of the burden that rests upon the country, we must take into consideration not merely the nominal amount of indebtedness that Canada has been charged with at the present moment, but we must take into account the reduction that we are compelled to effect in that indebtedness by the enhanced prestige of the country. Of course the hon. gentleman will see that if we were obliged to pay $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. now to the public to obtain money, that he can readily understand that we could not ask the savings bank depositors to take $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But I think the hon. gentleman will see that no just ground of complaint can be made against the Administration, if they were to say to parties who wish to deposit their money with us: We will give you the highest rate of interest that money costs us. And as it is in our power at any moment—I am dealing with a mere hypothesis, for there is a sum that we can practically reduce at any time from \$40,000,000 to \$29,500,000 by changing the rate of interest which we are paying on that money, or replacing it by money at the rate at which we are obliged to borrow it. I hope the hon. gentleman does not suppose that I would wish for a single instant to mislead the House. I am treating it from that standpoint, and I am only making to the House what I trust will be received as a gratifying statement. That is, that our increased credit will enable us—as the burden of the country is to be measured by the annual charge of money, that it is practically borrowed in perpetuity—it practically enables the Government of the day to reduce the nominal indebtedness of \$227,000,000 down to \$173,220,000. That is all that I propose to say in reference to that matter. I have mentioned to the House that we incurred a floating debt of five million dollars during the last year owing to the causes which I explained when I rose. The House is aware that Parliament has imposed liabilities upon the Government to the extent of about \$6,000,000 more, by the aid and subsidies given to railways.

Mr. MITCHELL. How is that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is six and a quarter millions, but I am assuming that perhaps a quarter of a million may not be required. Therefore I am treating that as \$6,000,000 instead of \$6,225,000.

Mr. MITCHELL. Covering what period of time?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is covering the last four or five years I should say.

Mr. MITCHELL. Present outstanding grants?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, it is the subsidies; under the authority to subsidise railways.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Government imposed that on Parliament, and not Parliament on the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says that the Government imposed this on Parliament. I was glad to have my hon. friend's assistance—and most valuable assistance it was—in imposing it on Parliament, because I had the good fortune to be able to show that that hon. gentleman, in the discharge of what he held to be his duty to the country to assist in expanding and developing our Dominion, very kindly, and in my judgment very judiciously, furnished the iron to a number of railways for the purpose of enabling them to get into operation when otherwise they could not get into operation.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I only lent that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman's loaning was something like our borrowing. I am afraid he was loaning them in perpetuity. When you lend a steel rail until it wears out, it is a very long loan. I know my hon. friend's good nature too well to suppose, that if the time came when he was compelled to ask them to return those rails, the last thing he would have done was to tear them up, and take them back into the possession of the Government. The hon. gentleman, I say, did a valuable service to the country in assisting these struggling lines of railway to open up and develop the country; and I, taking advantage, as I have been delighted to do, of the example set by the hon. gentleman, not only followed him in that particular, but I went a little further. I went so far that, as I have frankly stated to the House, I am afraid that the time has come when we are obliged to check that policy a little, and that we shall not be able to realise the expectations of the House and the country this Session as we have done in the past. However, as I have said, that involves a charge of something like \$6,000,000. Then, the Estimates this year provided for an expenditure on capital account of something like \$5,000,000 more. So that, under these circumstances, I find myself obliged to ask for increased borrowing powers with a view to meet these various liabilities; and I have only ventured to take up the time of the House on the present occasion—first, for the purpose of reassuring the House and the country as to the fact, that although there has been a very large increased indebtedness between 1877 and the present time, it is not actually so great as it appears at first sight to be.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does that \$6,000,000 embrace any portion of the ship railway guarantee?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It does not; and I am again reminded that when I brought forward that project my hon. friend did not give it any opposition. That guarantee was not given by a party in this House, but was given by the whole House; and I am only sorry that when that measure was attacked somewhat vigorously by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) the other night, when it was brought forward, not as a new project, but simply in order to give effect to what had been done some years ago in this House, I understand, jointly—

Mr. MITCHELL. Not at all; I always protested against it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the view I take. I am only sorry that my hon. friend, Mr. Mackenzie, was not here on that occasion to show that, having permitted that liability to be assumed when he was leading the Opposition in this House, he felt it was not unreasonable when no additional charge was proposed, that a little extension of time should be given in order to see whether Canada should not set an example to the world of leading in a great enterprise of that kind. I do not intend to detain the House further than to say that the primary object I have had in making this statement, as the Finance Minister of the Government, to this House—a statement that I have taken great pains to verify by the most careful actuarial calculations—was that I felt that it would be not only gratifying to the House and the country at large, but would be of use to Canada when, as I suppose will occur at an early day, we ask in the money markets of the world for an additional loan.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a very few words in reply to some of the points made by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman informs the House that we may fairly assume that the credit of Canada will continue to improve. Well, Sir, that assumption can only be fairly based upon the assumption that the affairs of this country will be economically and prudently managed. Now, I think there is something in the condition of the financial affairs of this country, even at the present moment, that warrants us in pausing to consider whether we are not going too far and too fast in the way of increasing the public debt of Canada. We commenced twenty years ago with a net public debt of somewhat less than \$76,000,000 in round numbers. When my hon. friend's proposition to borrow \$25,000,000, in addition to what we already owe, becomes law, and the money is borrowed, the debt of this country will be \$252,000,000 in round numbers. That is an increase in the public debt in twenty years of \$176,000,000, or an increase of 230 per cent.; and while the debt has been increasing 230 per cent., the population of this country has increased in round numbers 40 per cent. In other words, the increase in the public debt has been six times more rapid than the increase in the population. Now, Sir, I cannot believe, if this ratio of increase is to be continued, that we have any right to assume that our credit will continue to improve, or even to be maintained. Our taxation on customs in 1868 amounted to \$8,578,000; last year it was \$22,378,000, an increase of \$13,800,000 in round numbers in twenty years, or an increase of 160 per cent., an increase in taxation four times more rapid than the increase in the population of this country. In 1868 we expended, chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, in round numbers, \$13,500,000; we are told that our expenditure this year will be \$37,000,000; that is an increase of \$23,500,000 in twenty years, or an increase of 170 per cent., an increase over four times more rapid than the increase in the population. Now, Sir, if this is the condition of things, if we have increased our taxation from customs four times more rapidly than our population has increased, if we have increased our debt six times more rapidly than our population has increased, if we have increased our expenditure four times more rapidly than our population has increased, and if this alarming rate of increase is kept up, if, in fact, it is accelerated, as the policy of the Government leads us to expect it will be, I do not think we can flatter ourselves with the consolation that our credit is to improve in the future. We are taking the very course to impair our credit; and prudence dictates that we should pause in the course that this country has been pursuing for some years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is just what we propose to do.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentlemen takes one rather curious view of the situation. He seems to infer that every reduction in the interest paid on our debt is a reduction in the debt. He tells us that this money is borrowed in perpetuity. I hope that is not the case. I hope the public men of this country have not adopted a policy that does not look to the future liquidation of that debt—that does not look to the time when Canada shall be out of debt. No matter how much the interest on the debt is reduced, the principal of the debt remains; and when we come to pay that, we shall have to pay \$250,000,000, if this resolution is passed, and the burden will be just as much when we come to pay that as it would be if the interest was 4, 5 or 6 per cent. We must bear in mind that our affairs are very intimately connected with those of the United States. I am sure the hon. Finance Minister will admit that that is the case.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Now, the United States are rapidly approaching that period when they will not owe a dollar, for they are rapidly reducing their debt. Their net public debt to-day is something under \$1,200,000,000. They owe *per capita* \$19, while we owe *per capita* \$50.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman take into consideration that outside of that public debt the United States are at this moment obliged to pay \$70,000,000 a year of pension fees, and that instead of decreasing, they are increasing every year?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am quite aware of that fact; and notwithstanding that the United States have a pension list of \$75,000,000, and that next year it will be much more, they are using \$2.03 per head less from customs in defraying the expenses of their Government, the pension list included, than we are using for our expenses. And notwithstanding its pension lists, the expenses of that country chargeable to consolidated fund are not one-half as great per head as the expenses of Canada, and it is this feature of the case that renders it so much more necessary for us to be prudent in the course we pursue with regard to incurring increased debt. Now, I do not rise for the purpose of discussing this question from a party standpoint, but I do rise to urge upon the Government that the time has come when they should, in the interests of the country, go slowly, when they should adopt the policy of prudence and economy. The country does not desire that we should keep borrowing in perpetuity; the country does not desire that we should place upon our shoulders a burden that is to rest there forever. Those who have the interests of Canada at heart desire to see this country, at some future day, free from debt and able to engage in the race of progress on equal terms with the United States; but if the present policy of the Government be continued we will never be able to reach that position. Now we are told by the hon. the Finance Minister that although our debt is large, although we have borrowed a good deal of money and have rapidly increased our public debt, our debt has been incurred for purposes that warrant this increase. I must dissent from that assertion. I must state that it is my belief that the money has been expended for public purposes which do not warrant the increase of debt. I must state that we have comparatively little to show for that debt. We have expended \$45,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway, and we could not, even if we gave that road away, find responsible parties to take it and run it properly.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do not say that.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, I do say that. We are paying every year interest on all the money that has been put into the Intercolonial Railway, and, in addition, a further sum to make up its running expenses. Therefore on that road

Mr. CHARLTON.

there has been an expenditure of between \$10,000,000 and \$50,000,000, which has not been judiciously invested.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is because the road has been mismanaged.

Mr. CHARLTON. That may be true, but I would like to see any one who could manage it so as to make it pay. Our canals, although the expenditure on them is more justifiable than any other expenditure, pay in return almost nothing. We have invested in the Canadian Pacific Railway \$70,000,000 in cash and the net land grant besides, which amounts to about 19,000,000 acres, and it is proposed to grant to that company terms that may amount to the equivalent of a gift of from \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 more. That, I contend, is not a judicious investment, because with that money we could have built the road ourselves and owned it and retained the land. I must entirely dissent from the assertion that the debt has been incurred for purposes which warranted our incurring it. The truth is we have not been prudent. We have increased our debt too fast, we have pursued a reckless course, and the time has come to call a halt; and whatever Government may be in power, that Government should endeavor to place Canada in a sounder financial position. The endeavor of whatever Government may be in power should be to reduce the debt; it should be to lessen the burdens that rest upon the people; and no policy contrary to that is a policy conceived in the interests of this country. The hon. gentleman, and I was a little alarmed at the remark he dropped with regard to Dominion notes, told us that every Dominion note we floated was found money.

Mr. MITCHELL. Less one-half per cent.

Mr. CHARLTON. Less one-half per cent. That is the old doctrine of fiat money.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend must not misrepresent me. I stated that every note Parliament authorised us to float over capital or specie reserve was practically found money, because it cost the country nothing except one-half per cent.; but we cannot issue a note except in conformity with the law of Parliament, after Parliament has carefully settled the rate to which we should go above the specie reserve, and we cannot go beyond that.

Mr. CHARLTON. Supposing Parliament should authorise the Government to issue \$100,000,000 above its specie reserve, would that be found money? The policy pursued leads on to the gulf of fiat money; if a Finance Minister felicitates himself that every dollar of Dominion money issued in excess of specie reserve is found money, why then the temptation will be very strong, should we ever get into financial difficulties, to avail ourselves of that found money to a very large extent, and whenever we go beyond the safe limits of issue, we will have adopted the doctrine of fiat money—and that is the danger. Whenever our financial necessities may induce some Finance Minister in the future to make large issues of Dominion money, we will be face to face with the great disaster that results from an irredeemable currency. I hope, therefore, the hon. the Finance Minister will be satisfied with a very small amount of this found money, and will not endeavour to get himself temporarily out of financial difficulty in the future by adopting the fiat system. I would say one more word with regard to railway subsidies. The hon. the Finance Minister has informed the House that he has copied his policy from that of my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Mackenzie). He tells us that the leader of the former Government (Mr. Mackenzie) inaugurated this system by practically giving railway grants, in the shape of railway iron or old rails, to railways in the Maritime Provinces, and he can see no difference between giving rails and giving money. Well, even if the rails were given, and that state-

ment is denied by the leader of the late Government, who holds that the rails were simply loaned—but even if they were given, there would be this difference between the circumstances of the two cases. In the one case, the Minister had a large quantity of rails for which he had no use, and, in the public interest, he might very properly justify himself in lending or giving them to be made use of; but in the present case, has the Government a large amount of useless money lying idle that it has no use for except to give to some railway corporations?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend is doing a great injustice to the leader of the late Government when he says that he could make no use of our steel rails, because the hon. gentleman knows that every ton of those rails represented just the cash expended on its purchase, and there was no more saleable article in the country.

Mr. CHARLTON. The business of converting old iron into money is a sort of junk business that governments do not often go into. The Government then had old rails on hand for which it had no use, and loaned them to railway companies, but the Government to-day has no surplus of money in its Treasury for which it is difficult to find use; and for every dollar granted as subsidies to railway corporations, the people must be taxed. This system of granting railway subsidies is open to another objection. It is open to the serious objection that the money is used by the Government to promote its own political interests, and that these grants have been made in places where they would do the most good politically, and without reference to the public interests. The whole system is essentially bad, and the sooner it is abandoned the better. It is fortunate if circumstances have forced the Government to abandon it at present, and it will be still more fortunate should the Government conclude, upon principle, to abandon it altogether. I did not rise to make any lengthy remarks on the subject, but, upon the spur of the moment, it struck me that it might be well to point out some of the salient points in regard to our financial position. We are paying out too much, our taxation is too high, the debt of the country is beyond our resources, and the Government should have in view, as its great aim and desire, the necessity of reducing the burdens of the people and pursuing an economical and thrifty rather than the extravagant policy that has been pursued for many years past.

It may be said that the Government of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) was responsible for the increase of the debt to a very large extent, and that the debt increased under his administration as rapidly as it has increased since.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say anything about that.

Mr. CHARLTON. I say it may be said. It is true that the debt increased under the Government of the hon. member for East York by some \$34,000,000, but that was consequent upon the policy of their predecessors, and upon the contracts which they had made, the expenditures they had provided for, the engagements which their successors could not fail to carry out. They had the Intercolonial railway to complete, they had contracts with regard to the public buildings to complete, they had the contracts in reference to canals to complete, they had to proceed to some extent with the scheme of giving the great North-West connection with the East; and, in view of the duty resting upon them to carry out these obligations of the previous Government, which pledged the country to almost every dollar of that amount, it is evident that almost the whole of the increase of \$176,000,000 on the net debt of Canada, if this resolution carries, which has been incurred since the Confederation of the Provinces, is due to the action of the present Govern-

ment or to that of the Government which preceded that of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie)—I mean the Government which existed previous to 1878. I hope the Finance Minister will take this matter into his serious consideration, and will see that an increase of our debt six times more rapid than the increase of population is dangerous, and that an increase of taxation more than four times as rapid as the increase of population is dangerous, and that he will in future pursue an economical and a careful policy so as to preserve this country from the dangers which threaten it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think there is one fallacy of which the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has been guilty. He bases his whole comparison on the population of the country. He must see that that comparison is altogether without proper foundation in this matter which is now in controversy, because the wealth of any place does not depend altogether upon its population. For instance, the wealth of the city of London does not depend upon the fact that it has a population of five millions; and, if we had not had the North-West handed over to us, it would not have been necessary for us to spend this money on the development of that country. It is really because we have not the population which we require that compels us to spend this money which we have expended. That is the reason why we have to expend more money in proportion to the population than those countries which have a larger population. Therefore, I think that the hon. gentleman's argument on that point entirely fails to meet the case.

Mr. LAURIER. I am desired by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to offer his apology for not being in the House to-day, especially as the hon. the Minister of Finance was kind enough to notify him to-day he would bring this very important subject before the House. My hon. friend would have been here but that he was called away upon important business, and his intention is to resume this discussion at a future stage of the measure which will be brought before the House. I was exceedingly gratified to learn from the statement of the Finance Minister that our public debt has decreased actually to the tune of \$53,000,000, but I was very sorry to learn that this is only a figure of speech after all, and that the amount of our debt remains just what it was, and that the ratepayers will have not a cent less to pay than they now have on the liabilities of the country. The only fact which we have really learned is that the rate of interest has been decreasing, but while the rate of interest was decreasing, we find that the Government were taking advantage of it to sink the country further into debt every year. In connection with this, if I followed the argument of the hon. gentleman correctly, I may say that I am not sure that he is a believer in his own theory. I compared his speech with the resolution which has been placed in your hands, and I do not think they are consistent, for he states that the debt is reduced by \$53,000,000 because the rate of interest is reduced to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and I cannot understand why, in that case, he should be authorised to make a loan at the rate of 4 per cent., because in that way, according to his own theory, he will lose so much.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is nothing like a margin.

Mr. LAURIER. I know there is nothing like a margin for the present Government, but the hon. gentleman is taking the margin in another way. He says he wants this amount to pay the public debt of the country and the expenditure on public works carried on by the Government of Canada. If I understand him aright, he has taken a margin of no less than \$30,000,000. He stated that the floating debt was only \$1,000,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Pounds.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood him to say dollars, but if it is pounds, then that is \$5,000,000. He has in that case not taken quite so large a liberty. He says he wants \$5,000,000 for floating debt, liabilities incurred in regard to railway subsidies, \$6,000,000, and public expenditure provided for this year, \$5,000,000. That would be \$16,000,000, and the hon. gentleman asks power to borrow \$25,000,000. I hope the hon. gentleman will give some explanation of that to the committee before he carries this resolution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You are not obliged to borrow the whole amount which Parliament gives you the authority to borrow, and the hon. gentleman will find, if he looks back on the Acts which have passed, that the Government have always had parliamentary sanction for borrowing a larger amount than that which was actually required.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is there any unexhausted amount now?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; there are about \$11,000,000 authorised which have not been used.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose that is on the theory of a wide margin.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has protested against this measure, but he and his party have admitted that all the improvements and all the undertakings of this country are due to the gentlemen who sit on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman says that the expenditures made by the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) were engagements entered into by the Government which preceded that. Therefore he admits that all the undertakings, in regard to public works in this country, are due to the gentlemen who sit upon this side of the House, and who are now conducting the affairs of the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. And conducting them very badly, too.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman says that they are very badly conducted. I do not think it matters much what opinion the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has of the way in which they have been conducted. We will not admit that he is a very good judge of what is done, well or ill, but we will go to other authorities. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that it depends altogether upon the way in which matters are conducted, as to what credit we can have in the money market. From 1878 to the present time, the public credit has been steadily and rapidly rising, and therefore, according to the view of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that is evidence that our position has been improving.

Mr. LISTER. Have not the Australian colonies and others improved their credit as well as we have?

Mr. McLELAN. Not nearly to the same extent, and I think they have run in debt to an extent of \$2 or \$4 to \$1 of ours. Their taxation is stated by English authorities as being at least three and a half times the amount of the burden which is placed on the people of Canada. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that our taxation has increased four-fold in proportion to the population. Let us turn to the taxation from customs and excise, or at least the amount received which is regarded as taxation. In 1875, the taxation per head from customs, excise and stamps amounted to \$5.30. In 1887, notwithstanding all the expenditures which had been made, and which the hon. gentleman says is four-fold what it was in 1867, yet from 1875 to 1887 the receipts from customs, excise and

Mr. LAURIER.

stamps have only amounted to \$5.79, as against \$5.30 in 1875 per head.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. I stated that the increase in taxation from customs had been four times more rapid than the increase in population; and my comparison between the increased debt and the increased expenditure was based upon the comparison between the increase in that amount and the increase in population.

Mr. McLELAN. I am taking the taxation from customs, excise and stamps in 1875, and I am comparing it with 1887, and I find that there has only been an increase of 49 cents per head of the population. Now, with all that has been accomplished in these twelve years, with all that has been accomplished since the present Government resumed the reins of power, I think the country has reason to be gratified that there has only been this small increase of taxation. I shall not prolong the discussion at the present time. I only make these remarks to show that the taxation of the country has not increased beyond what would be warranted by the expenditure.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is one statement made by the Finance Minister which, I think, he ought not to have given utterance to, and that is, that Canada, in effecting these loans, in increasing this debt, is borrowing money that she never intends to pay. If that idea becomes prevalent throughout the country it will lead—in what direction? It will lead in the direction of carelessness and ultimately to repudiation, and instil into the minds of the people the idea that all they have to do is to go to the money markets of the world and borrow money, and that they will never have to pay it. Some future generation may, but we are not to concern ourselves about that at all. Whenever we find ourselves in a tight place, after having recklessly wasted money, finding that our credit is good, we will borrow with the intention of never paying. I say, Sir, that is a sentiment that it is not desirable to encourage in the country. Why, Sir, other nations have been in debt, and they do not teach their people that they never intend to pay their debts; other nations have contracted an enormous debt, and they have gone on reducing it until soon they will have wiped it out altogether, and its burden will be lifted from the people. But we are being instructed in the doctrine that all we have to do is to go on and spend money recklessly and extravagantly in this direction and in that, our credit being still good in the money markets of the world, we will go on and borrow, never intending to repay at all. Then I want to make one remark about what was said by the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) who, alluding to the argument of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), said that you were not to measure the wealth of a country by the population that was in the country. My hon. friend for North Norfolk based an argument upon the undesirability of greatly increasing the public debt, or of increasing it in a far greater ratio than the increase of population. His argument amounted to this: that if your population was increasing in a like ratio, as it is not, with the increase of your public debt, the burden upon your people would not become greater, and therefore could be renewed with more safety. But the hon. member for Muskoka says that does not follow, that the wealth of the country does not depend upon its population, that they may be more wealthy and better able to bear taxation, even if your population has not increased in the like ratio. There is this fundamental mistake that the hon. gentleman made, to which I wish to call attention, and all the sophistries of the Finance Minister in reducing this debt, as he does, simply by his paper arguments, will not overcome the fact that it is not the wealth of the country that is taxed to pay the interest on

the millions we borrowed, but it is the people of the country who are taxed. The system of taxation that is levied upon the people of this country, by which we raise the interest that is to be paid for these sums we are borrowing, is a system that bears not upon the wealth, but it bears upon the inhabitants of the country, and more unequally and more unjustly upon the poor than it does upon the wealth of the country. The Finance Minister has lost sight of this fact, and while he speaks of the improved credit of Canada, perhaps it would be as well to take into consideration that there has been a plethora of money, and the rates of interest have decreased. Take his own argument. He says we have deposits in the savings banks. People are depositing their moneys at 4 per cent., and that is their income, that is their wealth. He says that we can reduce that to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The moment it is reduced to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., are these depositors not $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. poorer, and that much less able to pay the additional burden placed upon them? And so this fallacy is running all through his arguments. A man might very well afford to pay his share of the public debt at 4 per cent. with wheat at \$1 and \$1.25 per bushel, but when his wheat brings but 70 to 75 cents per bushel, then ask him if he is just as able to pay $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. as to pay 4 per cent? Ask him which position he would rather be in? Sir, the position you have to face is this: A time has come in the history of our country when the earnings of the people are less than they were, when the agriculturist is not receiving the profits that he once received, when the business man is transacting his business on a smaller and slimmer margin; a time has come when wages have been increased, but when the additional taxation, the burdens that have been levied upon him by this Government, take more from him than the additional amount that he receives in wages; and the result is that to-day you have a people in Canada less able to bear the rate of interest now existing, reduced though it may be, than they were a few years ago when the interest was higher. Sir, these are things to be borne in mind. I may have borrowed \$2,000 upon a building, and the builder may think it is worth somewhat more, and I wish to put an increased loan upon that building. What would the lender say to whom I would go? Would not he judge it by the rent that I received, by the revenue coming in from that building? Would that not enter into his calculation as to whether it was a safe investment to loan any more money upon it? Therefore when you are considering our credit, when you are considering the sums that we have paid for public works, as the Minister tells us, as a reason for our enhanced credit and I agree with him in part—the question does come in as to whether your money has been invested in such public works as will repay you, as will be profitable to you, as will give you an increased value on which you may make your security better. Sir, I think, looking at it in that light, we can scarcely congratulate ourselves to the extent the Finance Minister has done, with reference to the public works, which, he says, have almost wholly entailed this debt upon us. It has been pointed out that at any rate 40 or 50 millions of that money, in the Intercolonial Railway, is not to-day a paying investment, but that taxes are actually taken out of the people in order to make the two ends meet. Then it will not be claimed that up to the present time the expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway has been a paying investment so far as bringing an additional population into the country is concerned, that will help the present inhabitants in paying the debt. With reference to our canal system I regret to say that so far as income is concerned, it is much in the same position. But there is a ray of light in the statement we have heard from the Finance Minister to-day; there has dawned upon his mind the fact that the public debt of Canada is something alarming, even without his proposed addition of \$25,000,000, and therefore he comes to Parliament with a nicely prepared

statement, fallacious in many respects, in order to lead the people of Canada to believe that, though nominally they are already indebted to the extent of \$227,000,000, and he proposed to add \$25,000,000 more to-day, yet after all, he can figure out on paper that it is \$53,000,000 less than that sum, upon which you will have to pay interest, and so, after all, you need not be so alarmed about it. The very statement made by the Finance Minister shows that the fact has at last dawned upon him that the public debt of Canada, in proportion to her population and resources, is such as to make men pause and think, and when the hon. gentleman comes to this House to ask for power to increase that debt by \$25,000,000, I am glad to see that he finds it necessary to make the explanation he has offered. I tell him that with a public debt including these \$25,000,000, amounting to no less than \$252,000,000, with a population of not more than 5,000,000 to pay the interest, and with a system of taxation so levied and adjusted that it does not bear on the wealth of the country, but presses on the great mass of the people, the country feels it difficult to bear the burthen, and as years go on, unless there is an addition to the values of our products and increased remuneration paid for labor, it will find the burthen still more difficult to bear. It is time the Ministry and this House, and the country, too, to seriously consider the position of affairs in which we stand. I was led to make these remarks only by the statement of the Finance Minister that the Government were borrowing money which they never intended to pay. Such a statement will tend to recklessness and extravagance instead of to a policy which I think the best interests of the country demand, a policy of prudence and economy in the management of our public affairs.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). One statement has been made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) which I should not like to go to the country unchallenged. He said the public debt had increased between 1867 and 1878, from \$76,000,000 to \$252,000,000. He was not candid enough to say that \$109,000,000 of that increase was debt owing by the Provinces of this country, and assumed by this Dominion, so that the net increase of the public debt, that is the increase in the debt of the country should properly be reduced by the amount of debt owing by the Provinces assumed by the Dominion. Deducting that amount of \$109,000,000 from \$252,000,000, which the debt will be after this loan of \$25,000,000 is made, only gives an increase of \$143,000,000. Deducting from this amount of \$73,000,000 which the Dominion was in debt at the time of Confederation, there appears an increase of only \$67,000,000, or 88 per cent. instead of 238 per cent. as stated by that hon. gentleman. I conceive it to be a duty to myself not to allow this statement to go to the country unchallenged. The \$75,000,000 paid in pensions on the other side of the line, and which is a burden on that country, represents a capital of about \$2,500,000,000, which the hon. gentleman may add to the public debt of the United States if he desires to do so.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has not corrected the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), whose argument was based on our net debt. Our debt, according to the admission of the Finance Minister, will not be less than \$300,000,000.

Mr. DAVIN. I was very sorry to hear my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) make what seems to me to be a demagogic speech on a subject like this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. DAVIN. I say a demagogic speech on a subject like this. It was the sort of speech which the hon. gentleman has probably recently made, one that he has probably made many a time from a platform; but I say it is not the

sort of speech which should be made on a financial question like this.

An hon. MEMBER. You make one.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, if the hon. gentleman will have the courtesy to listen to me I will try to make one. I listened to the statement of the Finance Minister with critical care, and I say that every statement he made and every calculation he made will bear criticism. As to the statement made and the figures given in regard to what might be called the real debt and the nominal debt of Canada, you will find a counterpart of the history which the Finance Minister has given in the history of finance in England, and if you turn back to the speeches made by Mr. Gladstone in the earlier days of his financial statements, you will find him pointing to exactly the same thing having taken place in England,—that while the debt had increased the credit of the country had increased, that its borrowing power had increased, and by consequence, though the debt was at a given figure, it was, in view of the power of England to meet that debt, a lower debt considered as a burden than it stood at actually in the books. That is what the Finance Minister comes to us and points out, that although the debt be \$227,000,000 it is not so terrible as it appears to be, because the credit of the country has advanced, and whereas twelve years ago we had to pay 4½ per cent, we can now borrow at 3½. With reference to the statement of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) that the Minister declared that we were borrowing money never to repay it, I understand the Finance Minister to have made no such statement as that. What I understood the Minister to say, and I think I understood him correctly, was that when we go into the money market to borrow, we look forward to a time when we shall go into the money market again when we want to pay the debt with another loan made at a better price, at a lower rate of interest than we had to pay for the loan previously obtained and which we desired to pay off. And so we go on in the same course of finance that has distinguished every country where the science has been well understood. It is a statesman-like exposition of our condition, and does not justify the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) declaring to the country that we stand before the world ready to repudiate our debts. The hon. member for Brant is great on illustrations, and is especially strong on concrete illustrations. He is one of the most effective members on the Reform side when an election fight is on, and he likes a concrete illustration. He gave us an illustration. He said: Suppose I have a house and I think it is worth \$2,000, I go to a man to borrow money on the house, but he is not prepared to advance as much as I ask because he does not think the house is worth quite what I think it is worth. Look at the position—we are in exactly that position. But our solvency is the converse of that assumed to be ours by the hon. gentleman. We go to the lenders in the money market. We say: We have a great Dominion, we have built great public works for the purpose of enriching our country—because no doubt the hon. gentleman, who is ambitious to be one day Finance Minister, knows that money is not wealth. What do we find? As the Finance Minister tells us, our credit is rated third in the money markets of the world, and we are able to borrow at a lower rate than ever before. So the illustration that the hon. gentleman gave turns back on himself and refutes the loud-mouthed fallacy he gave this House. The hon. gentleman also said that the Canadian Pacific Railway had not produced the results that were anticipated, and he very properly mentioned population. It is by adding to the population of this country undoubtedly that the Dominion will progress and our burdens be diminished. But has the Canadian Pacific Railway had time? I understand that at the present moment emigrants are flowing westward.

Mr. DAVIN.

No doubt a few years hence my hon. friend will not come here and say, the Canadian Pacific Railway is doing now much more than it did a few years ago. He will come here and find some new reason for denouncing the Government of the day. I have referred to the state of our finances in England. We know if you take up an English newspaper, the *Times* for instance, and look down its monetary column, some of the prominent words that meet you there are “consols,” “reduced threes,” “new threes” and so on. What, Sir, do “consols” mean? They mean that in 1751, or thereabouts, a lot of debts that had been incurred on account of wars and what not, had been consolidated at a lower rate of interest. The same thing is true of “reduced threes,” and the same thing is true of other financial items in the English money market. That is the history of one of the most successful financial nations in the world, which nation has been expanding at a rate of wealth that probably has never been equalled. History, comparing great things with small, leads us to expect a similar state of affairs in this Dominion of Canada. The public credit to-day stands high. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) made a statement which my friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) controverted, and there again I rather think he misrepresented my hon. friend from Muskoka. I apprehend that my hon. friend did not say that population had no relation to wealth, but what I understood him to say was, that great public works had to be projected and carried out because we had a vast extent of country through which those lines of railway should run, in order to bring them within a civilised condition and to ultimately increase the population of Canada.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes, I said that. I also meant to say that population was only one of the elements that had to be taken into account, whereas the hon. gentleman treated it as the only element.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) made a statement that has often been refuted in this House, and on the platforms in this country. It is refuted every day in the press, refuted in the well known sentiments of the people of this country and refuted by the fact that on three successive occasions the present Government has been returned to power. He makes the statement that taxation is pressing on the poor and not on the wealthy. He makes the statement that wealth can go “scott free,” although if he examines our tariff it will show him, that it is actually contrived to press rather on the middle and wealthy classes than on the poor classes with whom he pretends to have so much sympathy. The poor man does not suffer by it; the votes of the poor men carried the day, but there is a two-fold proposition in this, there is the proposition that if they were in power again they would conduct the affairs of the country in such a way, as not to press on the poor man and that the present administration presses hard upon him. If the present Administration in Canada is pressing on the poor man why do they return it to power? Are the people all gone mad? What is the meaning that in three successive elections they have returned this Government to power with large majorities? I believe that on an occasion like this, we ought to discuss a great financial question such as the Minister has presented to us, free from party feeling and the disturbing passions that belong to party controversy. For myself I can say that I never attacked a man in all my life, unless he richly deserved it, or a cause or a party either, and it is always unpleasant for me, especially on an occasion like this, to deal with it in any other way than purely as a question of what is beneficial to the interests of the country. I repeat what I have said in the beginning, and it has been my business all through my life to criticise and discuss and write about financial statements. I say that the statement

made by the Minister showing that our credit has advanced is irrefragable and that you cannot assail it successfully. The Minister of Finance has shown that although our nominal debt is at a given amount, our liabilities as compared with our capacity to meet them—the relation between the burden and the potentiality of dealing with the burden is such at present, that our debt is actually not as greatly in excess of the debt of ten or twenty years ago as it seems at first sight to be.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am sure that the Finance Minister was highly flattered to find that his financial exposition has received an endorsement, so able and so clear, from the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. I should like to have heard the opinion from the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Perley) as to some of the statements he made, as to whether he was really so generous or so chivalrous in his attacks on other people. I was present the other day at an entertainment given by Canada's humorist, Mr. Bengough, and among other amusing sketches he drew, was one in which the Prime Minister was holding in his hands a portfolio, and opposite it, holding out his hand was the figure of my esteemed friend from Assiniboia who was offering to carry this portfolio. It is quite evident, I think, from the speech we have had to-day that the views of the member from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) are changed in regard to the particular portfolio he deserves, or which he would desire to have. It is clear that the rumour having become prevalent that the Finance Minister wishes to remove from his present sphere of operations, the hon. gentleman wishes to show his qualifications to assume that important, vacant portfolio. I am sure that the very clear, the very concise, and the very easily understood speech he has delivered will be a sufficient recommendation to the hon. the First Minister as to the member for Assiniboia's (Mr. Davin) qualifications for his appointment to that position when it unfortunately becomes vacant. I have only risen for one purpose, and that was to refer to the statement the hon. gentleman has made, and which has been endorsed by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. The Finance Minister has presented to this House, cleverly no doubt, a hypothesis as if it were tangible and real. We know the other day that the Finance Minister of Great Britain, converted her three per cent. console, into two and a half, and by that financial operation, successful as it was in the money market, he made a brilliant stroke and saved a large amount of money to the people of the country. But the hon. the Finance Minister is aware that it is not in his power to convert our six or five per cent. debt into three per cents. This debt stands in the shape of bonds payable years hence, now bearing a fixed interest. Whether the interest is five and four per cent. interest, it will have to be paid for the next ten or twenty or thirty years. The hon. the Finance Minister cannot change those bonds into bonds bearing three per cent. If we were in a position to convert those into three per cent., I would say you are making a great saving in your debt. The hypothesis might be easily understood as the member who sat down said it was, but he knows that those abstract calculations cannot be grasped in a moment. Further my hon. friend says he followed them with critical appreciation, and I can understand very well that some men are naturally clear and apt in appreciating points of that kind. I have no doubt my hon. friend was able to understand him, but I do not think the general public will understand him. I think the hon. leader of the Opposition summed it up in a phrase when he said that while he was delighted after he heard the speech, his delight was turned into sorrow when he reflected that it was after all only a theory, which could not be carried into practice. Our debt remains the same, and will be the same during the coming year. No change will be made by the hon. gentleman in the interest we now pay, but 4, 5 or 6 per cent. will continue

to be paid for the next five or ten years, because you cannot convert the bonds bearing those rates into bonds bearing a lower rate of interest; so that even if the hon. gentleman's contention were correct, you could not apply it to reduce the debt. There is another remark that I would make. The hon. gentleman stated that he was making this financial statement, not merely for this House or this country, but for the money market of the world, where he was going to borrow, and he argued that our net debt was only \$227,000,000 in round numbers. There is this to be said however, about it, and it is well to be frank: Our total debt is \$273,000,000, which we reduce by certain assets which we say we possess. The hon. gentleman knows that a large number of these assets are merely nominal; and he knows that he has resolutions before this House for wiping out millions on millions of these very assets, such as the Quebec harbor works, the improvements in the St. Lawrence, and the St. Charles tidal dock. I think it is hazardous for a man to express any settled opinion as to the value of these assets; but having gone over them from time to time, I think the hon. gentleman will bear me out in saying that at least \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 of our assets are merely paper assets, and nothing more. We have no right to assume our debt to be \$227,000,000 net. It is nearer \$240,000,000 net; and we have no right to assume that we are only paying 3 or 3½ per cent., because the interest we shall have to pay for many years to come is fixed at a higher rate, and we cannot convert it into a lower rate. The hon. gentleman expects that he will be able to borrow this money at 3½ per cent.; but if he does, he is certainly not pursuing the policy which his predecessor did, and which I imagine would be good policy. If he takes power to borrow at 4 per cent., that is pretty good evidence that he does not expect to get the money at a lower rate. However, I do not criticise the hon. gentleman's method; I leave that to others more familiar with such matters. I join in the expression of regret given by the hon. leader of the Opposition, that the hon. gentleman did not take the House and the country more into his confidence, and tell us all the purposes for which he wants this large sum. He has given us items amounting to \$16,000,000, and he has a margin of \$11,000,000 remaining from the authority to borrow which he previously obtained; and in addition there is \$9,000,000 of this amount, making in all \$36,000,000. I think we have a right to be taken into the hon. gentleman's confidence to a much larger extent than he has taken us as to the purpose for which he wants to borrow that large amount of money. I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) that in giving the Finance Minister unlimited authority of this kind, we are only encouraging extravagance, and inviting hon. gentlemen behind the hon. Finance Minister to press him for extravagant grants for all kinds of objects which he should not make.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has expressed my views so well, that I do not think I will travel over the ground which he has traversed. I may, however, make some slight reference to two or three matters. The hon. Finance Minister this afternoon—and he has done it on more than one occasion this Session—twitted hon. members on this side that they had assented to certain propositions, notably the Chignecto Railway and the Pictou Railway, because we did not get up and divide the House on them. Now, I am not going to attempt to divide the House on this scheme of the hon. Minister of Finance, although I think it is the duty of the Government, when they submit a scheme to Parliament for their consideration, to state fully and explicitly the objects for which they demand the assent of Parliament. Especially when asking for such an enormous amount of money as is involved in this scheme, I think it was the duty of the hon. Finance Minister to enter, in greater detail

and greater particularity, into the matter, not only for the information of this House, but for the country. Why, Sir, he has given us only three or four items, and these in gross and general terms. As I understand the position stated by the hon. gentleman, we owe \$227,000,000 net. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) looking at our so-called assets, a portion of which are of such a class as we have in the Quebec harbor bonds, and at what has been said about the Intercolonial Railway, claims our net debt to be \$240,000,000. Practically there is about \$300,000,000 of gross debt standing to-day against this country, and if we had to realise on our assets, I am afraid they would not reduce the gross debt to any great extent, and that we would find that our net debt amounted to nearly the full amount of our gross debt. I am not one of those who have taken the position that expenditure for public purposes, even when not reproductive in the way of revenue, were not valuable to the country. I have not taken the view of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House with reference to our expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, the outlay for the Pacific Railway and the canals; but when we begin to talk of these as an asset which is convertible to pay the debt of this country, I claim it to be a fallacy. We ought to look the thing in the face, and not allow ourselves to be deceived. The hon. gentleman has asked this House for a credit of \$25,000,000; in other words, he asks us to give him power to go into the markets of the world and borrow that sum. In addition to that he admits that he has an unused authority to borrow \$11,000,000, which, added to the \$25,000,000 makes \$36,000,000, which he asks this House to give him authority to borrow in the British market. Now, Sir, what do we want of \$36,000,000? Is there any necessity for it? With the taxes increased as they have increased—with the people suffering—with every industry in the country feeling the effect of the high taxation, not only upon the food and the clothing which the workmen wear, but on the materials which go into the production of their manufactures, I say it is no time to ask this House to give authority to the Ministry of the day to go into the British market and borrow money to the extent of \$36,000,000. I am not going to follow the hon. gentleman in the different explanations he made. I may, however, say this in regard to what he said about the savings banks account, that he admits himself that he is not prepared to ask this House to enable him to borrow the money at once for the purpose of recasting that debt, but states that he may possibly ask the House for authority to do it. But if he were prepared to ask this House for authority to reduce the interest on deposits in the savings banks from 4 to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and thus save a certain sum to the Government, no doubt it would save money to the Treasury, but it would reduce, as my hon. friend for North Norfolk said, the earning capacity of the men who have money invested. I would not oppose the proposition, however, on that ground. I am not prepared to say that the suggestion ought not to be carried out. I am rather inclined to think it should. I am also inclined to think that the post office savings banks, which were established mainly for the benefit and advantage of the poorer classes, have been largely utilised for the purpose of investment by the rich, and that the country would save, while, at the same time, the poor man would be protected to a certain extent, though he would not get as much as he does now, he would get all that the Government can afford to pay, looking at what they have to pay to the public when they go into the money market of the world. My hon. friend from North Norfolk spoke about the Intercolonial Railway. I feel it necessary, because it will be said by-and-bye, should this Government attempt to sell that road that I assented by my silence, and I am credibly informed that negotiations were in operation during the past year with the view of

Mr. MITCHELL,

selling it to a syndicate, and that the hon. the Finance Minister carried on those negotiations.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend allow me to say that there is not the slightest foundation for that statement. I have never had any proposal made to me for the purchase of the Intercolonial Railway. I have never been a party to any negotiations of any kind whatever in that view, nor am I aware of any such negotiations having taken place.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to hear that statement. I was credibly informed by a person whom I believed when he made the statement, and I saw a book printed with the whole thing set out as a prospectus, and I am told, moreover, that one of the persons projecting the purchase and that the promoters of the scheme had costly engineers upon that road for months gathering statistics in reference to it, and that a conference was held in London, with three, if not four, Cabinet Ministers present, in which a discussion was held as to the advisability of the Government prosecuting a sale to that syndicate. I am glad to hear the hon. the Finance Minister say he has never had anything to do with it, but the information came in such a direct and positive manner that it impressed me as true and I believed it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend never had the information, which he states he had, from anybody. He never had the information that any proposal of the kind was made in England, when three Ministers were present.

Mr. MITCHELL. I tell the hon. gentleman he has said what he does not know.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. He has stated what he does not know. How does he know I never had information to that effect? How can he state it? I tell him he said what is not correct.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think what my hon. friend, the Secretary of State, means to say is that no such thing ever took place, and, therefore, it was not correct information that was given to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have said, and I said it knowing what I was saying, that the information the hon. gentleman may have had was another information, that he never had the information he has given this House.

Mr. MITCHELL. What was the information I had? If you know more about it than I do, tell us what it was.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I know the hon. gentleman had some information in Montreal before the interview which took place.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then there was an interview?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We had an interview. My hon. friend may have had information of a certain gentleman, whom he knows and I know, but I say he never had from him the slightest insinuation or information that anything of the kind concerning the Intercolonial Railway was spoken of at that conference in London; and I know that he had not.

Mr. MITCHELL. I can tell my hon. friend that he is stating what he does not know.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I know it.

Mr. MITCHELL. You do not know it, and you are undertaking to tell us what you do not know. I repeat that I had the information, and I had it from a gentleman whom I believed to be telling the truth, and I have seen the prospectus or book which was printed—a very expensively got-up book—and it was intimated that they could get the Intercolonial Railway, which cost \$45,000,000 for \$15,000,000. That I heard, and I had my information pretty direct. And my hon. friend seems to know something about the

meeting in London. He admits there was a meeting, and yet he has the audacity to state that I had not information, that I do not know—

Mr. CHAPLEAU. You do not.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say I do; and if it was parliamentary to use stronger language, I would use it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to say that I was present at an interview at which were present my hon. colleagues the Minister of Customs and the Secretary of State, in my office in London, that Mr. Kamper, the gentleman to whom the hon. member refers, was one of the parties present. That was an interview with a syndicate of gentlemen connected with the iron industry, who came to London for the purpose of laying before me a proposition for the manufacture of steel rails in Canada, and that during that interview, or any other interview of any kind, not one word was ever said with reference to any negotiation or proposal for the purchase of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. MITCHELL. The gentleman to whom the hon. the Minister of Finance refers was not the source of my information, but it was that gentleman who conducted the negotiations, as I was informed, for the purchase of the road. I learned that negotiations for the establishment of steel works was the subject of the meeting also, and, as an adjunct of it, the purchase of the Intercolonial Railway for the purposes of transport was a feature of the scheme; and it was told that intimations came also from another Minister, who was not there, that \$15,000,000 would be considered not an unacceptable offer, if made for the purchase of the road. One of the objects I had in rising was to protest against that road being sold for any sum to any private or speculative corporation for any purpose. That road is part of the charter by which the Maritime Provinces are tied to the Dominion. It is part of the agreement by which we of the Maritime Provinces were induced to enter Confederation for the purpose of making a practical connection, not a mere paper one, as it would have been if we had not the Intercolonial Railway; and no man knows better than the hon. the Finance Minister, who formed part of the conference held in London, as I did myself, which created the document that bound the Maritime Provinces to this portion of Canada, that the road was built, not for the purpose of making money out of it, not for the purpose of drawing revenue, but with the national object of creating a union; and when the hon. member for North Norfolk points to the road as a non-payable asset, I say to him: Why, it is not an asset at all. It is part of the national constitution; it is in the British North America Act, and forms part of the constitution of this country. I have risen on this occasion for one purpose amongst others, for the purpose of letting these hon. gentlemen opposite understand that if there were negotiations in London—and I believe there were, and elsewhere, too, and perhaps the hon. the Secretary of State knows more about it than he likes to say—these negotiations were striking at the root of this union which is binding the Maritime Provinces to old Canada.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. What do you know about it? That road was built under a solemn contract. It formed part of the bargain, and it was because it formed part of the bargain that we entered Confederation. Any attempt, therefore, to sell that road or to put it into the hands of private corporations for speculative or other purposes, or to pass it out of the hands or the control of the Government in any way, would be a violation of the contract by which these Provinces are bound together, and would be a fair ground for the Provinces to contend that the compact was at an

end. I am not one of those who would like to see anything of the kind. We are bound together; I desire that we should remain together, and I want to see our constitution made as perfect as possible, and the attempt to sell our road is a violation of that contract; but I fear we are running too much into debt. Our debt has now reached nearly \$300,000,000, and with the power to borrow \$36,000,000, \$25,000,000 by this resolution, and \$11,000,000 by the authority to borrow under previous resolutions, yet unused, besides \$15,000,000 which we will be shortly asked to guarantee for the Canadian Pacific, we may well look with alarm to the increasing debt of the country. What does it mean? The increase of indebtedness must mean the increase of the cost of living not only to the rich, but to the middle classes and to the poor of this country, and the cost of living is now very far beyond what it should be in relation to the earning powers of the people. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance made a very specious case when he said that, because he can borrow money for 3½ per cent. for which we are now paying 4 or 5 or 6 per cent., that would reduce the amount of our indebtedness by \$53,000,000. That is a fallacy. It is true that, if we never intend to pay the debt, it would reduce the amount we have annually to pay, and he almost said what would amount to that. Then, it would make very little difference. But upon that hypothesis, I am afraid the credit of the country would not stand very well in borrowing any further amount in the money market. We may assume that the \$53,000,000 which he proposes to save by the reissue of bonds at the reduced rate of interest of 3½ per cent. instead of 4, 5 or 6 per cent. would be a reduction in the interest. But the debt is not reduced at all. The debt is the same. It may not cost as much for interest, but the debt remains, and it is well understood that we have to pay these debts some time or other; and, unless we announce that fact and admit that fact, we could not borrow any money at all. There is another hypothesis upon which he proposes to go into the money markets of the world and save money to us, and that is that when these debts mature he will be able to obtain new loans at a less interest. How does he know that? He may have to pay 6 per cent. We have no assurance that money will not go up in value in a few years; a threatened war or a general disturbance in Europe would disturb the whole proposition; and yet the hon. gentleman says that he is going to save \$53,000,000. The Postmaster General has chosen to challenge my authority as to the mode of governing this country. He says that he questions whether the authority of the member for Northumberland is very good in reference to the government of this country. I will only say one word on that subject, and it is this, and I will leave it to hon. gentlemen who sit around him as to the truth of it: that, if I was not a better administrator than he has been, if I gave no better satisfaction to the hon. gentlemen who sat around me and to the public than he has done, I would have very little to boast of to-day.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the House cannot too strongly emphasise its disapproval of the new doctrine of the Minister of Finance, which is neither more nor less than a policy of repudiation. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) appeared to agree with the Minister of Finance in all his utterances, but I doubt if he apprehended the full effect of his argument. The hon. gentleman prepared a statement which was intended to show that our public debt, instead of being \$27,000,000, by his species of financing, was \$53,000,000 less. To-morrow, no doubt the Minister of Finance will be telling the country, through the newspapers, that our debt is only \$175,000,000, because, when our liabilities mature, they are renewed at a reduced rate; but you are taking credit to-day for what may or may not

be the outcome of the future, you are assuming that the country will never be called upon to pay this \$53,000,000. How did the \$227,000,000 fall to \$175,000,000? It is in that way and to that extent that the Finance Minister is teaching the people the doctrine of repudiation. In that amount which he says the country will save, there is included \$8,000,000 of promissory notes, that is, legal tender notes owing by this country. Does he mean to say that the country does not owe the amount of these legal tenders? Does he mean to say that those cannot be exchanged for gold? If he does, I venture to say that the notes will be exchanged for gold to-morrow. He says that these are not a legal liability, but the fact of his stating that may make them an instantaneous legal liability. The member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) refers to the case of England. It is well known that England has been able frequently to renew her debt, and that there are many who contend that the national debt of England is an advantage to the country, but on what ground is that? It is on the ground that the bonds are held by the people of the country themselves, that it binds the country together, and makes the people in favor of the preservation of the constitution, but is it not very different here? Here, as the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) should see, we should establish such a condition of affairs that we should not be transmitting millions of dollars a year out of Canada to pay the interest on our debt. Is that for the interest of the people of Canada? Is it for the interest of our people that we should educate them to believe that it is a good thing to borrow all you can, to mortgage all your property, and to create an interminable debt which will be continuous as time itself, by which the energies of the people shall be taxed for all time in order to remit money abroad? I look forward to a time when our people will be in a better position than to require them to remit money abroad, and it is not in the interest of Canada to encourage extravagant expenditure on the idea that there never will be a pay day. The only check against extravagance and improvidence is the idea that at some day or other these liabilities have to be paid; and, if the Finance Minister does not desire his doctrine of what I claim to be repudiation to lead to its natural results, let him get up and state that there was no ground for his statement that our debts should not be paid. Let us have some stability in this matter. In 1884 he declared that if we gave him \$30,000,000 he would do away with the policy of disallowance. We gave him the money and in 1887 the hon. Minister and all his party, assisted by the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) repudiated that. They repudiated in 1887 what they promised in 1884, and this year they have repudiated what they did in 1887. You do not find the same policy, but it is practically repudiation in regard to all their principles, and they are carrying that out in regard to the national debt now. I think we cannot, as a House, take too strong ground in favor of the view that Canada intends to pay her debts when the obligations fall due. That is the obligation we want to live up to, and, whether it be soon or late, let it be understood that it is our policy to pay off our national debt and so to make the people of Canada a free people.

Mr. MADILL. Is the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in favor of the Government assuming the debts of the Provincial Governments to the extent of \$107,000,000? Is he in favor of the Dominion Government assuming those provincial debts as part of the national debt?

Mr. MULOCK. Am I in favor of what?

Mr. McMULLEN. In my opinion, we are called upon to consider the most important matter that has been brought before us during this Session. We are now considering the very large increased indebtedness that rests upon this country. A great many people in this country know

Mr. MULOCK.

what it is to get into debt, and there are many people, who, from their personal experience, would be able to realize the fallacy of the argument that has been presented by the Minister of Finance to show the manner in which he would reduce the public debt of this country. Now, Sir, I hold that the question before us of giving the Government power to borrow in the British market such a very large amount of money, is a very serious one. During the last general election when the hon. gentlemen opposite appealed to the country, they made the statement that the national debt was \$196,000,000, and that the interest *per capita* was \$1.65. They went on to show that, comparing that sum with what the people paid during the *regime* of the Mackenzie Government, they were only paying 3 cents a head more. But when we came to find out the exact facts, when Parliament met, we ascertained that the debt of this country, instead of being \$196,000,000 it was \$227,000,000, and that the *per capita* interest, instead of being \$1.65, was at least \$1.98. We found that the Government succeeded so far in secret- ing from the people the true financial condition of this country that, on the strength of that statement, they were able to get back into power. Now, they come down and virtually confess to this House that they require to borrow a very large increased sum in order to pay the debt which they secreted from the people, and which will raise the *per capita* drain upon the people's resources from \$1.98 to \$2.27. If we take their own statement made during the elections in 1887, we find that they now virtually confess that inside of one year they have found it necessary to increase the *per capita* tax by something like 62 cents. Now, it will be remembered that the leader of the Opposition of that day drew the attention of the House and the country to the consequences that would naturally follow the recklessness of hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with the different public works that they had undertaken, and notably the Canadian Pacific Railway. We are all quite prepared to admit that it was desirable that road should be built, but we contend that the extravagance in which they indulged in building that road, has largely increased the people's burden beyond the sum that was necessary to construct that line if it had been economically done. The leader of the Opposition from time to time endeavored to impress upon the House and the country the fact that the debt was going to increase to a very large amount, and although he did that forcibly and pointedly, as well as others who associated with him, hon. gentlemen opposite presented such a condition of things that they were enabled to exact from the people of this country a lease of power for five years more. Now we are having the evidence that the statements made by the leader of the Opposition were correct. Sir, I say that the statement presented by the Minister of Finance is a most fallacious statement, and it will tend largely to mislead the public in regard to our true financial condition. I would like to ask what effect it would have upon the farmer, for instance, who has got a mortgage upon his farm of \$2,000? That mortgage, we will suppose, was produced a few years ago when interest was at 8 per cent., for a period of 20 years. The interest has dropped until now he can borrow that money for 5 per cent., and in the place of looking upon his mortgage as \$2,000, he calculates what it would cost him at 5 per cent. to mortgage it again, and he says to himself: At the rate I can borrow money now, I would only have to pay \$100 a year, at 5 per cent., on \$2,000, instead of having to pay \$160, at 8 per cent., on \$2,000, and consequently the principal of my mortgage is only \$1,250, and I look forward to the day when I will be able to place my mortgage again and get the money at a reduced rate of interest. But in the meantime, for the balance of the 20 years, he has got to pay \$160. It is just the same with us. The Finance Minister points us to a period when our bonds, that are now floating on the London market, will mature, and he will be

able to replace them at, as he says, $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and by an operation of that kind, he says he will be able to reduce the annual drain upon people's resources. Well, that is a very good thing to look forward to, but it is very poor encouragement to the people of this country, who are struggling hard to make a living for themselves and support those depending upon them—it is poor encouragement for them to look forward to a period 20 years hence, when, perhaps, they will be buried in the dust, and when the prophecies made by the Finance Minister, even if realised, will be of no benefit to them. Now, I say it is unfair to mislead the public mind in this manner. The remarks that were dropped by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) are very true, that although money at the present moment may be low in the English market, and Canada is able to borrow on fairly good terms, we are not certain that that condition of things will exist in five years, in ten years, or in twenty years. It is very foolish on our part to congratulate ourselves upon the fact that we can borrow now any amount at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The unfortunate thing is that we are now committed to an annual drain upon our resources, in some cases at 5 per cent., in some cases at $4\frac{1}{2}$, and in some cases at 4. In connection with this resolution, I was glad to get from the Finance Minister a statement of what the rebellion in the North-West cost us—I think he said it was some \$5,860,000. Well, Sir, it is very unfortunate that we should have had to increase our national debt by that amount. If hon. gentlemen opposite had been anxious and earnest in the discharge of their duty and their endeavor to govern this country, we would not have been called upon to add these \$6,000,000 to our national debt. Now, Sir, according to the statement of the Finance Minister, our national debt will be \$252,000,000. The interest on that amount at the present rate is over \$11,000,000 a year, which is a great drain on the resources of the country, and it will continue so long as our bonds remain out bearing the interest they now bear, so although hon. gentlemen opposite look forward hopefully to being able to reduce the annual amount for which our people are made subject, the drain will nevertheless continue. From the admissions of the Finance Minister it appears that the present Government have increased the debt at the rate of \$3,000,000 a year since they took office, equal to \$667,000 a month or \$22,000 for every day they have held power.

An hon. MEMBER. What was the amount in 1878?

Mr. McMULLEN. Our total indebtedness in 1878 was \$174,957,268. Adding the amount now proposed to be borrowed, our present debt is \$252,000,000, which gives an increase of \$8,000,000 a year from 1879 to the present time. The hon. Finance Minister has not told the House all the purposes for which the money is required. I suppose the Government have a large number of railway schemes on hand. They have spent considerable money during the past few years in these enterprises. In some cases they were desirable and the Government were to a certain extent justified in giving them money, but in a great many cases they have subsidised lines running alongside roads already constructed. I do not look upon that as a very wise policy in the face of the increased burdens proposed by the Finance Minister. I hold that the whole system is wrong, and I am sorry the Finance Minister was called upon to make such a statement as he has made. We are undoubtedly in a most wretched and deplorable condition in this country; it is a most humiliating position for us to be placed in, that this country with a population of \$5,000,000, and the population increasing very slowly, should be increasing its debt from year to year until now it has beyond doubt reached the enormous sum of \$252,000,000, which is far in excess of the debt of any of Her Majesty's colonies in any part of the world. The Postmaster General said

the Australian colonies were more heavily burdened than we are. But those colonies built all their own railways and issued their own bonds for that purpose, and if you take our entire indebtedness and add to it the indebtedness for bonds held in England for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Grand Trunk Railway and other railways, our debt will exceed that of the Australian colonies, and it was, therefore, not fair for the Postmaster General to present the statement as he did. The prophecies of the Opposition during the past seven or eight years have been fulfilled to-day. The statement of the Minister of Finance is a frank confession that the results we predicted during the last ten years have come to pass—and they are the natural results of spending money in building railways where they were not wanted, of expending money extravagantly on public works and undertaking different enterprises until we have reached the period when the drain on the people's resources has become enormous. I felt it to be my duty—I care not what others in the House may do or what others on this side may do—to enter my solemn protest against this increase of the country's indebtedness. It is the duty of every member of the Opposition to criticise the Government's actions, particularly in regard to expenditures and increase of debt, and before the Speaker leaves the Chair I hope the Minister of Finance will submit a more minute statement as to what he intends to do with the money he proposes to borrow and where every dollar is to go. With respect to savings banks deposits, I myself advocated years ago that the rate of interest should be reduced. I held that the country should not be called upon to pay 4 per cent. interest on deposits, and the Finance Minister of that day acknowledged that it cost about 1 per cent. to handle that account, thus making the rate of interest 5 per cent. To-day the Finance Minister proposes to avail himself of the advantage of being able to pay off our post office bank indebtedness, that is to people having deposits there. I well remember when the First Minister came west and addressed different meetings, that he took me very seriously to task for having dared to suggest that the interest on such deposits should be reduced. He said those savings were the earnings of the poor laboring classes, mechanics and others, and it would be grossly unfair and unjust to pay less interest than 4 per cent. Now the Government have changed their policy in that as in many other things. This Session will be remembered many years hence as the Session in which the Government changed daily their policy. One day they favor the National Policy completely; another day exceptions are made to it; and to-day we have another change, and that is with regard to the rate of interest to deposits in the post office savings bank. No attempt has been made to defend the Government policy as expressed by the Finance Minister, except by the Postmaster General. He attempted to prove that our condition financially was not so serious after all as we made it out to be. I believe the statement he made is in keeping with the statements he has made year after year. The people are becoming wonderfully accustomed to humbug. They have been humbugged for many years, they were humbugged at the time of the general election.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

An hon. MEMBER. Go on, go on.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite willing to go on if the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side wish. I have noticed, however, that when the hands of the clock pointed not so near to six o'clock as it does at present, and when a member on that side of the House was speaking, he was generally allowed to call it six o'clock. I do not think they should refuse to a member on this side of the House the courtesies we extend to members on the other side.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before six o'clock I was about giving some reasons why we thought it was imprudent, that the Government should ask this House, without a more extended statement of facts by the Finance Minister, to give its consent to the borrowing of this money. The Minister of Finance in his statement offered some general explanations with regard to what is going to be done with the sum he intended to borrow, but we did not get it in detail, and I think a considerable sum has got to be accounted for out of the \$25,000,000 that it is his intention to borrow.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not made any such statement as that. I have asked for power to borrow, but I have not stated that it was the intention to borrow \$25,000,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understood across the floor of the House that the question was asked from the Finance Minister as to what he would do with the money he intended to borrow, and he mentioned some items he wanted to wipe out. For instance he stated there was the floating debt of \$5,000,000 and some other items too. Yet he did not account for the balance, or what he intended to do with it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to know it is not the intention of the Finance Minister to borrow to the extent of \$25,000,000. I hope in the interests of the country he will not have to do that. I have tried to give some attention to the statement of the Minister of Finance, and I find in the first place that he says there are four millions of money payable to this country at a half per cent. which is practically the cost of issuing the Dominion bills. If that is a true statement, and if we have that money that has been drawn from the pockets of the people (for undoubtedly the bills must represent something) would it not be wise to borrow in Canada the \$25,000,000, if we can get it at a-half per cent. in place of going to England and paying 3½. If the hon. gentleman can manage an issue of Dominion bills and when the interest will only cost the people of the country only one-half per cent., I should think it would be prudent not to ask power to borrow abroad, but to borrow the money at home. He acknowledges we owe \$150,000,000 in England on which we pay 4 per cent. His statement to the House is that the actual cash value of the indebtedness would be \$114,000,000, counting what we would be able to borrow at 3½, but he admitted that we cannot redeem those debentures for 20 years hence. Let us suppose that a man in business fails, and he calls a meeting of his creditors and says: "There is a mortgage on my house for \$2,000, and that mortgage bears 10 per cent. interest. It is not due for ten years but the money to day can be borrowed for 6 per cent., and I claim that in giving me credit for my assets you should only value that at \$1,200, because the reduction between 10 and 6 per cent would be 4 per cent., and 4 per cent. on \$2,000 would be \$80 per year, which, in ten years, would amount to \$800, and I contend you should reduce that from the amount of the mortgage on \$2,000." I would like to know if any meeting of honest and intelligent men in this Dominion would listen for a moment to any such statement as that, yet that is practically the argument the hon. Minister of Finance has presented to the House to-day. I do not believe there is any man in this House who would dare to present to an intelligent people, a statement based on such a fallacious argument as he has made to this House with regard to the actual cash value of this Dominion. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman prepared the statement, but I must say that whoever put it in his hands must have thought that he was able to present a statement of this kind with all the ingenuity and

Mr. McMULLEN.

powers that he is acknowledged to possess. I contend that our national debt at this present moment is a very serious consideration for the people of this country, and I wonder how the hon. gentleman has attempted to get around the fact which stares us in the face. I do not think in the future the hon. gentleman himself will say that the debt is less than he acknowledged it will be; that if he should use those borrowing powers it would virtually be \$252,000,000, on which we have to pay a rate of interest which would average about 4 per cent. in the meantime. Of course, if the money market continues to be favorable, but there is no guarantee that it will be so because it fluctuates; when those debentures mature he will be able to reduce the rate. In the meantime the Finance Minister is trying to comfort the representatives in this House and the people of the country that to-day if we borrow money we can borrow it at 3½ instead of 4 per cent. That means that it would take every bushel of fall wheat grown in this country during the last year, at the regular market price, to pay the annual interest on our public debt. According to the returns brought down, the yield of fall wheat last year was 14,440,611 bushels, which at 78 cents a bushel would amount to \$11,263,676, just about the amount we have to pay in interest every year; and this will tend to increase the annual expenditure, which I presume will now amount to \$40,000,000. I do not know how long the people of this country will keep patient under this sort of thing. They have borne wonderfully with it; but possibly they will wake up after a while, when I am afraid, judging by the condition of things into which we are drifting, it will be too late. It will be like locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. Hon. gentlemen opposite charge us with having annexation sentiments. My impression is that we shall be glad to join any country that is in a better financial position than we are if things go on as they are going at the present time. There is not another state or union of states on the continent of America that has so deplorable a financial condition to present to the world as Canada has at the present time, and hon. gentlemen appear to think nothing of increasing our debt. We do not hear so much to-day about an increase of \$25,000,000 as we used to hear about an increase of \$1,000,000. However, I suppose, as we are in a minority, we shall have to consent to it

Mr. ELLIS. I have endeavored to get from the Public Accounts some idea of the effect of the borrowing system upon the country, and to discover its advantages. I find that in the whole period since Confederation, the charges of all kinds on the debt, including interest, expenses and sinking fund, have amounted to \$161,590,432. There are to be deducted from that sum the earnings of investments, amounting to \$16,193,048, so that the total debt expenditure over earnings amounts to \$145,397,384. Well, Sir, what have we borrowed? Our debt in 1867 was \$75,728,612. At present it is \$227,313,911, the increase being \$151,585,270, which I presume it is fair to infer represents what we have borrowed. We have not received all that amount, however, we have only received \$143,430,021, the balance, \$8,155,249, being the discount on the loans, the commissions, the cost of bringing the money out, &c. So that the actual net result appears to be that we have received \$143,430,021, and have paid out \$145,397,384, leaving a balance against us of \$1,967,363. I take it, from the financial statements furnished to the House, that that is a fair statement. I have gone over the figures fairly on both sides, and I cannot reach any other conclusion but that we are actually borrowing money to pay the interest on the debt. Looking at the matter from another point of view, the result is the same. The debt of the whole period as I have said is \$151,585,270; we have paid out in interest and other charges \$145,397,384, and we have paid in discounts on loans \$8,155,249, making a total of \$153,552,633,

The inference derivable from these figures seems to be a plain one. The country itself is quite capable, if it got a rest, to recuperate and to overtake the burdens laid upon it. It seems to be perfectly useless to go on borrowing money, while we practically pay more than we receive in interest, in the cost of management, and in the cost of transference from the other side of the water to this side; and that is one of the main objections to going into debt on the other side of the water. The hon. the Minister of Finance in his statement left out reference to the premium, discount and exchange as simplifying the financial operation in which he explained; but in the meantime we thus lose sight of the heavy charges involved in having to carry this heavy debt in England. It seems to me to me that is the reason why the gentlemen in charge of the finances of this country should consider whether a new financial arrangement could not be made instead of going into the markets of the world to borrow money. If we could stop borrowing for a while, and let the country rest and recuperate, there would not be the necessity of this heavy drain on the resources of the country which the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who preceded me has so forcibly depicted.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have frequently observed that the hon. Minister of Finance, when he finds himself in a rather difficult position, always adopts a mode of directing public attention away from the real question, and indulging in some imaginary and glowing picture of what is going to happen under certain peculiar circumstances. We have become accustomed to that mode of tactics in this House. I remember last year, when the hon. gentleman found that it was necessary that the Government should have an increase of revenue to the extent of a million or a million and a half in the iron duties, he indulged this House for a few hours in describing the great resources of this country and what great manufacturing industries he was going to build up if the representations made to Parliament were accepted. No one knows better than that hon. gentleman, when that statement was made, that there was very little probability indeed of his expectations ever being realised. Those duties were imposed more with the view of enabling the Government to collect a million or a million and a half of additional revenue which the Government stood so much in need of than with the expectation of developing the iron manufacturing industries of this country. In a previous year, when the changes were made in the sugar duties, the hon. gentleman or his predecessor did not inform the House that the change involved an increase of taxation to the extent of \$7,500,000. Now, this mode of dealing with public questions before the House is extremely unsatisfactory. The hon. gentleman, on the present occasion, has indulged in one of those flights of fancies for which he is celebrated; drawing on a fertile and powerful imagination, he has endeavored to lead this House to believe that we will be none the worse off by the adoption of this resolution, but that we will be the better of it. I would say to the hon. gentleman that if he possesses the power of forecasting financial events for ten or twenty years, he is wasting his time in this country. If he can look ahead fifteen or twenty years, and tell this House that those obligations, which are maturing, are going to be renewed at three and three-quarters per cent.,—if he can only persuade the bankers and financiers to believe in his powers of forecasting financial events to that extent, he will become an authority in the London market, and his services will be paid for at a much higher rate than they are paid for in this country, or in England when he is there. But the absurdity of that forecast must be apparent to the hon. gentleman himself. He told us that when these various bonds became due, they could all be renewed at so much less interest than they are bearing at present, but he did not inform the House that it was not in his power or in

the power of the Government to obtain the immediate control of those bonds.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I stated in the most explicit terms that the debt in England had an average of about twenty years to run.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Exactly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, you must not say I did not state it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes, but the hon. gentleman did not say that the Government could obtain possession of those bonds and renew them at a low rate of interest, and thereby secure the advantage he so eloquently pictured. Of course, he stated that the bonds would mature in twenty years, but the bonds are not in the possession of the Government. They are in the hands of the monied men of the United Kingdom, who will hold them until maturity, unless they can make a better investment in the meantime. At all events, the bonds will not, under any circumstances, go into the possession of the Government. The hon. gentleman must see the absurdity of the position he has taken, and absurdity is not too strong an expression to use with regard to explanations such as those with which the hon. gentleman has favored us to-day. It is quite within the range of probability—nay, I may say, it is more than probable—that within the next ten years or twenty years, when these obligations are maturing, a war cloud may pass over Europe, and instead of interest being at 3 or 4 per cent., the rate will have gone up to 6 or 7 per cent., so that when these obligations are falling due, the successor of the hon. gentleman, on going into the money market in England to negotiate a new loan to pay off these bonds, may have to pay 6 per cent., and therefore, according to the argument of the hon. gentleman, instead of reducing he will increase our debt by 50 per cent.; and the debt, instead of being \$227,000,000 as at present, will be \$340,000,000. If the argument of the hon. gentleman holds good in one case, it must hold good in the other. This shows the complete absurdity of any public man attempting here to forecast for ten years or fifteen years, or even one year, the rate of interest in the old country. I venture to say that if the speech of the hon. gentleman were placed before the financiers of London, they would treat it with perfect contempt, and would justly consider a gentleman occupying the high position of Finance Minister of this country, who would thus seek to mislead public opinion, unworthy of public confidence. Were the bankers and financiers of London to analyse the speech of the hon. gentleman and expose the fallacies in which he has indulged, they would have a very small opinion of the intelligence of the people and the Parliament of Canada in allowing themselves to be deluded by such a representation as the hon. gentleman has made to-night. But the hon. gentleman must not imagine that he can test our credulity too far. Another view taken by the hon. gentleman was a very unfortunate one to be adopted by any gentleman occupying the position of Finance Minister of this Dominion. The hon. gentleman has told us that we need never expect to pay these debts, as when they fall due we can make a new loan, and so go on *ad infinitum*. Well, I confess that if the finances of this country should be under the charge of a Finance Minister holding the views of the hon. gentleman, the probability is that we will go on borrowing until our credit will have reached a point beyond which we can go no further. The hon. gentleman says all we have to do when our obligations fall due is to renew them. We all know what renewing an obligation means in ordinary financial circles. We know that a man need never expect to obtain a renewal of his obligation unless he has kept his credit intact, and his credit depends altogether on the position

in which he stands when asking for a renewal and not at all on that which he occupied when he contracted the debt. The hon. gentleman reminds me of the witty Irishman and all Irishman are witty, like the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who, when he had given his note for a certain amount and signed it, said: There, thank Heaven, that is paid. That is about the soundness of the argument of my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman when referring to the interest, should have reminded the House that the interest payable on our debt to-day is about \$4,000,000 more than it was in 1878; so that no matter how much the rate of interest may have been lowered, the amount on which we are compelled to pay interest has reached such a figure that our annual payment is \$4,000,000 more than it was when this Government took office in 1878. Now, Sir, there is another feature of the statement made by the hon. the Minister of Finance which I think was of a very dangerous character, coming from a gentleman in his high position. He led this House to believe that we had extended and probably might extend still further the issue of Dominion notes without any great injury to the country. He pointed out that, in issuing \$4,000,000 in excess, after the \$8,000,000, it only cost us $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The hon. gentleman knows that there has been a feeling among a certain class in this country, and we have listened to debates in this House in times gone by, to the effect that the Government should take the issue of notes into their own hands, and should issue Dominion notes for whatever amount the Government might require. Suppose, instead of proposing this loan to-night, the hon. gentleman had asked the House to issue \$25,000,000 of Dominion notes, we know very well that, with the support which the Government have on that side of the House, or we have every reason to believe, his supporters would have as readily agreed to a proposal to issue \$25,000,000 of notes as they will agree to give him this authority to raise \$25,000,000 by way of a loan.

Mr. HESSON. Why not?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that, as it only shows what is underlying a great deal of ignorant opinion in this country, of which the hon. gentleman, I suppose, is an exponent. It is an ignorant opinion to imagine that we can issue a large amount of Government notes in this country without finding them in a short time below par, and, if the Finance Minister would desire to bring the credit of Canada to the position of that of San Domingo, Cuba, or Honduras, or some of these countries, where their notes are at a discount of from 20 to 40 per cent., he could not adopt a more effective mode than by adopting the suggestion of the hon. gentleman behind him.

Mr. HESSON. How about the American greenbacks?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is a dangerous idea to promulgate, because the time may come when the Government—I mean any Government in this House—might not be strong enough to resist a strong feeling in this country on the subject, and might be compelled to yield against their better judgment, and so practically ruin the country. If \$25,000,000 can be issued in notes, why not \$100,000,000? I think the hon. gentleman has done a great injury in letting it go abroad from one occupying the high position he does, that the expansion of the paper issue can be made—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is putting a statement in my mouth for which he will find no foundation whatever. What I said was that the amount of Dominion notes issued in excess of the specie held had increased from \$8,000,000 to \$12,000,000, and that the additional \$4,000,000 cost us \$420,000 a year; and I said that, instead of expecting that we would lose the advantage of that, as the country expanded, it would probably expand, and there was not the slightest suggestion from me that

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

there should be any large issue of Dominion notes. The hon. gentleman knows that every one of those notes is as good as gold.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is exactly what I said. I gave the hon. gentleman's own statement that, by an increase of 50 per cent. on the paper currency of the country, no injury had arisen; and I said that his argument led to the conclusion that you might extend that to any degree that a parliamentary majority demanded. That was my argument.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not my statement.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I did not say that he made that statement, but I was arguing from his statement that the increase of 50 per cent. would be of advantage to this country; and certainly the hon. gentleman indicated then, as he has indicated now, that this issue might be expanded from time to time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, not that we could increase it now, but that the expansion of the country might lead to a similar increase.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes, that it would keep pace with the expansion of the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is correct.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Therefore I was arguing that, in my judgment, and I believe in the judgment of every well regulated banking or commercial mind in Canada, the hon. gentleman was taking a ground that would be detrimental to every interest in this country. If he adopts that, he cannot limit it. The power is behind him, that is his majority in the House, and that power may force him, or may compel any Government to make a larger issue of Dominion notes than I think would be consistent with the credit of this country. It is in that sense that I regret exceedingly that the hon. gentleman should have made such a reference. Then as to this loan, the hon. gentleman indicated the way in which he anticipated the appropriation of about \$16,000,000, but he also stated, in reply to my hon. friend in front of me, that about \$11,000,000 of a previous loan remained unappropriated. That would give him a credit of \$36,000,000 supposing this vote is passed. That is a credit of \$20,000,000 more than he can show any necessity for. It is a most unusual and unconstitutional proceeding. No Finance Minister in this country or in any well-governed country would ever venture to come to Parliament and ask to pledge the finances of the country to such a large amount without being compelled to lay on the Table of the House a direct, positive, detailed statement as to how that money was to be appropriated, and I think the hon. gentleman is not dealing fairly with the House or the country or following the rule which has always been considered necessary in this House in regard to financial affairs, if he does not, before the final stage of the Bill, show a detailed statement of how this money is to be appropriated. What does he want it for? Is it for any public purpose which he cannot state? Is it to cover up any deficiencies? Is it in regard to any expenditure of money which he cannot state to this House?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Must the hon. gentleman be told that not one single dollar of the money appropriated by the Parliament of Canada can be used except under an Act of Parliament or a resolution of this House?

Mr. MITCHELL. Every one knows that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman does not seem to know it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Cannot the hon. gentleman state something new?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman for Halifax knew it, it is entirely unpardonable that he should sug-

gest that this amount was to be applied to some purpose of which Parliament was ignorant.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend said that the money cannot be applied except as Parliament directs. Why, Sir, with the hon. gentlemen behind them, with the voting power behind them, we do not know but that to-morrow they will come down with some Chignecto Railway scheme, or something of that kind, that will swamp the whole of this money.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. member surely has a very short memory. He would lead this House to believe that not one cent of this 20 millions can be appropriated without the special sanction of this Parliament. Why, does not the hon. gentleman remember that only last Session he brought down special warrants for nearly three millions of money, after the money was spent, and what could Parliament do but sustain and sanction the action of the Government? Was the House consulted respecting the appropriation of one cent of that money, a large portion of which was most improperly spent? I say, Sir, there never was a greater abuse of executive power than was shown last year when nearly 3 million dollars was expended by the Government under Governor General's warrants, which was never contemplated when that permission was given by this House. The hon. gentleman knows that the authority of the Governor General's warrant is only used when some great public work has to be rapidly constructed, or when some public calamity occurs which calls for the immediate action of the Government, like the fire at St. John, or an accident on a canal, or an accident on a railway, or a public building being burnt down. But there we had a long detailed statement of expenditure of a character that could have waited and for which there was no necessity, at least for the largest portion of it, being spent until Parliament met. I dare say the hon. gentleman next Session may come down with Governor General's warrants for a good share of the \$20,000,000 which he asks us now to place at the disposal of the Government. I repeat that this is an unusual and unconstitutional act on the part of the Government. If they have any use for it in view, if they think they will require this money in the public interest, we are bound to know what it is, and we should not be called upon to place this money at the disposal of the Government when they may abuse their discretion, and fritter away a large portion of the money under Governor General's warrants, for purposes of which we know nothing now. I hope, Sir, that the hon. gentleman will retrace his steps, that he will see that it is necessary to regard public opinion, that he will have enough respect for the usages of Parliament, enough respect for his own position, enough respect for the people of this country, not to ask permission to make a loan of \$20,000,000 without letting the people know what it is for. I hope he will yet give us some explanation before the Bill passes its final stage, for he will find that if he does not, there will be further discussion, and we shall endeavor, whether we succeed or not, to persuade other hon. gentlemen, if we cannot the hon. gentleman himself, and his Government, that they are pursuing a course which may lead to very unconstitutional procedure in the future of this country. Hon. gentlemen who are charged with the Government of this country can only conduct its business within prescribed limits and rules, and the moment the Government, through their Finance Minister, attempt to take a power which the constitution of the country and Parliament never contemplated, and never sanctioned, they will find that there is enough intelligent opinion in this country to express a very strong disapproval. I hope, therefore, that the hon. gentleman, with regard to that point, will give us some further information before he proceeds to take the final stage.

Mr. COOK. I wish to call the attention of the leader of the Government to the fact that his Finance Minister has made a statement to this House that he is going, with one stroke of the pen, to reduce the debt of this country by 53 million dollars. He was not in his place when that statement was made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I heard that.

Mr. COOK. Well, Sir, I would call upon the right hon. leader of the Government to retain that heaven-born statesman and keep him here. He should not allow him to go to a foreign country, because he will find difficulty in replacing him unless he calls in the services of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who, I believe, would be the only man who could perform such a feat besides the Finance Minister himself. My hon. friend, the senior member for Halifax, says that we should have a statement of the purposes for which this money is to be expended. He need not concern himself about that matter, because this Government will find ways and means enough for spending that money. Now, it has been stated that our net debt is \$227,000,000 and this \$25,000,000 will increase it to \$252,000,000. Our gross debt will then be about \$300,000,000. Although we have some assets, and they may be very good assets, still we cannot realise upon them sufficiently to pay off the balance, and, therefore, this money being borrowed will have to be paid back, unless we adopt the plan that the Finance Minister has just proposed, and which hon. gentlemen opposite seem to approve by the way they cheer him on. They did not cheer him yesterday at the result of the election which took place near this city under the very nose of the hon. gentleman, although the Ministers exercised such an influence in that constituency that they expected to carry it by a large majority, but fortunately for this country the people thought differently. Well, Sir, our gross debt will be increased to three hundred million dollars, and our interest will amount to over \$11,000,000 a year. When hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side of the House some years ago, I remember a statement made, either by the present Finance Minister or by Mr. Tilley, that the business of the country, under the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, should be conducted upon a sum of \$23,000,000 a year, and that the public expenditure should be kept at that point. But since they came into power they have increased the annual expenditure to \$35,000,000, being an excess of \$12,000,000 over the sum expended by the Mackenzie Government. I was somewhat amused and alarmed at the statement made by the hon. gentleman with reference to the issue of bank notes. It is within the recollection of hon. gentlemen in this House that some of their friends, a few years ago, were advocating what was known then as the "rag baby." It is also known by the hon. gentlemen in this House that the bank charters expire in 1890. The Dominion elections will not take place, if the hon. gentlemen keep in office to the expiration of their time, till 1892, which will give them an opportunity of ascertaining the feeling of the House and country as to whether the "rag baby" will be a good card to play at the next general election. Hon. gentlemen have been feeling their way for some time in this respect. This action of the Finance Minister will go out to the papers and be spread throughout the country, and we all know how unscrupulous some political papers are, particularly those supporting hon. gentlemen opposite. We shall probably see in the papers to-morrow or in a few days that the Finance Minister has reduced the debt by \$53,000,000; the larger papers on the Conservative side will make the statement and the smaller papers will follow, and an effort will be made to impress on the people, who read nothing but Tory papers, that the Finance Minister has followed in the steps of the first financier of England, Mr. Goschen. But there is a difference between financing in

this country and in England. We have to borrow our money from a foreign country, while in England they have it at their own doors and they lend money to other countries that require it. It has been stated that our debt will increase. Certainly it will increase. It is the policy of this Government to increase the debt, it never decreases anything where public expenditure is concerned, and although the papers will endeavor to make the people believe that the debt has been decreased by \$53,000,000 by a stroke of the pen made by this heaven-born financier, the result will be really an increase of \$25,000,000 by the loan now asked. The money will be spent. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) need have no doubt on that score, they will find a way of expending it, because that is their way of doing business. They have increased the people's burden, but they should learn a lesson from the late elections in Missisquoi, Kent and Russell. Supreme efforts of hon. gentlemen were put forth in those elections, and in almost every township they made a scheme by which to advance the interests of the people of the locality. Notwithstanding all the efforts brought forward to corrupt the electors of the constituencies it had no effect. They have humbugged the people a little too long, and they know that if there was an appeal to the people to-day they would not come to this House with a corporal's guard. They know that, and I advise them to make hay while the sun shines. Mr. Mackintosh, the Conservative candidate in Russell, openly made the statement that he did not know how long they would be in power, and he said: "You can rest assured I will look after myself and make hay while the sun shines." So I advise hon. gentlemen to make hay while the sun shines, because their lease of power is very short.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Good hay in Scotland.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the Finance Minister will take the committee into his confidence and state the objects for which he seeks to borrow the money and whether he really requires the amount mentioned. We understand that beyond the amount stated by him to be required there will be a balance of \$10,000,000, and he has already a margin of \$11,000,000 under authority already received from Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not suppose that hon. gentlemen opposite were really serious in asking for an explanation as to how we proposed to expend the amount for which we ask borrowing power from Parliament. If they will look at past legislation they will find that every Government has been armed with borrowing powers largely in excess of anything they require for immediate use. How is it that at this moment we have an unused borrowing power of \$11,000,000? That very fact will show hon. gentlemen opposite that taking the authority of Parliament to borrow to a certain limit does not at all involve using that power; but it might at any moment become extremely inconvenient not to have a considerable margin of borrowing power. Hon. gentlemen will understand that fact at once when I state that at this moment we owe the savings banks \$40,000,000. Every dollar of that sum is on call, so that if at any time the banks offered a larger interest than the Government were paying we would be liable to lose the deposits, and hon. gentlemen opposite would not want the Government to be unable to pay such claims. I merely mention this, not as a thing likely to occur, but in order to show hon. gentlemen that asking for borrowing power does not at all involve an intention to use that power or to borrow money materially in excess of the requirements of the country. It

Mr. Cook.

is not sufficient, as I have explained, to meet the liabilities that have to be provided for. There are \$5,000,000 for the floating debt, \$6,000,000 for railway expenditure authorised, \$5,000,000 for expenditure for capital account, public works, and I do not myself know at this moment what amount will be required or what amount it will be found at the moment judicious to place upon the market. The Government of India a very short time ago floated a loan for £7,000,000 sterling without requiring a single dollar for expenditure this year. I merely mention this to show that the Government should be armed with borrowing power to use in the interests of the country at the right time and for the right purpose. I have already explained that to give power to borrow money is not to give authority to expend it, and that the authority of Parliament must be obtained for every dollar of expenditure. If the Government to meet the wants of the public service, as provided by law—because the Governor General's warrant is issued under the authority of the law—require to resort to the Governor General's warrant, they take still greater responsibility than when they lay a vote before Parliament, because they are held strictly to account by Parliament for every expenditure made without its previous sanction; and, therefore, that does not affect the question. The amount asked is not with a view to take advantage of that borrowing power, but it is asked in conformity with the past practice of Governments on both sides of this House to arm themselves with such borrowing powers as may be required, and which it will be extremely inconvenient in the interests of the country at any time not to possess. I explained to the House in the first instance the amount on which we propose to make a loan at no distant date. In doing that we have followed the uniform practice in taking a considerable large margin, to meet any exigency of the public service.

Mr. MITCHELL. The illustration which the hon. gentleman has given is one eminently unsatisfactory to this House and to this country, as a reason why we should pass this Bill, and give in addition to the borrowing power of \$11,000,000 the Government already possesses, \$25,000,000 more, making in all \$36,000,000 that this country is expected to be responsible for. He has stated as a reason for that that the Government of India have taken borrowing powers for about seven million pounds sterling.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say they had taken powers, but that they floated a loan, although they do not require the money, to the extent of seven millions sterling.

Mr. MITCHELL. Very well, they floated a loan although they do not want the money. But my hon. friend forgot to tell this House, what most of the gentlemen know, that the Government of India control a population between 250 and 270 million souls, and is it because the Government who control that population have borrowed \$35,000,000, or seven million pounds sterling, it should be a justification, that the Government of Canada, controlling a population of only 5,000,000 of people should borrow \$36,000,000. The hon. gentleman has told us he is following the precedent that other countries have pursued. Will he point to a precedent in any country, for the borrowing of such an enormous sum as that, without any statement in detail whatever having been given to the House? The Government has already power to borrow \$11,000,000 and why should the hon. gentleman come to this House and ask for \$25,000,000 more? If any extraordinary occasion should arise, this Parliament can be called together at a fortnight's notice, and at all events unless we dissolve, we will meet in nine months from this. The hon. gentleman now comes to this House with reasons which are eminently unsatisfactory to the country, and asks for this increased borrowing power, notwithstanding the circumstances which I have pointed out. I would be recreant to the duty which

I owe to my constituents and to my country, if I did not protest against this, and that we in this House allowed the hon. gentleman to taunt us next Session, as he has taunted us before, with the remark that we consented to those borrowing powers and allowed him and the Government of which he is a member to get this permission to borrow money to expend as they pleased without dividing the House. The hon. gentleman has told this House that they cannot use a dollar of that money until Parliament votes it. I know that, but my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) pointed out the fact that \$2,000,000 were used last year by the Government on Governor's warrants without the consent of Parliament. The hon. gentleman says: Oh, we are authorised to issue those warrants by law. Yes, that is so; but the authorisation is only in the case of great national emergencies, and the Government was not authorised to issue such warrants for the purposes they used them for last year, and yet they did it. I am afraid that the fact of issuing those borrowing powers may injure the credit of this country in the markets of the world. People will naturally ask what do we want with the money? Do we want it for public works, or do we want it to promote the interests of the country? If we do want it for those purposes let the hon. gentleman come down with a statement and show this House how the money is likely to be expended during the coming year. We will then be able to judge if he is justified in asking for those extraordinary powers. He says that this House is bound to grant the money before the Government can expend it, but we know that any proposition the hon. gentleman, as Finance Minister, brings down will be carried through this House. We know it is not the voluntary will of the House, but that it is the majority that rules, and the hon. gentleman knows that he has a solid majority behind him to sustain him in any proposition he may make.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. Let me say to those gentlemen who are so ready to say "hear, hear" that we know what extravagance has been committed in connection with the public works of this country. Let us get borrowing powers to the extent of \$36,000,000 and what will the hungry men behind the First Minister say? You will find that one and all in every county from Vancouver to Cape Breton will be pressing their demands on the Government.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Cape Breton did not get much.

Mr. MITCHELL. Cape Breton has got a pretty good slice already. Every one of the hon. gentlemen behind the First Minister will be pressing their demands on the Government to get a share of this money, and it will be useless for the Government to refuse them. We know what the combination in "No 8" did a few years ago, and when the pistol was put to the head of the Government we know how the money went in the past, and it will go the same way in the future. Before the authority to get this money is voted by the House we should have a specific statement of how it is to be expended. I would not say in great detail, but in general detail, as to what the hon. gentleman intended to do with it, and where the necessity exists for asking the House for such an extraordinary vote.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) There was, I think, no disposition on the part of any hon. gentleman on this side of the House to require anything like an accurate statement, showing within a million dollars or so, what the hon. gentleman wanted this money for. I was really under the impression that Canada had some contingent liability falling due in England which the hon. gentleman wished to meet, and that he was going to take advantage of the favorable money market, to raise the wind and discharge that liability. The answer of the hon. gentleman to my question convinces me that there is no necessity for

this money being borrowed. He suggests a contingency which he ought to be the last man to suggest in this House. That contingency is of the most impossible character—a contingency that there may be a run on our savings banks, and that we will be required to pay the money that people have loaned us. I have not the slightest doubt that the people who have the money in the savings banks, have the greatest faith in the stability of the country. There is not the slightest danger of a run by the depositors, for they know they have the best security that can be obtained on this continent for their money. That reason puts the hon. gentleman at once out of court with his argument. We are face to face with the fact that the Government are seeking powers from this House to borrow \$36,000,000 and that they only require \$16,000,000, or in other words they want the power to borrow \$20,000,000 more than they can suggest any reason for spending. The committee should seriously consider whether they are doing a wise thing by investing this unlimited power in the Government. There is no special phase in the money market which renders it desirable that hon. gentlemen should borrow \$20,000,000 extra. If the hon. gentleman could show that the present time was a peculiarly favorable time for floating a loan, more favorable than twelve months hence would probably be, there would be not a word said on this side of the House against his proposal. But we stand face to face with the fact that the Government are asking for \$20,000,000 more than they require, and, under those circumstances, I think the hon. gentleman is not acting wisely in forcing his resolution upon the House. We do not need to be told that the money cannot be expended without a vote of this House; but I reiterate the statement of the experienced gentleman, the hon. member for Northumberland, who has been in this House since 1867, that if the Government borrow \$20,000,000 and have it on hand, there are lots of gentlemen sitting around them who will bring pressure to bear to have it expended. It is not right that a surplus of money should be in the hands of the Government, the existence of which may be used by hon. gentlemen behind them as a reason for the demands they make being acceded to. There is no doubt that they will say, judging from the elections which have been held during the last four or five weeks, that the Liberal party are coming into power, and that the sooner you spend the money the better.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hon. gentlemen may sing out, but I think the result of the last five or six elections have brought a truth home to their minds that they are very reluctant to believe.

Mr. MITCHELL. What did Sir John say at the Quebec meeting, that he would not leave a dollar in the treasury?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think that unless the hon. gentleman shows us that he needs this money in the near future, or that this is a specially favorable time for borrowing, the House should not give him the power to borrow it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If there is a run on the savings banks, the credit of Canada will be in such a state that the Government will have great difficulty in borrowing; but so long as the credit of Canada remains as it is to-day, there will not be a run on the savings banks. No doubt a prudent Government will have a certain margin to meet contingencies; but the hon. gentleman is asking power to borrow a sum equal to the whole revenue of the country for a year. That is too much power to place in the hands of any government, and we should not entrust them with it until it is required. It has been pointed out that we have had experience of Governor General's warrants being used for purposes entirely different from that authorised by the statute. During the administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) whenever that power was used, the

reason was stated for using it; but when warrants were brought down last year for nearly \$3,000,000, the Government refused to give reasons for them. We know that the requirement of the statute was not complied with, that the urgency which should exist as a justification of a Governor General's warrant did not exist at all; and these Governor General's warrants were used for purposes coincident with the general election of 1887. I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance whether this \$5,000,000 includes the New Brunswick 6 per cents that falls due this year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. CASEY. It does seem to me that this is the most unprecedented demand that has ever been made on Parliament in the last 17 Sessions, at all events. As nearly as I can understand, the hon. Minister has only accounted for about \$16,000,000 of the \$25,000,000 which he asks power to borrow. In regard to the other \$9,000,000, the only excuse I have heard is that he wishes to provide for such a casualty as a run on the savings banks. Setting aside the absurdity of the supposition that there could be a run on the savings banks, for whose solvency the credit of this Dominion is pledged, and supposing for a moment that there might be a run on them, the hon. gentleman has not shown the ghost of a reason why he should be given this unusual borrowing power. We have seen in the past that when an extraordinary emergency arises, the arrangement of Governor General's warrants, as my hon. friend has shown, has given every facility to the Government for spending money; and they have been able to expend it even when emergencies have not arisen. We know that at the present time, on the hon. gentleman's own statement, there is a floating debt of \$5,000,000 or thereabouts. It is perfectly clear from both of these considerations that the Government are not likely to be in a pinch for money, seeing that they have been able to borrow \$5,000,000 as a floating debt without any bonds or debentures being issued at all, and that they have been able in one year to spend over \$2,000,000 under Governor General's warrants. Then what excuse have they for asking power to borrow \$9,000,000 above the present needs of the country at any time, without consulting the House? The constitutional course would be, if a pinch occurred, to exercise the power of borrowing as far as possible, and to use the Governor General's warrants, and as soon as possible thereafter to call the House together and state what they had done with the money, and ask the House to give them power to borrow sufficient to cover the floating debt; just as the hon. gentleman is doing with regard to this \$5,000,000 which he is now asking power to cover by a loan.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken; every dollar of that was voted by the House.

Mr. CASEY. But it was borrowed without the special authority of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. We have general borrowing powers by the statute.

Mr. CASEY. Exactly. I say that that was borrowed without making a special application to the House, and the hon. gentleman could do it again. He has given away his whole excuse.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I cannot borrow \$16,000,000 with power for \$11,000,000.

Mr. CASEY. Certainly not. I am not objecting to the \$16,000,000 if the hon. gentleman tells us what it is for. I am objecting to the enormous margin of \$9,000,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But the hon. gentleman forgets that we have had a margin of \$11,000,000 year after year on the Statute-book, and that it has not been used.

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

Mr. CASEY. Why does the hon. gentleman want a larger margin? What has become of the \$11,000,000? Has it all been used up?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, we have had the borrowing power, and used it for years.

Mr. CASEY. Why not use that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because \$11,000,000 will not get \$16,000,000.

Mr. CASEY. Then you only require to ask for power to borrow the difference between \$11,000,000 and \$16,000,000. On the hon. gentleman's own confession, he only needs power to borrow \$5,000,000, and he is asking for power to borrow \$25,000,000. He has made the case worse for himself by his interruption; he has made it more clear than I could have made it in half an hour's speech. I do not pretend to be a phoenix of finance like the hon. gentleman, I do not pretend to be able to prove that the more we borrow the less we owe, I do not pretend to be able to juggle away our debt by the means of finicking calculations on the basis of the interest paid, I do not pretend to be able to prove that because money is cheaper all the world over now than it was twelve years ago, therefore the credit of Canada has been vastly advanced by the hon. gentleman's Administration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say so.

Mr. CASEY. These are the very things the hon. gentleman has been proving to-day. I do not pretend to be a pre-stidigitateur of finance like the hon. gentleman; I do not pretend, therefore, to be able to put his position in regard to this margin as clearly as he has put it. With that inciviveness, which is his special forte, he has shown there was no need whatever for asking the power to borrow this tremendous margin over what is needed. The hon. gentleman only needs \$5,000,000 more to meet the existing wants of the country, and he asks power to borrow \$20,000,000 more. If this resolution passes he will have the power to borrow \$25,000,000 and \$11,000,000, which makes \$36,000,000, leaving a margin of \$20,000,000 which he can borrow at any moment without asking Parliament for special authority. I say that is an extraordinary and unconstitutional course, a course which no House that respected itself and respected the constitution of Canada, or the rights of the people of Canada, would for a moment endorse. The reasons for asking this tremendous blank cheque from the country we must seek for ourselves, since they have not been given to us. We must imagine that the hon. gentleman expects a new rebellion to spring up of three times the dimensions of the last rebellion. We must imagine that he expects possibly a general election to come on suddenly, and the \$20,000,000 would not be too large in that case to enable the hon. gentleman to retain his party in power, for it would take that and more to accomplish that end. But, of course, such contingencies as these are only speculations of our own. Let hon. gentlemen who interrupt read over the speech of the Finance Minister to-morrow, and show me where there is the ghost of an excuse for our giving this tremendous blank cheque to the Government, and I will admit this side of the House is wrong and that the constitution of Canada, as understood hitherto by every Canadian statesman, has no foundation.

Committee rose and reported.

MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider resolution (p. 1031) respecting the Harbor Commission of Montreal. He said: In rising to move the resolution to provide for the assumption by the Government of what is familiarly known

as the Lake St. Peter debt, I will detain the House but a short time, as this question has been so frequently before the House, that it is familiar to hon. gentlemen on both sides. The River St. Lawrence, a few years ago, would only admit vessels drawing nine feet of water to the harbor of Montreal. It was then determined to endeavor to deepen Lake St. Peter and remove obstructions, so as to improve the navigation of that river, and, from time to time, money has been appropriated by this House for that purpose and advanced to the Harbor Commissioners, who recouped themselves for the interest by the tolls or tonnage dues levied upon steamers, and by wharfage dues. The efforts that have been made, I need tell the House, have been successful, so much so, that the entire amount appropriated for that purpose by the Parliament of Canada has reached the sum of \$3,005,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he proposes to abolish the wharf dues?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I have not come to that part of the subject at all. I said that the Harbor Commissioners had recouped themselves for the interest payable on the money advanced by the Parliament of Canada, to deepen Lake St. Peter and the River St. Lawrence, by tonnage dues on vessels and by harbor dues. The Commission have been discharging, I need not tell the House, two duties—as Harbor Commissioners and as Commissioners for the deepening of Lake St. Peter and the River St. Lawrence. I say that the amount of money altogether advanced by the Parliament of Canada has been \$3,005,000, and that there remains unexpended \$279,475, which has been appropriated by Parliament to the use of the Harbor Commission. It is estimated—and I may here say that I believe no public body in this country have ever discharged a duty imposed upon them with greater ability or greater success than the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal, and I believe they have been singularly fortunate in being able to command the service of so eminent and able an engineer as Mr. Kennedy, under whom these important works have been carried out—that with an amount of only \$20,000 over and above the estimate and appropriation of Parliament the entire work of deepening the St. Lawrence, so as to allow the passage of vessels drawing 27½ feet of water will be completed. To widen the channel which has been thus constructed, so as to furnish the most complete facilities for navigation, it is estimated that \$195,000, or, in round numbers, some \$200,000 more will be required to perfectly complete that work. Now, the Government feel that the time has come when the question of that liability should be fairly considered. They feel that the time has come when it is in the interest of the whole of this country that this great water-way should be made free so far as tonnage dues on vessels are concerned, whether inland or ocean; they feel that the time has come when the great port of Montreal, the great commercial centre of this country, should be made practically a free port, so far as tonnage dues upon ocean or inland vessels are concerned, and the Government have arrived at the conclusion that if there is one public work in this country that may fairly be assumed by the Government and the Parliament as chargeable upon the public revenue, it is the deepening of Lake St. Peter and the River St. Lawrence, thus furnishing a means of bringing ships drawing 27½ feet of water up to the city of Montreal. They believe it is not a question of the city of Montreal alone. They believe it is a question in which the whole tonnage of this country is more or less interested; they believe it is a question of importance to the whole trade of Montreal and to the whole trade of the country lying to the west of it, which will be greatly facilitated by taking this course. They believe it is a question that intimately touches this great water-way which lies between the Strait of Belle Isle and Port Arthur, giving facilities for the expansion of the

trade and commerce of this country. They believe it is in the interests of this country that this port in the great commercial centre of this country should be placed in such a position as to be able to compete with the Atlantic ports in the neighboring Republic where there is a great and sharp competition in the ocean-borne traffic and that of the great lakes down to the ocean. Under these circumstances, it is not necessary that I should detain the House, familiar as it is with the circumstances, at any length, in showing that it is desirable that this great public work should be assumed by the Parliament of Canada as a public work, in view of the objects to be attained. Therefore, we propose that the advances which have been made should be made a charge on the consolidated debt of this country, but we couple with that proposal to assume this indebtedness the entire removal of all tonnage dues, so that Montreal shall be made in that respect a free port. We ask by these resolutions that Parliament shall assume all the advances that have been made to the Harbor Commission for deepening Lake St. Peter and the River St. Lawrence. We ask that Parliament should agree to cover the amount of interest, which has been punctually paid by the Harbor Commissioners out of the revenues collected from the shipping at the port of Montreal, so that the deficit of \$37,000 which occurred in consequence of their having to pay the last instalment of interest, should be assumed by us, so as to take that altogether off the harbor proper of Montreal.

Mr. CHARLTON. What will be the entire amount assumed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The amount appropriated is \$3,005,000. In addition to that there is the amount of \$200,000 for widening the channel which has been deepened and \$37,000 of interest which is a deficit caused by the last payment of interest. In that way the Harbor Commissioners are relieved from any obligation or burden imposed upon them in that way.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does the Government undertake the responsibility of going on with improvements in the harbor?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Under the resolution this work can be completed by the Harbor Commissioners themselves, or directly by the Government, under the management of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. MITCHELL. But, if you take away their revenues, they will have no money to go on with.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have provided the money to carry the work to its entire completion, and all we propose to take away from them is the tonnage dues.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What about maintenance?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There has been an expense of \$600,000 for new plant which becomes the property of the Government, and will cover the \$220,000 additional that Parliament has already appropriated.

Mr. MITCHELL. But who is to improve the harbor and the wharves, and matters of that kind?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That will remain with the Harbor Commissioners.

Mr. MITCHELL. Where will they get the money?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The harbor of Montreal has never been chargeable to the extent of a dollar on the revenue of this country. The interest on the money we have advanced has been obtained from the tonnage dues on vessels and the wharfage dues. We do not propose to touch the wharf dues, which will not only leave in the hands of the commissioners the money required to maintain the harbor, but will give them a considerable margin to

enable them to improve the harbor of Montreal or to make a large reduction in the wharf dues. Do I make myself understood?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, the hon. gentleman makes himself understood, but I would like to know if the tonnage dues are abolished and there are still to be wharf dues, how it can be called a free port, but, if they are all abolished, the commissioners will not be in a position to go on with the improvements?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend looks at the report, he will find that the commissioners will not be in the least degree embarrassed in relation to that matter. He will see that the expenditure of the Harbor Commissioners for the calendar year 1887, apart from the amount chargeable to capital account, was \$327,000, and that their net revenue was \$289,885. If you relieve them, as you do, they only had a deficit of \$37,000, and that was only caused by their paying nearly \$100,000 of interest. Consequently, being relieved from any charge for interest, they have a large revenue left, which will enable them, from the charge on wharfage on goods at that port, either to make a reduction in the wharfage dues, or to carry on the improvements in the harbor. The effect of making this a free port, as far as the tonnage dues are concerned, will make Montreal more attractive, and will enable the St. Lawrence, as a great route of intercommunication, to compete much more successfully with other ports and in that way will greatly increase the revenue of the harbor. Now, Sir, I do not intend to take up the time of the House longer, as at this stage of the Session I know how impatient the House is to proceed with public business. As this subject is so familiar to the House, I do not think it necessary to say more upon it than to make the brief statement I have to the House.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the resolutions before the House are of a rather startling character, looking at the amount of responsibility we are going to assume, and looking at the amount of assets which we are going to release, assets which heretofore have been considered of a sufficiently satisfactory character to be continued from year to year against the public gross debt of the country. Let us examine for a moment how it is going to work out, and let us see, if we can, what amount the Government propose, under these two resolutions, to ask the House to sanction, and what amount they propose to release. In the first place, I desire to say that I sympathise very considerably with the views propounded by the Minister of Finance that the expenditure on Lake St. Peter for deepening the channel to the sea and for admitting shipping of a much larger draft of water to Montreal, may be regarded in the nature of a public work in the interests of the country. At the same time we must not lose sight of the fact that this amount has been incurred and expended to build up the city of Montreal as against the city of Quebec, which, geographically speaking, should have been the natural shipping port of the St. Lawrence. However, I am not going to enter into a discussion of that aspect of the question, but confine myself as closely as I can to the arguments the hon. gentleman has adduced in support of these resolutions. I admit, as I said before, that the expenditure of money for deepening Lake St. Peter, and for bringing commerce to Montreal, may be regarded as a public work in the interest of the country at large. The people of the west are interested in having their produce shipped as cheaply and economically as possible, and if by deepening Lake St. Peter ships of large capacity and of large draft of water can frequent Montreal, there will naturally be greater competition for the freight west, and it will naturally lead to a cheaper rate of freight. Under these circumstances I think we do not require to justify ourselves to Parliament or to the country in supporting a

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

public work which, in my judgment, may be fairly considered in the interest of the public at large. The Lake St. Peter debt, as shown by the hon. gentleman, is of course of some magnitude, and the amount expended, according to the return given by him the other day, in answer to the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) was, according to the *Hansard* report, \$2,725,504; balance of the appropriation to be spent, as given by the hon. gentleman to-night, and as given at the same time the other day, \$2,794.95; amount estimated to complete the work to 27½ feet draft of water, and to straighten the channel, \$220,000; that is the amount which the hon. gentleman has mentioned to-night; the amount of \$37,405, as mentioned by the hon. gentleman, is also the amount given as the loss on last year's operations in deepening the harbor. It was that amount, I suppose, which led the president of the Board of Trade there, as quoted here on a previous occasion, to intimate at a meeting of that board, that the Harbor Commission of Montreal was in a state of bankruptcy, and that unless the Government came to their rescue, they would be in a very embarrassing position. The amount of \$37,405 has therefore been assumed to relieve the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal from the position of bankruptcy, which the president of the Board of Trade said was threatening them. Then, again, the Minister of Finance the other day, in reply to my hon. friend, gave the amount of \$107,187 as the annual expenditure on the work in deepening the lake. Now, this amount, it must be remembered, is more than it would appear to represent, and from our experience with regard to the expenditure of public money by the Government, I am afraid that we cannot flatter ourselves that under their management, no matter how well they may be able to conduct it, it can be anything less than the amount which the Harbor Commissioners themselves expended last year. On the contrary, I think there is moderate ground for apprehension that the annual expenditure in keeping up the Lake St. Peter channel will be larger than was made by the Harbor Commissioners last year, \$107,187. Now, remember, Mr. Speaker, that this amount has to be capitalised, and taking it at 4 per cent., it will be equal to a capital of \$2,675,000, which, added to the previous items as given, will make the sum of \$5,937,404 which this House is called upon to assume for taking charge of deepening Lake St. Peter and the channel of the St. Lawrence. This of itself is rather of a startling character, but we must remember that whether it can be justified locally, we can take the view of it here that it is in the interest of the general commerce of the country. This amount capitalised, added to the expenditure already incurred, will, as the hon. gentleman sees, be equal to an appropriation of \$5,937,404 for the Lake St. Peter and Montreal debt. Then the amount covered by the other resolution which I will discuss in connection with this, respecting the graving dock of Quebec, as given by the hon. gentleman the other day, is \$38,000, interest to date on that amount \$20,454, and expenditure on work which we cancel or assume under the last clause of this memorandum is \$493,706.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope the hon. gentleman will postpone his remarks on the graving dock until we reach that resolution, which will be, I hope, in a few minutes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman prefers it I will confine my observations to the resolution before the House, which, as I have shown, calls for the assumption of a debt equal to \$5,937,000. Hon. gentlemen will remember in this connection that the amount spent last year, according to the report of the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal, was a sum considerably larger than that mentioned by the Minister of Finance. The amount mentioned for channel operations, as given in that report for last year is, I say, considerably in excess of the amount given by the

hon. gentleman in reply to the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), the other night.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is the same.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The report says: New channel operations, \$192,204.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I called that in round numbers \$200,000 in my statement just now.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Not the other day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, in my answer I gave before.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I thought there was a difference between the annual expenditures given. I understood the hon. member to give the amount as \$107,187.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. That was the expenditure of last year. I gave this answer.

"The Harbor Commissioners estimate that it will take the whole of this amount and \$20,000 additional to deepen the channel to 27½ feet at low water, and that to straighten and widen it so as to make it easier of navigation, would cost say \$200,000 more."

Mr. JONES (Halifax). According to *Hansard* the hon. gentleman is reported as saying—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the expenditure of last year; it has nothing to do with this.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This is the report of last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is another answer. \$220,000 is applicable to the harbor and \$187,000 is applicable to the channel. That was in answer to a question as to how much we spent last year.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Exactly. We are quite on the same line; but the hon. gentleman in his reply said it would be \$107,000 applicable to the channel.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have not capitalised that amount, and it would therefore be so much the worse.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is all included in the \$3,005,000; everything is included in that except \$20,000 and \$100,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman will refer to the report of the Harbor Commissioners he will find under disbursements last year: New dredging plant, \$5,000; new channel operations, \$192,214—instead of \$107,000. That is the point to which I wish to draw the hon. gentleman's attention. If such is the case, unless there is an error in the Harbor Commissioners' report, which is not probable, I think the hon. gentleman has not given us the amount which would be required to be expended on the channel to keep it open year by year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is nothing to be spent year by year on the channel.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman mean nothing to keep that channel open? The hon. gentleman must know better than that. We can hardly venture to make a statement of that kind in face of the fact that there is a strong current there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is just what will keep it right.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And a sandy bottom.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) It is not worth while for the hon. gentleman to make predictions as to future expenditure, because every nautical man knows that it will not be safe to keep the channel at 27 or 27½ feet unless there is constant dredging going on, and therefore no matter what opinion he may have, I am sure that no one familiar with

the work of the locality will doubt that an expenditure will be required year by year to keep the channel open to its present depth. I, therefore, estimate that the amount will be in the neighborhood of \$6,000 when we capitalise the annual expenditure. However, I will not make any further observations with regard to the subject, but I will wait till the other resolution is before the House, because I then propose to contrast the grants made in previous years to Quebec and those called forth under the resolution now proposed to be submitted, and to ask this House whether in view of the large amount given to Quebec during these years under peculiar circumstances hon. members from other Provinces of the Dominion are not justified in asking that a proportionate sum should be distributed for public works of an equally necessary character in other Provinces. That is the view which I intend to submit to the Government when the other resolutions come to be discussed. In the meantime, on the face of it this is a more justifiable expenditure than that covered by the other resolution which will shortly come before us.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has certainly made a mistake in his figures when he capitalised the sum of \$107,000 or \$192,000, I did not understand which amount, and added that to \$3,005,000 which is the amount of the debt advanced by the Dominion to the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal for the channel through Lake St. Peter. The hon. gentleman was mistaken in that statement. The amount the Minister of Finance mentioned as the amount of interest on the debt itself was \$112,000. When the hon. gentleman now speaks of \$192,000, which is given at page 32 of the report of the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal, for new channel operations, he seems to believe that this means for operations to keep the channel open and is an annual expenditure. It is not so. This is an amount which has been expended by the Harbor Commissioners to go on with the work of deepening, and it is taken out of the amount advanced by the Dominion to the Harbor Commissioners. It is a capital expenditure, not an expenditure to keep the work open. It is to complete the work which they have undertaken to do. That is to say we get a channel of 27½ feet deep, and, therefore, there will not be an annual expenditure. The sum of \$279,000 remains in the hands of the Government to complete those works. Of course there must be in all works of this kind some annual expenditure. You have a wharf, or you have a pier which requires care, but I think the hon. gentleman is quite mistaken in thinking that it will cost \$107,000 a year to keep it up. This work has been well executed, and when the \$279,000 in the hands of the Government has been expended to give us the required depth of 27½ feet, then there will be only \$20,000 more to complete the work as undertaken. The commissioners in their report have stated that in addition to that, in order to make it a perfect work and to prevent the sharp curves in the channel interfering with the navigation by the large steamers that come to Montreal, we will have to spend \$200,000 more to make it a more direct channel than it is now. This will complete the work. My hon. friend when he speaks of \$6,000,000 as being the amount we assume was quite mistaken. When we have expended the money which is now in our hands, the amount will be \$3,005,000 and \$220,000 more will be required to complete the work in the direction I have stated. Those sums together will make \$3,225,000. We will then have in our possession the plant which has cost over \$600,000. Of course that plant will not have a value of \$600,000 when those works are completed, but they will have sufficient value to cover the \$225,000, beyond the \$3,000,000 of the debt. When the works are completed and when the plant is disposed of, we may say that the debt will be \$3,000,000.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Who will attend to buoying and dredging the channel?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As far as I can recollect, the placing and removing of those buoys was done by the Harbor Commissioners for the Department of Marine and the commissioners received \$7,000 for executing that work. If we choose, it can continue in their hands on the same conditions or we can have it done ourselves for the money we are paying for it every year.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There is the dredging in summer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was not for the dredging but for keeping the buoys in order, and removing them and placing them in position.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). You will have to dredge the channel or it will never keep open.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will probably, in the spring, have a tug to pass down the channel, to see if there is any accumulation, or if the ice has left any boulders. If there is any obstacle found we will do what we do for all other works and have it removed.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Minister allow me to suggest that he will have to have dredges constantly employed working on the wharves?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will have nothing to do with that.

Mr. MITCHELL. Who will do that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Harbor Commissioners.

Mr. MITCHELL. Where do they get the funds?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. From the duties on goods, and wharfage dues.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will remember that the channel in the centre of Lake St. Peter, and the harbor of Montreal are two distinct things. The harbor of Montreal goes as far as a point called Ruisseau Migeon as my hon. friend knows. From that point downwards towards Quebec is the channel the Government will have under control if those resolutions are adopted by the House. From Ruisseau Migeon westwards to the Lachine Canal, will be the harbor of Montreal and that will be under the direct control of the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal. It will be their business to look after the channel in the harbor, to deepen it and keep their wharves in order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Out of what funds will they do that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are two funds from which the Harbor Commissioners derive their resources, by which they are able to proceed with the works in the harbor of Montreal. There are the tonnage dues on the vessels, and out of those the Harbor Commissioners pay the interest on the advances made by the Government, that is to say, \$3,005,000.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is abolished now.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; that is abolished now. Beyond that the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal collect a large sum for goods on their wharves.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you know what amount?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Wharfage on goods inwards, amount to \$128,000 and outwards to \$72,000, so that those two sums make over \$200,000. The Harbor Commissioners will have this money to go on with their works in the harbor of Montreal. Hon. gentlemen need not be uneasy; for the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal will have quite enough to deepen their harbor, when it is required. In addition to this, they have the right to borrow money to extend their wharves, and build new piers, and those new piers will give them revenue sufficient to pay the interest on the money expended.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. MITCHELL. Has the hon. gentleman received an estimate of what it will cost to keep those wharves in repair; to do the dredging necessary, to keep the channel in front of the wharves deepened, and to perform the duties the Harbor Commissioners are expected to perform within the territorial limit described by the hon. gentleman? I have myself seen from 100 to 200 men in the employ of the Harbor Commissioners clearing off the ice in spring, and it generally takes them a couple of months to get the wharves in repair in consequence of the damage done by the ice. I am greatly mistaken if \$200,000, will even begin to do all that work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think their revenues are more than \$200,000, but the reason why I say the amount will be quite sufficient for the purpose, is that I have put together the revenues they derive from tonnage dues, from wharfage and from goods inwards and outwards, and so on. The Harbor Commissioners had quite enough revenues to keep the harbor of Montreal in perfect order, to pay all expenses, and to pay the interest on the advances made by the Government. But last year they found that the advances made by the Government to them had so increased by the deepening of the channel, that their revenues from tonnage dues and other sources were not sufficient to pay the interest by \$37,000. Then they said, we cannot get along, and we must be fair and candid with the Government, and tell them at once what position we are in. So they ask us to come to their relief by assuming the debt for deepening Lake St. Peter, which they consider to be a portion of the canal system of the country. We will relieve them of last year's deficit of \$37,000, assume the debt, and extinguish the interest they were paying to the Government this year to the amount of \$112,000. The balance of their revenues, amounting to about \$250,000, will be quite sufficient, as they were last year and the previous year, to pay all their expenses in the harbor of Montreal proper.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is the length of the channel of Lake St. Peter?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose the distance must be 110 miles from the harbor of Montreal down to Cap à la Roche. I do not know the length of the excavated channel.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend has given his explanation very clearly. But I wish to state that the harbor of Montreal is far too cramped to enable the business coming to it to be done properly. It will require to be extended, and a much larger amount of money than the hon. gentlemen expects must be provided. I am not an engineer, but I know from the constant statements of persons connected with the port that such is the case. I would like the hon. gentleman to bear that in mind, because if he takes away the tonnage and the wharfage dues, I am afraid there will not be enough left to extend the harbor. The railways coming in there demand a larger amount of accommodation, and I have heard merchants complain of the deficiency of wharf accommodation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no doubt that in consequence of the abolition of the tonnage dues the business of the port will increase largely—that a much larger number of vessels will come up the St. Lawrence and contribute a larger revenue to the resources of the Harbor Commission. But the commissioners foresee that they will have to expend within three or four years about \$900,000. They expect that they will have out of their ordinary revenues, which are increasing every year \$40,000 or \$50,000, which will help them in meeting the interest on that amount. The new wharves and piers, at which the vessels will be moored, and on which merchandise will be landed, will also give a large revenue to the Harbor Commissioners. They do not

seem to be uneasy about that at all. They will have power to borrow that money; but as prudent and honorable men, they did not wish to borrow money in order to proceed with other improvements until they were sure that the Government and Parliament of Canada would relieve them of this debt and of the deficit, and thus give them an opportunity to meet the interest on the new debt.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is the hon. Minister quite right in stating that the revenues are likely to increase? I notice that the figures for the past few years show an increased tonnage, but a reduced revenue:

Year	Tonnage	Revenue
1878.....	397,000	\$ 63,000
1879.....	506,000	106,000
1880.....	628,000	156,000
1881.....	531,000	70,000
1882.....	554,000	68,000
1883.....	664,000	65,000
1884.....	649,000	51,000
1885.....	683,000	28,000
1886.....	809,000	68,000
1887.....	870,000	69,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A large reduction was made both in tonnage dues and wharfage dues some years ago.

Mr. MITCHELL. I doubt if the revenue from wharfage is very likely to increase.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As I stated just now, the wharfage on goods inwards and outwards amounted to a little over \$200,000. My hon. friend will see that the interest which the commissioners paid out of their revenues to the Dominion Government was \$99,187. They did not pay that out of capital, but out of the revenues of the harbor. They will be relieved of that, and also of \$27,000 of a debt which they would have had to pay to the Government.

Mr. JONES. They would not be worth the whole of that \$99,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, the whole of that, leaving \$5,000 that the Government will pay or will expend there. The remainder of their debt is not due to the Government but to outsiders, who bought their debentures, and, therefore, the interest on those debentures will be paid as heretofore out of ordinary revenue. On these resolutions becoming law, the Harbor Commission of Montreal will be relieved of \$99,187 at once, which is now paid out of their revenue. With the tonnage dues on steamers and sailing vessels amounting to \$48,000, that with the \$5,000 will make, say \$53,000, which deducted from the \$99,000, will leave the commission a nice margin of over \$40,000, which added to their ordinary revenue, will give them ample means to meet their annual expenditure on their harbor and besides a portion of the interest on the new debentures they may have to issue. With these explanations, the principle being admitted that this is a work which is not only for the harbor of Montreal but for the country at large, the House should agree to this resolution.

Mr. MITCHELL. I notice that the harbor expenses, including harbor repairs, expenses of management, &c., amount to \$261,323. Assuming the expenses to be no more in the future, that would leave only \$40,000 for repairs, which will not amount to anything.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The deficit last year of the Harbor Commissioners, after paying \$99,000 of interest to the Government on this debt, of which we are now relieving them, was \$37,000. Is it not, therefore, evident that on relieving them of the \$99,000 interest, their revenue will be ample to meet the service to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, because this \$261,333 is for the actual working of the harbor. Then they have the inter-

est on the debentures to pay to be added to that, which will amount to more than the balance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. After paying everything and doing everything a harbor requires, after making all the expenditure necessary, after paying \$99,000 out of their revenue besides, the commissioners had a deficit only of \$37,000. Then, if we relieve them of the \$99,000, and the deficit was only \$37,000, when they had to pay that amount, and also performed all other services, that will leave a balance of \$62,000 in their favor.

Mr. MITCHELL. Provided you have a finality; but if you expect to go on improving the harbor as the necessities of increased railway business demands, where is the money to come from? I am not going to delay this resolution, but I think it my duty to call the attention of the Government to the fact that they will have to give some additional facility to the Harbor Commission to enable them to get these improvements, if these improvements are to be made. True, they may raise money on bonds.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. After making Montreal a free port, so far as tonnage dues are concerned, the increased business of the port ought to give ample revenue.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. member for Northumberland has addressed himself boldly to some contemplated improvements with respect to the harbor of Montreal proper. He is afraid that after the Harbor Commissioners have been relieved of this \$3,250,000 which he proposes to relieve them of and to assume ourselves, they will not be able to carry out certain grand improvements which they have in view. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 14, he will see that the chairman of the board is not under any apprehension on that score, because he says that, "if relieved from the interest on our advances to the Government, the board will be able to meet all the necessities of the harbor without unduly burdening trade. I hope there will not be the smallest end of the wedge inserted here to lead to the hope that any sum of money may be obtained for those contemplated improvements in the harbor of Montreal proper. I have read the report of Mr. Kennedy, and I have no doubt he is a most able engineer, but it is quite apparent that the improvements in the harbor, which he has in view, will involve the outlay of an enormous sum of money, an outlay required not for any project of national importance but simply to improve the harbor of Montreal proper. That is not the exact question before us to-night. We are assuming, as the hon. gentleman for Halifax put it very clearly, an enormous liability added to the general liabilities of the country. Had this proposition been made a few years ago, it would have been received with a great deal of, I will not say fear and suspicion, but of disapproval. When this proposition was made to the House, I turned up the different statutes under which advances were made to the Montreal Harbor Commission. We began the work in 1873, when we authorised the Government to advance \$1,500,000 to the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal for the purpose of deepening Lake St. Peter channel to a depth of 22 feet. It was understood then there was no fear at all of the country ever being called on to pay this money, and the money was voted. A few years afterwards the commission came before Parliament again, and asked an additional grant of \$218,000 to carry on the work. Parliament gave that allowance on the further assurance that the country was not undertaking any liability, but was merely making an advance to the commissioners to enable them to carry out much needed improvements. Then, in the year 1883, the hon. the Minister of Public Works comes forward with another proposition, that they should deepen the channel from 21½ feet, which was the proposition, to 27½ feet, and for that reason we should advance nearly a million more, and the hon. gentleman managed to

carry that through the House. At that time, one hon. gentleman, at least the former representative of Montmagny, stated that there was an agreement between the Government and the Harbor Commissions of Quebec and of Montreal, that these works should not be undertaken at the Government expense. That statement was not contradicted here, and the general impression of the members who were voting these enormous sums of money was that the country was not assuming any liability, but was simply enabling the Harbor Commissioners to carry out an improvement which was much needed in the city of Montreal. This may or may not be a work of national importance, I think there is something to be said for it, but it is well that we should understand the enormous liability which we are assuming, and I hope the hon. gentleman from Montreal will not in future put forward any claims for the improvement of this harbor. I am not sure that the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Jones) was wrong when he said that the amount which had been advanced was \$2,725,704. We assume that and make it part of the debt of the Dominion. Then there is another matter which is hardly defensible, and that is the amount of \$37,000. I do not see why we should assume that amount which is the deficit on the last year's operations of the Harbor Commissioners. I should like to ask if that has any relation to the works in Montreal proper?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, but we do not want the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal to have any claim on the Government for anything in connection with the deepening of Lake St. Peter, and, as that deficit arose in a year when they paid \$99,000 for interest, it is evident that, if it had not been for that, they would not have had that deficit, and we want to start them with a *tabula rasa*.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They paid that on the amount we had advanced to them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That was on the channel debt.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We advanced the money, and the tolls were allowed in order to enable them to pay that back. I think I am correct in saying that the \$37,465 is the total deficit of the commissioners as to the channel debt and also as to the Harbor of Montreal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So, practically speaking, there is no deficit on the deepening of the channel, but it is in connection with the works in and around Montreal. I am not satisfied myself that it is quite fair. However, it is a small matter to haggle over \$37,000 when you are voting millions. It appears that we are to assume a debt of \$3,242,404.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is \$3,222,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is not very much difference, we will say three millions and a quarter. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) asked if this was the full extent of the liabilities, because, from the answers to questions which I put the other day, because we were trying to find what the extent of the liability was which we were assuming, the hon. gentleman said that the commissioners divided their expenditure, that \$220,123 was applicable to the harbor, and \$87,000 to the channel, and the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) naturally assumed that to be the amount of our annual expenditure on the work. I find, on page 14 of the report which has been laid on our Table, that the commissioners support the statement given in response to the enquiry of an hon. member. In that statement, it will be found that the ordinary charges for management, lighting, &c., were \$108,000. Taking that in connection with the answer of the Minister of Finance that the proportion applicable to the channel was \$107,000,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

I do not think my hon. friend was very far wide of the mark. I believe it is true that every year the channel will be silting up that mud. It is stated that at one point the incoming tide meets the flow of the river, as I am instructed by shipmasters who know that river well. What we have been doing is to dig out this channel, but there will be silting and filling up of that channel every year. I am not objecting to this, but I think we had better understand what we are assuming. We are taking over all the dredging plant, and why? Because we will require it for dredging every year. I am not going to oppose this proposition at all, whether right or wrong.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mostly all wrong.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I had some conversation with some of the representatives of this work, and I find that \$14,000 has been expended for buoying, and lighting, and matters of that kind. I do not think my hon. friend is far astray in putting the annual cost of management at \$107,000, and that is in addition to this three and a quarter millions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That includes \$99,000 of interest.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is wrong there. The hon. gentleman will see that, if we have to dredge that every year, the cost cannot be much less than \$100,000, so that we are practically assuming a debt of \$6,000,000 for the harbor at Montreal. The Minister of Finance said that we were giving facilities for traffic from the Straits of Belle Isle to Port Arthur. That is not certain. We are simply improving the approach to the city of Montreal proper. Nature has provided a port for the Dominion at Quebec, and all the vessels that come down our canals could go to Quebec without deepening this channel at all. The hon. gentleman knows that our canals are only made at present for 12 feet vessels; barges of 12 feet can go down our canals already as far as the city of Quebec. It is not an enlargement of our canal system, otherwise we would have to enlarge the canal system to the proposed depth of 27½ feet. It is to enable large sized vessels and steamers to go to the city of Montreal that otherwise would have to stop at Quebec.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Inland navigation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, it may be defensible. Gentlemen who know more about the resources and wants of the country than I do, seem to think it is; I am not one to raise my voice against it; but I want to know exactly what we are doing. I remember here, two or three years ago, these votes slipped through the House without being fully understood, in obedience to the suave manner and persuasive tongue of the Minister of Public Works, and scarcely no objections at all were made to them. A year or two ago we were told that Montreal was all very well, but Quebec was to be the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in a very grandiloquent speech the Minister of Finance came down and told us that it was essential to the interest of this country, and a matter of national importance, that they should maintain access for the Canadian Pacific Railway to the great national port of Canada. No use to talk about your inland ports, you must go to the great natural harbor of Quebec; and the hon. gentleman invited us to spend over two millions of money in purchasing the North Shore Railway to prolong the Pacific and to make Quebec one of its termini; and now, having voted two millions, you are asked to assume the debt.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A million and a half, \$970,000 and \$530,600; that makes a million and a half.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the first place there was the \$954,000 which we returned to the Government of the Province of Quebec in consideration of their having constructed

a railway from Quebec to Ottawa, and for the portion between Montreal and Ottawa, 120 miles, \$1,440,000; that is over two millions; and again a million and a half in 1885, as an hon. friend reminds me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. For what did you say that \$1,440,000 was for?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) For the portion between Montreal and Ottawa.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But that has nothing to do with it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It has a great deal to do with it. The hon. gentleman, I say, when he brought down his resolution, asked the House to give him that money, because he said it was necessary that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be prolonged to its natural terminus, the city of Quebec.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was at Montreal then.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman took a vote from this Parliament to recoup the Province of Quebec for money it had expended in building this railway. Now, what are we doing? After doing that you turn round and say you ought to assume the debt of \$6,000,000 in order to build up a rival port.

Mr. CURRAN. Make it \$12,000,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not exaggerating it. I have given the hon. gentleman the figures, and I say they come to six millions, and if the hon. gentleman can contest the accuracy of any of them, I am perfectly willing to hear him after I sit down. There is no desire on my part to exaggerate, and there should be none on his part to minimise. I say that having voted this two or three millions for that purpose, you now turn around and assume the debt of six millions, which will render nugatory the purpose for which you voted these large sums six years ago. Still, I am not going to oppose the motion, because it is alleged by those who have a pretty good knowledge of it, that it is, perhaps, not unfair, that it may be construed, in one sense, as part of a great national work. But I hope we will not hear anything more hereafter from the great rich city of Montreal about not having its share of public expenditure. I hope when some outlying Provinces ask for some small grants from time to time, for necessary improvements in their harbors, and in the construction of their public works that the representatives of that great metropolitan city will not be continually taunting us with our demands on the public exchequer. Montreal is making a haul to-night that no other city in Canada has ever made before, and I will venture to say that no other city will ever make again. There is no doubt, as an hon. gentleman says, that Quebec will come to the front. In a few minutes we are going into a resolution—I do not want to anticipate a discussion,—to give some millions to Quebec.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Quebec gets nothing at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, we will discuss that directly. I am anxious we should understand the resolution, I want to be clear in my mind as to our share of the responsibility in assuming this debt.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not object at all to the line of criticism the hon. gentleman has adopted; I think in the main it is very fair, but I do protest against his constantly swelling an appropriation of three millions into one of six. I protest against it because it is most misleading. I will show my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) in a single moment that he is entirely mistaken as to the capitalisation of the amount outside of the \$3,005,000. The \$220,000 in addition to that will be more than covered by the value of the plant,

if the plant was sold when the work was finished; therefore I call the debt assumed by the country three millions, and I will show my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) that that \$107,000 which I gave in answer to his question, contains \$99,000 of interest. I said, in answer to him, that the expenditure of the Harbor Commissioners for the calendar year 1887, apart from the expenditure on capital account, was, according to statements made by them to the Government, \$327,290. That is the whole of their expenditure chargeable to revenue. They divided their expenditure as follows, that is, their expenditure apart from capital: \$220,123 as applicable to the harbor, and \$107,187 as applicable to the channel, and out of that amount they paid over \$99,000 of interest to the Government, and they charged \$8,000 as the proportion of the expenses of the board which would be applicable to the channel, to make up the \$107,900. I know the hon. gentleman does not wish to misunderstand me, and I want to make that point clear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will see that he is not yet quite accurate, because at pages 32 and 33 of the report the total expenditure of the Harbor Commissioners that year was \$31,739, which included \$237,000 debentures paid, a certain amount for construction and the cost of management. There was for salaries \$26,300, and \$14,000 for buoys and beacons. Those items are connected with the channel. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman what will be the cost of dredging the channel from year to year and lighting and buoying it?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the Finance Minister is laboring under a misapprehension with regard to these items. Here is an account of the disbursements. There is for new dredging plant so much, new channel operations \$192,214.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That has nothing to do with the point we are dealing with. I am dealing with charges to revenue apart from capital. I said the amount of \$107,000 is composed of \$99,000 interest and \$8,000 management.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is only an assumption.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is according to the report furnished to me by the Harbor Commissioners of the port of Montreal. They furnished me with a statement that their whole expenditure was \$327,000 and they divided it as \$20,123 applicable to the harbor and \$107,377 applicable to the channel. That is chargeable to revenue and it includes interest as I have said.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). By referring to the report of the Harbor Commissioners, which I accept in preference to the statement furnished by the commissioners to the Finance Minister, it is stated that new channel operations cost \$192,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is an entirely different subject. \$192,000 is chargeable to capital expenditure and has nothing to do with the other. It is included in the \$3,005,000, and you must therefore not capitalise it over again.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is the amount which the Harbor Commissioners had to expend in that way. They reduced it afterwards, according to the statement, to \$107,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. One is capital and the other is revenue.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It does not form any part of the charge which they put down.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Entirely so; but the hon. gentleman must not capitalise \$192,000 as the amount spent on the channel when that amount is already embraced in

the \$3,005,000. The hon. gentleman must not capitalise it twice.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It was the amount they spent that year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But it was part of the \$3,005,000.

Mr. GIROUARD. I was astonished by the remarks made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), when he said that he hoped this was the last time any claim would be made by Montreal with respect to the Lake St. Peter debt. I do not pretend to represent the city of Montreal and I do not speak for that city; no doubt we shall hear from the members of the city reasons why the resolution should be adopted. I desire to offer some remarks from an independent point of view, and as the representative of the county which has some interest in Montreal, but not to the extent that the views of the county may be influenced by the interests of Montreal. It has been admitted by all the speakers this evening that the deepening of Lake St. Peter was a Dominion work. If it was a Dominion work I do not see why so much time should be spent in inquiring as to how much the Government would be required to spend in future in order to maintain that work. It matters very little what amount is necessary, unless Parliament is going to lay down the doctrine that a Dominion work must be shut up. I admit that works should be closed if they are of no use, but no one will question that this work is a necessity to the commerce of the country. I hold that instead of getting too much, the city of Montreal is far from obtaining full due by the resolution now before the House.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD. I hear the hon. member for Halifax say "hear, hear." When I visited Halifax last summer I saw many improvements there that had been carried out by means of the public funds of the Dominion. Is it not a fact that the breakwater in front of the city of St. John, N. B., which I also visited last summer, was built by the Dominion at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Only \$100,000.

Mr. GIROUARD. I said several hundred thousand dollars, so it was twice the amount I indicated. That breakwater is in the very heart of the city, and in fact the harbor of St. John could not exist without it. It is astonishing that hon. gentlemen should declare that Montreal is getting too much. It does not obtain one-half what is due to it, considering its importance from a commercial standpoint. If it is admitted that this is a Dominion work, why should we not get back interest for the past? If the work should have been built by the Dominion from the very beginning, why should we not get that interest? I say that we are entitled to it, and if the representatives of the city want to get some support, I am willing to give it to them in the future, in order that they may obtain that claim, and so long as Prince Edward Island receives injury, or any other portion of the Dominion, that portion will get my support. Let us now see how the matter stands in regard to Quebec. It has been said that the channel was commenced with a view to establishing a rivalry between Montreal and Quebec. There is no foundation for that statement. The deepening of Lake St. Peter was commenced in 1873. What was the position then of the city of Quebec? Was it in the position of the first sea port of the Dominion? There was no railway communication with Quebec at that time.

Mr. MITCHELL. What about the Grand Trunk Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. GIROUARD. It was on the other side of the river, not in the city of Quebec. There were no harbor improvements to accommodate the whole shipping of the Dominion. Quebec did not give sufficient accommodation for importers in order to distribute from it trade throughout the Dominion. The city did not have a back country to maintain a large trade; but what has been the worst drawback to Quebec is the ship laborers, whom the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), in this House last Session, declared to be a conspiracy and a perfect nuisance in Quebec. That organisation has been the greatest enemy of the port. I agree to a certain extent with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that the revenue of the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal will be cut down by the resolution. Some of the dues will be abolished, but the people of the country will at once receive compensation from the adoption by the Dominion of the Lake St. Peter debt. The public will receive immediate compensation: they were paying \$107,000 a year tonnage dues for interest on the Lake St. Peter debt, which in future they will not pay, but the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal will surrender the charges which were imposed on the shipping of the country, and the people of the country will thus receive compensation for the outlay. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I., said that the chairman of the Montreal Harbor Board said that if the Government would assume the Lake St. Peter debt, they need not trouble themselves as to where to get the revenue in order to meet the ordinary expenses of the harbor. The report of the chairman of the Harbor Commissioners does not intimate that the Harbor Commissioners expected that the tonnage dues are going to be abolished. The chairman expected that while the Government would assume the debt of Lake St. Peter, all the sources of the revenue of the Harbor Commissioners would be maintained—that the tonnage dues would be continued, if they were needed, and also that the wharfage dues would be continued. It is impossible in the position the Harbor Commissioners are left in to-day, to say that they will be able to improve the accommodation for all the trade of the Dominion in the port of Montreal. As I said a moment ago, the city of Montreal does not get its whole due. We ought to get the interest paid in the past. As has been done in most cities of the Dominion, they should have got certain assistance for the improvement of the harbor. They should have got it as it was given to Halifax and St. John, and a great many other ports in the Provinces of the Dominion of Canada. I wish to say that I will gladly vote for the resolution before the House. Although Montreal does not get full justice, it gets a portion of it, and I believe that in one or two sessions full justice will be done to the city of Montreal.

Mr. AMYOT. I agree with the speaker who has preceded me that this is not a question of rivalry between Quebec and Montreal. It is a question of business and justice. I am in favor of digging out our rivers, completing our canals and having inland navigation as far as possible. That is a right principle and I am in favor of it. I am glad to see Montreal going ahead so fast in the march of progress, but I am not in favor of justice being done at the expense of other places, or that injustice should be committed for the sake of doing justice. What will be the position now? In Quebec we have built some works which have caused the Harbor Commissioners to be indebted to the Government, and they will remain indebted to the Government, so that in order to enable them to pay interest they will be forced to charge tonnage dues on the ships entering that port. Quebec harbor will not be a free harbor, and it is not the fault of Quebec that such is the case. It is the fault of the Government which has organized the Harbor Commissioners, or the majority of the commissioners who have

proposed those works, and imposed on the Harbor Commissioners the obligation of borrowing money from the Government. We have now to force the commerce away from Quebec, by charging tonnage dues on the ships coming to the port of Quebec, so as to pay the interest on the remaining debt. Under this proposition Quebec, as well as the rest of the country, has to pay to deepen the St. Peter channel, and when ships arrive at Montreal they will not be charged with any tonnage dues. Shipping will therefore have more interest in going to Montreal than to stop at Quebec, and in this way you are taking the public money to chase the ships from Quebec and send them to Montreal. You take the public money to ruin Quebec and that is not fair justice to Quebec. We contend that Quebec is a natural port, and that no means should be taken to remove from Quebec the advantages it possesses of being a natural port. You will in this way take the ships from Quebec, in spite of its being a natural port, and by means of the expenditure of public money send them to Montreal. I say it is very unjust and very unfair. I am told by an hon. member that the ship laborers in Quebec are the cause of the diversion of trade from that port. To some extent I admit that they are, but who is responsible for that? I say the Government is responsible, because they have not put an end to that state of things. They know that the sailors coming from other countries have contributed to organise that condition of affairs, but why do they not pass the legislation that I and the city of Quebec asked them to pass, to prevent that organisation of the ship laborers to do harm. The members who represent the city of Quebec cannot agree to this proposition, because Quebec remains loaded with a debt useless to itself, in favor of Montreal, and which burden on Quebec will have the effect of chasing the commerce from that natural port. I draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to that point, and I am sure that it will only suffice to remind him of this injustice to Quebec, in order that he may remedy it. He has said that the business will increase in Montreal, and that the fact of its becoming a free port will make the port more attractive, but at the expense of what other place is this done?

Mr. CURRAN. New York and Boston.

Mr. AMYOT. It will take away from Quebec what trade remains there, and bring it to Montreal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will enable Montreal to compete with New York and Boston.

Mr. AMYOT. We crush the trade of Quebec with a debt on account of useless works there, and give the whole of the advantage to another city. You leave Quebec burdened with a debt, and you open another port where you create a free tonnage. Under those circumstances this policy is good for Montreal, and good for the country, but for Quebec it is a ruin.

Mr. CURRAN. Mr. Speaker, the task which falls upon me at this moment is certainly one that is extremely light and were it not for some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), I should not attempt to say one word in defence of the policy which has been so ably placed before this House by the hon. Minister who has it in charge, and by his colleagues as well. We have been told by the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) that he hopes this is the last time we shall have the city of Montreal coming here and begging, or, on the other hand, clamoring against those who from other cities may come here and ask for grants from the public treasury. I have not been very long in this House; this is only my second Parliament, but during the five or six Sessions I have been here, I know that neither I nor any of my colleagues from Montreal have risen in our places to urge the slightest objection to any grant being made to any city in any Province whatever, and I think,

as one of my hon. friends says, we are all pulling together Montreal tries to pull with the whole Dominion. We are anxious to see the whole Dominion prosperous. We have no jealousy of any other port either in the Maritime Provinces, in our own Province or in any other Province. We are delighted to see public money expended in a manner that will benefit the country at large, and I am not aware that any member from the city or district of Montreal has ever raised his voice in opposition to any scheme that had the slightest feasibility on its face. But I will say this, that Montreal as a harbor has never received one cent from the Dominion of Canada. Montreal has paid its own expenses and the cost of its own improvements. The work on Lake St. Peter was originally a Dominion work.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How about the harbor police?

Mr. CURRAN. The police have nothing to do with the city, but they are paid out of the shipping and their duties are on the wharves and in the harbor.

Mr. MITCHELL. The shipping actually pays a tonnage tax for that expense. The shipping pays it, not the Government.

Mr. CURRAN. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the report of the hon. Minister of Public Works for the year ending June 30, 1887, he will find that the harbors of Toronto, Owen Sound, Kingston, Goderich, Cobourg, St. John and Halifax, have all received considerable sums of money for the internal improvements of these ports, but not one cent has been contributed for the internal improvement of the port of Montreal. Now, with regard to my hon. friend's assertion that we as a Dominion are assuming a debt of \$6,000,000, there is no gentleman in this House who has heard the explanations of the hon. Minister of Finance, and there is no gentleman in this country who will read his explanation in answer to both the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Queens, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), who will not admit that these gentlemen are both in the wrong in making that assertion, and that the amount assumed is exactly the amount named in this resolution.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). The hon. gentleman, I am sure, does not want to misrepresent me, but does he contend that there will be no annual expenditure required for maintaining this channel?

Mr. CURRAN. My hon. friend may take my word for it that there will be comparatively no expense for maintaining the channel. What I said was that he was contending, and was giving the public of Canada to understand, that we are assuming a debt of \$6,000,000 when it is only \$3,000,000 and a fraction.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I capitalise the probable expenditure at \$100,000.

Mr. CURRAN. That expenditure has nothing to do with maintaining the channel open. It was for operations carried on at Cape à la Roche, and when they are finished they will be finished forever. As the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has pointed out to those gentlemen, it has not a sandy bottom, but is of the hardest of rock almost, and will not require any dredging. On the contrary, it will be kept perfectly clean by the natural flow of the water, and the only work to be done, as the hon. Minister of Public Works has pointed out, will be the removal of perhaps an occasional boulder that may be driven into the channel by the ice shove. Now, I am sorry that the hon. gentleman who spoke last should have taken the view he did of this question as one affecting the sister city of Quebec. I can assure him that there is nothing but the kindest feelings towards that city in the city that I have the honor to represent; there is no spirit of unfriendliness there towards the city of Quebec; and if the hon. gentle-

man has read the memorandum with appendices on the St. Lawrence route, submitted to the hon. Minister of Public Works in February last, and distributed to the members of this House, he will find that the most eminent men of this country, those occupying adverse positions to each other on every public question—such men, for instance, as the vice-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, the president of the Board of Trade of Montreal, the representatives of all the great shipping lines that come to our Canadian ports, both Montreal and other ports, the representatives of the importers and the exporters, the representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, in fact every great commercial authority in the country—

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). In Montreal.

Mr. CURRAN. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the Grand Trunk Railway is confined to Montreal alone? Does he suppose that the Canadian Pacific Railway is confined to Montreal alone?

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Their headquarters are in Montreal.

Mr. CURRAN. If they are, it is because they find it to their interest to have them in Montreal. They are not there for love of Montreal. It is no matter of feeling or affection with them. They go where it best suits them to go; and each one of these gentlemen says that the question is not one of rivalry between any two Canadian cities, but the question is whether Canada shall hold its trade or whether that trade shall go to Boston, New York and other United States ports. The assumption of this debt is not a question that affects Montreal alone. It is impossible that it should be assumed without Montreal benefiting; but the great benefit will redound to the shipping and commerce of Canada. The city of Montreal is alive to the importance of this question. As the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) has said, Montreal did feel that there was a reimbursement due to it for what it had expended in the past in the shape of interest. However, there is no use of opening up a question that is not before the House. But the city of Montreal as a corporation is fully alive to the importance of coming forward and aiding, even to the extent of more than its share, more than has ever been done by any city in the Dominion of Canada, in pressing forward the great improvements which are absolutely necessary for the development of that harbor, in view of the great accession to our trade that is likely to come in the early future. My hon. friend has shown exactly what we have done in the past; and with regard to the matter of the police, and matters connected with the revetment wall and other expenses which the city has no right to assume, I have the assurance of the chairman of the Finance Committee that the city of Montreal is prepared to come forward and do nobly that which its citizens feel devolves upon them as an enterprising and go-ahead people. For my part, I am satisfied that some hon. gentlemen to-night have shown that they have come to this question with far more interest in it than they have shown in the past; and I am glad that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), has made the admission that this is really a Dominion work, and that he does not take the same view of this question that he did on another occasion and at another Session of this Parliament. I am satisfied that these resolutions will carry. I am sorry to have detained the House at this late hour, but I felt it due to the city I represent that I should say these few words in vindication of what I conceive to be the justice of the position we occupy.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise simply for two objects. One is to set myself right with regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., implying that I was advocating that money should be expended from the

Mr. CURRAN,

public treasury to improve the harbor of Montreal. I expressed no opinion about that. In the remarks I made, my object was only to ascertain exactly what the position of the harbor trust would be after they were divested of their tonnage dues and relieved from the liability of \$99,000. That was my sole object, and it was not for the purpose of drawing from the Government in any way a statement pledging them to expenditure for Montreal. When the senior member for Halifax and the hon. member for Queen's took exception to this large sum being given for dredging out the channel of the St. Lawrence, they talked as if the question was a new one. Why, I recollect that in the early days of my occupation of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, this very question was a ripe one, a question to which the public were alive. Delegations came from the harbor of Montreal, and a committee of the harbor trust came up for the purpose of settling this very question, and the Government of that day were prepared to do exactly what the Government are doing to-day. They were prepared to assume the responsibility of deepening the channel of the St. Lawrence and Lake St. Peter, but the harbor trust did not feel disposed to let the patronage and power resulting from the execution of the work pass out of their hands, and they undertook to do it themselves and to pay for it by levying tolls on the shipping.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend will remember the circumstance. It was a mistake on the part of the harbor trust not to accept the proposition of the Government of that day. It came within the prevision of my duty as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to discuss that matter, and I submitted a scheme twenty years ago, by which the Government were to assume the responsibility of doing this work. No man should object to this; no man should object to our making this great artery, one of the greatest in the world, of as great capacity as possible, so as to admit all shipping. I hope no jealousy will exist between the ports of Montreal and Quebec. The Government have been liberal to ports all over the Dominion. In this case it is not asking too much, that this, the greatest of the whole of them, this great artery into the interior of the continent carrying out the flow of a water shed of thousands of miles, a water territory of millions of acres, be made navigable for the largest shipping. True, the question of the increase of harbor accommodation is entirely distinct from this, and if the commission have not means enough, it may be that they will come back to this House, but that is not the question before the House, and my object was not to get a pledge from the Government, but to understand how much and to what extent the assistance given the Harbor Commissioners would go and to what extent they had to rely upon their own resources to improve and maintain the harbor. My hon. friend seems scarcely to realise the importance of the trade of the country of having additional facilities in Montreal. Montreal has not one-half the accommodation she requires, and if we look at the large additional trade that will be brought in by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with their elevators which exist and those they have yet to put up, and with their cattle yards, perhaps the finest in the world, should the harbor of Montreal not be in a position to accommodate that trade, it will go to Boston, New York, Portland and other American cities. It behooves the merchants of Montreal to take the matter in hand in time, and before the trade gets diverted to make such improvements as are required, and if they cannot do what is necessary, it will be time enough then to approach the Government and see what can be done.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I did not intend to make any remarks on this resolution but to reserve them for both resolutions, but as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has brought into the question the harbor of St. John as one

on which a great deal has been expended, and has stated that the harbor would not be a harbor without the break-water, I tell him the harbor existed long before the break-water was put there.

Mr. GIROUARD. It was not necessary then.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It was necessary for the smaller vessels.

Mr. GIROUARD. Is it not within the limits of the port?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). True, it is within the limits of the port, but since Confederation all that has been expended on the port is \$422,000, and by-and-by we will show that we are thoroughly entitled to further consideration at the hands of the Government with regard to our harbor. The question now is with regard to the assumption of this debt created by the deepening of the St. Lawrence and Lake St. Peter. I pointed out that the river police at Montreal and Quebec are sustained by the Federal Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. If they are, the tax is raised off the shipping which is collected by the Federal Government.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The collector of customs pays over the tonnage to the Harbor Commission, and there is no charge in the Harbor Commissioners' accounts for paying the harbor police.

Mr. MITCHELL. Having managed this business for seven years, I may say that was always the general practice of my administration, and I think that there has been no change since.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I will admit my hon. friend is right, but if that was the arrangement why should it not be put under the control of the Harbor Commissioners, instead of dividing it between the Federal Government and the Harbor Commissioners. The Federal Government, it seems, receives a certain amount of money to be expended back on the port of Montreal.

Mr. MITCHELL. Whenever the fund, which varies increases faster than the expense requires, we reduce it. We reduced it twice during my administration.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Probably my hon. friend is correct. I have no objection to Montreal getting a fair share of the public money or to the improvement of the ship channel, but we find that even the canals of the St. Lawrence are practically for the benefit of Montreal. The expense for harbor police was, I find, \$17,400, and the receipts for police dues \$10,000, showing the expenditure over the receipts to be about \$7,000.

Mr. MITCHELL. When we found the receipts were larger than the expenses, we reduced the amount of the dues, and the present Government may have allowed that to remain.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I have no objection as far as that goes, this being the great highway to the west. It is necessary, however, for us to understand the burdens we are undertaking. The Minister of Finance has taken exception to the figures used by the member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), as to the amount of capital which we say will become a liability of the Dominion. It is clear that the amount is \$3,225,000, and, in addition to that, we will have \$200,000 for deepening the channel to 27½ feet.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, that covers everything, and you have \$600,000 worth of plant after next year.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Would it not be necessary to keep a large staff and a large plant there all the time? I see that the expenditure on buoys and beacons was about \$15,000, of which the Dominion pays \$7,000, so that will increase the burden by \$8,000. We have not had any

information as to what will be the annual expenditure to keep the channel clear. Up to this time I find that everything has been put down to capital account, and, when the capital account is closed, what amount will be necessary to keep the channel in order. We all know that every year a considerable amount of dredging has to be done.

Mr. SHANLY. I may inform the hon. gentleman that so far, since the dredging operations were commenced in Lake St. Peter, there has been no indication whatever of the dredged channel silting up.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I was informed differently, but no doubt the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly), with his experience, is right. I should think, however, that there must necessarily be some deposit, if that channel is anything like the rivers in New Brunswick. We know, in our own harbor of St. John, what an immense amount of deposit is brought down by the freshets, and there we have a very strong flow of water, and in St. Peter's, where, as I understand, the river meets the tide from the sea, and the flow of water is not so rapid as it is on the St. John River, it would seem that there must necessarily be an expenditure every year to keep the channel clear. At present, we cannot tell what that is because everything has been put down to capital account. In the spring of the year, the dredge is put to work immediately after the buoys are laid down in order to bring the channel down to 27½ feet, and we cannot tell what will be necessary for scouring and cleaning that channel every year. Judging from the experience of other rivers, it must necessarily amount to a large sum and the dredging plant must be kept. Does the Minister of Finance say that we are to take over the whole of the plant from the Harbor Commissioners?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; all the plant used for the deepening of the channel.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). And that used for the deepening of the harbor?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have nothing to do with that, but we simply take over \$600,000 worth of plant used for deepening the channel.

Mr. MITCHELL. There are two classes of plant, one suitable for the deepening of the river, and more particularly where it has a stone or shelvy rock bottom, and the other different altogether and suitable for scooping out round the wharves and the harbor. As I understand, the one goes to the Government, and the other is retained in the harbor.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Yes, but I see that three spoon dredges belong to the harbor fleet were used in the channel. I understand that the only plant taken over is that which is purchased for the channel. It seems to me that the Government will have to keep that for contingencies which may arise. Then there are the buoys.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman is getting on the wrong track. The buoys have had to be sustained for years past as they will have to be in the future.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I have put the amount down at \$15,000. The Government has paid \$7,000 and now that the Dominion must take the whole that will be an increase of \$8,000. I find that tugs were employed last year 110 days going up and down and watching where it was supposed that there might be a wreck. In that case they have to take it out of the way, and it is clear that a staff and plant must be kept for that purpose. I want to know whether any estimates have been made as to what that cost will be. I think the sum of \$108,000 includes the interest paid to the Government of \$99,000, which leaves \$18,000 and then there is an additional expenditure of

\$10,000. I presume the expenditure will not be less when this is in the hands of the Government than it was before, so that represents so much more capital which will become a liability of the Government. I am not opposing the grant. I mean by-and-bye to put forward other claims in regard to this matter.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has been speaking of that question as if it was only a matter of expenditure without any compensation. As I understand it, it is a measure to settle the question whether the trade of the Dominion will go to the American ports or will remain within our own territory. It is well known that at present, on account of the dues exacted by the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal to meet the interest on the debt and keep up the harbor and the channel, the steamers that come into that harbor are charged four times what they are in the harbor of New York. I think when we see the State of New York relieving the internal shipping from any dues on the canals, and other maritime cities of the United States doing everything they can to attract shipping into their ports, it is time for us to take up this matter as a Dominion question, and to relieve Montreal of the charge. We could do no less than relieve the harbor of Montreal of that charge upon it when it was acknowledged to be a Dominion work. The question of competition between Montreal and Quebec, or any other harbor in the Dominion, has nothing to do with this question. The deepening of Lake St. Peter is acknowledged to be a Dominion work, and the Government is only assuming a debt which was created, not for the benefit of Montreal harbor alone, but for the advantage of the traffic of the whole country. That is so much the case, that it has always been claimed by the other Provinces that Quebec was not entitled to the whole credit of the income derived from customs on imports coming into Montreal, but that those receipts should be considered as spread over the whole country. And so on many occasions in the past, whatever increased the trade of Montreal was considered as benefiting the trade of the Dominion, so that the Government, in assuming this debt, is not assuming it for the advantage of a locality, but for the advantage of the Dominion.

Mr. GILLMOR. This discussion is taking a different course from what I expected. After my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) admitted that it was important this should be done in the interest of the Dominion, I saw no necessity for any further discussion. The discussion has all been on the details. If you admit that this should be done in the interest of the Dominion, then everything else is of minor importance, and we are discussing details which do not amount to much. I thought the discussion was to be upon the point whether it was the duty of the Dominion to assume this liability. This seemed not to have been the opinion of Parliament heretofore. They thought it was a matter in which the city of Montreal was especially interested. The city of Montreal wanted to make certain improvements in their harbor, and instead of going into the money markets of the world to borrow money, they came to the Government, and the Government agreed to loan them so much money. I think myself that perhaps the Government are about the best capitalists to whom any locality can go to borrow money, because they never pay it back to the Government. This has been running on for twelve or fifteen years, and now new light seems to have dawned upon the Government and upon Parliament. My hon. friend from Halifax gave away the whole case when he agreed that it is in the interest of the country that it should be done. Now, it was in the interest of the country in 1873 that it should be done, therefore you have been taking interest from Montreal that you had no right to.

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is wrong there. The trade of the country has paid it; Montreal has not paid a dollar.

Mr. MITCHELL. The shipping paid it.

Mr. GILLMOR. Now, I am not yet convinced that it is the duty of Parliament to assume this debt. I know that my hon. friend from Halifax says it is all right, and my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) who seems to understand the question so well, does not dissent from it, nobody seems to dissent from it. I am not convinced that Montreal, situated as it is by nature in the most important position of this Dominion to derive great advantages from commerce from all parts of the world—I do not yet consent to the idea that it should shift its responsibility upon the shoulders of the Dominion. It is deriving, at least, the cream of the benefit from that commerce. Montreal is the centre of the wealth and of the population of this great Dominion, and I do not see why the whole Dominion should assume all the cost of making it more easy for her citizens to become wealthy. It may be said that whatever facilities are given to any port to increase its commerce are in the interests of the Dominion. Now doubt about that. But although I have not been convinced that it is our duty to assume that responsibility, I think there are arguments on both sides. There is one point that I would like to see explained. A question has been asked, perhaps it is impossible to answer it. We are not only taking upon ourselves the debt, but the yearly expense that will be entailed upon the Government in the future. I think it must entail a yearly expenditure to maintain those works, and we do not have the revenue that the commission have now, because they tax the shipping. As I understand the argument, so far as it has been advanced, they do not have the revenue because they make it a free port, so far as certain charges on the vessels are concerned. They will not have the tonnage to recoup the Government for any expenditure they may make. I think the sediment, or the silt, as it is called, settles in rivers, and I think it must continue, in the very nature of things, to settle in the St. Lawrence, as it has done in the past, and there must be a yearly expenditure entailed upon the Government, if they assume this responsibility to keep the channel open. Of course I know it is a foregone conclusion not to oppose this resolution, because it seems generally agreed to be in the interest of the Dominion. But it is a bad principle that does not work both ways. If it is in the interest of the Dominion to assume this charge and the amount due from Montreal, it is right to do so for every other port of the Dominion, for all are important in their degree.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is not in the port at all.

Mr. GILLMOR. Then it is in the river. But nature placed Quebec at the mouth of the river, and my hon. friend seems to forget that while they are doing a great work for Montreal, they are deepening the channel of the river in order to induce vessels to go further up the St. Lawrence than the city of Quebec, which is, by nature, the natural sea port of the St. Lawrence. There is no doubt about that, and they are trying to overcome natural obstacles in favor of Montreal.

Mr. CASEY. We have heard a great deal from the east in regard to this question, and as representing Western Ontario I feel it my duty to say something in regard to it. I feel it my duty to do so particularly because it has been asserted most positively that this measure has been adopted as much in the interests of Western Ontario as of Montreal or any other part of the Dominion. The Minister of Finance put it in the broadest terms, that this was not done for the benefit of Montreal, but for the benefit of the Dominion at large, that the whole

Dominion had an interest in it. If we all agreed to that proposition I would stop discussing the question and let the vote come on. But I feel bound to traverse the very first proposition. The Minister asserts that this measure is taken in the interest of the Dominion at large. I hold that the channel between Montreal and Quebec was deepened specially for the purpose of attracting ocean steamers to Montreal instead of to Quebec. Quebec was the natural port; Montreal was no port at all for ocean steamers until the channel was deepened. It would be no port without this expenditure, which in fact is necessary to make it a port. Who originated the deepening of the channel in the first instance? The merchants of Montreal, for their own advantage. The Hon. John Young agitated the question, brought the scheme to completion and got the Harbor Commission appointed by the Government in order to have the channel deepened. We remember how far he saw it perfected before he died, and we know how much has been carried out since. It was a magnificent work as showing the enterprise of Montreal. Why did they do it? Was it for the interests of the Dominion? No, but for their own interests, in order to bring trade from Quebec to Montreal, and they have made Montreal the commercial metropolis of the Dominion at the expense of the old metropolis. I give Montreal all credit for it; the people did a very smart business transaction as the Americans would say. But instead of doing it in the interests of the Dominion, they did it in the interest of their own pockets, which they have filled, and they have reaped their reward. What did it cost them? It cost them nothing, because they had money advanced by the Government, and the interest on the loan was paid by tonnage and wharfage dues collected on ships coming into port. These people had two advantages: they drew a large amount of shipping to Montreal, and they did not pay for getting it there. If they had spent three millions and a quarter and paid the amount themselves, it would have been a good investment for the city; but instead of doing that, they collected tonnage and harbor dues to pay the interest, and the money has been advanced to them by the Government at a low rate of interest. The Government after keeping the people of Montreal to carry out the improvements, after allowing them to rob the sister city and to collect tolls to pay the interest, turn around and declare that there is no object more worthy of Dominion support than this improvement, and they come forward and ask Parliament to assume the responsibility of maintaining a channel constructed for the benefit of one city and not for the benefit of the Dominion at large. It is no difference to us in Ontario whether grain is shipped at Montreal or Quebec. It can be sent by water all the way. A small amount of freight goes down by rail, but the difference of 180 miles from Montreal to Quebec would make a very slight difference between the cost of water carriage and rail carriage. If the argument of the Minister of Finance to-day is true, why was it not equally true last year and for several previous years? This is no new thing. Year after year the Harbor Commissioners have asked to have this thing done and they have been refused on the very ground I have stated, that the work was not constructed in the interests of the Dominion but in the interests of Montreal. What new light has come to the Government in regard to this question? It all arises from the monopoly clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter. When that monopoly was granted we told the Government that it would lead to endless complications. Now they have to confess that they have had to buy up the monopoly. We are granting to the Canadian Pacific Railway an immense amount of money for that purpose, and Montreal naturally comes to the Government and says that the result is that the abolition of monopoly might possibly injure their city, and that something must be done for them. The Government having been forced by circumstances to accede to this view, the people of Quebec next come forward and say

"having done this for Montreal you must do something for us." The Government say yes, and forthwith propose to assume the debt for certain works at Lévis. So we have to pay three millions and a quarter to Montreal and over three millions to Quebec, all on account of that injurious monopoly in the North West, and it is done to enable the people of Montreal and Quebec to vote with a clear conscience for the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions. That is the whole matter in a nutshell. The people of Montreal and the people of Quebec, feel that they were aggrieved by the tremendous expenditure elsewhere and they must have something to make it possible for them conscientiously, to vote for the other scheme. I do not blame them. I say they have a perfect right to come here and ask for this when the public money is going the way it is. But the Government are going beyond what is just and fair, going beyond what is constitutional, and what is tolerable, when they lay on new burdens in this way, in order to enable them to get out of the scrape they have deliberately put themselves into by inserting that monopoly clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter. It is to save themselves they are doing this and not to help the country. If this action is in the interest of the country now, it would have been just as much in the interests of the country years ago when they refused to do it. They do it now simply because they are in a tight place, and have to do it. No thanks are due them from the people of Montreal, or from the people of Quebec who have been refused this year after year. They do not expect gratitude I suppose, for they do it to save themselves. The people of Western Ontario, the people of Manitoba, the people of the North-West and the people of British Columbia, are taxed to relieve the people of Montreal and Quebec of certain duties, and why? Simply because the Government bound themselves to do a thing which they found they could not carry out; to maintain an absolute monopoly for the Canadian Pacific Railway for a number of years. They have been compelled to give that up, and in consequence of that the taxpayers of this country, from Cape Breton to British Columbia, are to be burdened with millions of money in order to get the Government out of a scrape. The pretense that this is done through patriotic motives will not go down with the people of this country. Let my hon. friends from Cape Breton, or British Columbia, or Nova Scotia tell the people that this is not a local scheme, that it is not a scheme to relieve the Government from the trouble they got themselves into, and that it is a broad, patriotic scheme to make a great water-way to get their goods nearer to market. If my friends go home and say this they will be told that it is all nonsense.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. member wants to be carried perhaps some person will carry him out, but the question is not going to be carried just yet. We are told here to-night that this expenditure is analogous to the expenditure on the Welland and St. Lawrence canals. I say there is no analogy at all. The expenditure on those canals was entered into in order to enable the farmers to get their grain to the nearest point which they could, to the port of shipment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman forget that there is no way in which we can add so much to the value of grain, as to make the great ocean port at which it will be shipped a free port?

Mr. AMYOT. Make Quebec the same thing.

Mr. CASEY. My friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has anticipated me. The statement is true that a free port adds to the price of grain, but why spend three and a half millions to make Montreal a free port instead of Quebec? There is a natural port at Quebec and if the Montreal people

want to make Montreal an artificial port, as the people of Liverpool did make the port of Liverpool, let them do it. Were the people of England taxed to make Liverpool a free port? No, the people of Liverpool paid for it themselves, and why should the people of Canada be taxed to make Montreal a free port, instead of having the free port at Quebec as nature intended it should be? The pretended analogy between this port and the canals does not exist. The canals were deepened to bring the grain to tide-water, but this simply affords greater advantages for large ocean vessels to come to Montreal. It builds up Montreal and ruins the other port. It renders no appreciable benefit to the country west of Montreal, and to pretend it is a benefit to the country, east of Montreal, is nonsense. I do not think anyone can get up in the House and say that it is. The subject is a large one, but considering the late hour I wish to cut my remarks short at this point.

Motion agreed, to and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec.) I would like to have some explanation on one or two points, one of which has already been raised by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and that is to ascertain the amount of liability we assume. There is a fixed amount of three and a quarter millions for the present debt of the Harbor Commissioners, and no Minister on the other side has stated definitely what is the estimated cost of keeping that harbor in order. The question has been put by several members on this side, but it has not been answered yet. The Minister of Public Works has stated it would not cost so much as estimated by the senior member for Halifax, but he did not state in his opinion what would be the expenditure for keeping the channel in order. Nobody on the other side has pretended it would cost nothing, and it is important to know whether it was fifty or one hundred thousand dollars. It will cost something surely, and I would like to know how much the Government estimate it will cost to keep that channel clear. That is to say, to do what has been done by the Harbor Commission in Montreal. The Government must have some data of the public expenditure.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN I am not in a position to give figures in answer to the hon. gentleman. He must see that as long as those works have been going on as they have been going on, and as they are now going on, the keeping of the channel, or the improvements of the channel, as the case may be, has been carried on with the other works of deepening, and so on. Therefore, it is an impossibility for me to say to the hon. gentleman what it would eventually cost, but, nevertheless, I will take care, before concurrence is asked on those resolutions, to have some data on that point in order to answer the question.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec.) I know there is a good deal of misunderstanding about this. I heard it stated by the member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) that no dredging is required for the St. Peter channel. Everyone is speaking as if there was only the channel in Lake St. Peter; but there is the channel from Quebec to Montreal. I have seen the channel of Lake St. Peter, and it would be against all the laws of nature and all experience were no silt deposited in it. It just starts where the tide ends, and the channel is not a straight one, and does not follow the direction of the stream. If it did, no silt would be deposited, or it would be carried away by the stream, on the same principle that Captain Eads proposed to apply to the Mississippi. He proposed to narrow the channel so that the natural current being increased would carry away the silt and the sand. But the case of Lake St. Peter is quite different. It is a widening of the St. Lawrence to about 20 miles, the river being about two miles in width up

Mr. CASEY.

to that point, and it is easy to understand that the flow of the water must be much lower, and that much more sand and silt must be deposited there than where the river has a narrower channel. If that is not the case, the ordinary laws of nature are not followed there. There is another objection. I have seen that channel in 1883 and 1884, when it was supposed to be 25 feet deep, and I have observed that instead of following the natural direction of the stream, it goes from one side of the river to the other—from Sorel on the south side straight across to Three Rivers. I asked the pilot on that occasion why the channel had been made in such a crooked way. He said it was not made in that way for the pleasure of making it crooked, but it was made so to save money. He said that those who made the channel had followed some holes that had been made by nature in order to save excavation; but everyone must see that such a channel must be much more exposed to be filled up by silt than a straight channel which would be in the natural direction of the stream. Then, there is another point on which I would like to get some information. I have heard the statement made, in answer to a question put by a member on this side of the House, as to the probable cost of completing the deepening of the channel between Quebec and Montreal, that the estimate given to the hon. Minister was about \$225,000. I would like to know on what data the Government rely for such an estimate. I have heard different statements made by people who are good authorities on that question. I have spoken very frequently on the subject with pilots who pilot ships between Quebec and Montreal. I asked one of the oldest pilots there how much he thought the deepening of that channel would cost. He said that nobody could say, for although the engineers might give a rough estimate, they had touched rocks at the bottom, and in many places they had found a bottom of solid rock, so that instead of having to blast rock for 100 or 150 feet at one place, they would have to blast it for a mile or a mile and a half. From what I have heard, I do not think it is possible for the Government to fix any amount as the probable expenditure for deepening the channel between Quebec and Montreal. There is another objection which to my mind is a very serious one. A great deal of the expenditure is being made to remove certain rocks at Cap à la Roche, some 60 miles from Quebec. If that is done, it will most probably necessitate the deepening of the channel all the way from that point to Montreal in all places that are a little shallow. The reason is that Cap à la Roche is a sort of natural dam which keeps the water from that point to Montreal at a certain height. If it is excavated sufficiently to allow ships to pass at low tide, the water will probably be lowered in the whole channel between Cap à la Roche and Montreal. These are observations that I have heard from pilots and others who know the channel between Quebec and Montreal much better than an engineer could know it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must not forget that the Government have not come here without the necessary information. This is not a work that has been done by pilots or mariners, but by scientific men, engineers.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). In Quebec we have learned not to have much confidence in scientific men.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, I have no doubt the House will have confidence in scientific men for scientific works. While a pilot may be skilled to guide a vessel safely into a port, I would not care to depend on his judgment as to now a work of this kind is to be carried on. The channel is not in a straight line, but nature has made nearly all rivers to wind about, and in this case we had to take advantage of the long stretches of deep water which had been formed by nature, and the channel was made in a diagonal line. It would probably be more scientific and

more handsome to have a straight channel, but it would cost probably ten times as much as this has cost.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I think I have been misunderstood by the hon. Minister. I was not blaming those who did the work. I was only discussing the situation of the channel.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It has been discussed by scientific men, and it has been considered that we should take advantage of these stretches of deep water, in order to avoid spending large sums of money. That is the reason why this channel is not in a straight line from Montreal to Quebec. Cap à la Roche is a portion of the channel. It is an elevation of the bottom of the river there, and is really rock, but it is such a rock that with the very powerful dredges which the Harbor Commissioners have there, the rock is removed in large pieces, pieces four times as large as these desks, and as hard as the hardest you can find anywhere. The engineers say that this portion of the river had to be deepened, in order to get 27 feet of water from one end to the other. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that the removal of this rock will allow the water to come down with such velocity that we will have to begin again and deepen the channel from Cape à la Roche to Montreal. The hon. gentleman wants to know where we get our figures about the future cost of the work. I take them from the engineers employed by the Harbor Commission. A few years ago, we advanced the amount of \$900,000 to the Harbor Commission to deepen the channel from 25 to 27½ feet. Later on we found that to deepen that portion called Cap à la Roche, an additional amount was required, and an additional sum was advanced to the commission. They have expended during the past four years a large portion of that, and the balance remaining in our hands is \$279,000, which has yet to be expended in completing the works. The engineers say that \$20,000 additional will be required to complete it. Besides that, in order to make the channel more perfect and facilitate the ascent and descent of large steamers, we will have to widen it at certain points. That is estimated to cost \$200,000. Add that to the \$20,000 further required and the \$279,000 not expended, and you will find it will take nearly half a million dollars to complete the work.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). This expenditure has always been spoken of as if it was only expenditure incurred or to be incurred for the deepening of the channel of Lake St. Peter. But it seems to be the whole expenditure on capital made by the Harbor Commissioners at Montreal.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, if the hon. gentleman will look at page 33 of the Harbor Commissioners' report, he will see at the first line, "interest on debentures \$115,750," showing that they have a debt which I would suppose must be \$2,500,000 if not \$3,000,000. That is the debt they have incurred for the harbor proper. The amount of \$3,005,000 is purely for the works outside the harbor.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is evident that the Government are not in possession of such information as will enable them to state with accuracy the amount that will be required to complete this dredging of the St. Lawrence. Any one familiar with the work must be satisfied that the Government will be required to keep up the dredging continually, and that if they get off with an expenditure of \$100,000 a year that will be the best they can expect. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt) who has travelled over that district many times and is familiar with it, can give you information as to the operation of the tides in that river. Then, as to the completion of the work, the Government are equally in the dark. Have they received an estimate with sufficient accuracy to decide what amount is required to complete that work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister of Public Works says "yes." I have no doubt he believes it, but I do not, and I do not believe that any engineer, no matter how skilled he may be, can make an accurate estimate as to what is required to complete that navigation. We know what the estimates of engineers have been from time to time, and the hon. gentleman knows probably better than any member in this House that the estimates of engineers are about as reliable as a good many other things in this world. I do not say that they purposely mislead you, but they give always a sanguine tone to their reports, and that leads the Government to believe that a certain thing will be done for a certain price. The hon. gentleman will probably propose only \$200,000 in one year, in another he will want \$150,000, and every year you will have a different estimate, and there is no telling when the end of it will come. I venture to say that for five or ten years to come the hon. gentleman will have an annual vote for this work in addition to the annual expenditure for keeping it open. I do not say the Government are blameable for not giving this information, because they have not got it themselves, but I blame them for leading the House to believe that in their judgment this expenditure is going to be confined to the narrow limits which they have marked out.

Mr. LANGELIER (Que.) I desire to say—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Question.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). If we are going to vote this blind, let us know it, but if not, I think I should be allowed to make some remarks.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There has been plenty of opportunity for discussing this question.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). The Government are acting on the supposition which they have never admitted before, that this is a Dominion work. It is very important to distinguish between the work done in the harbors of Montreal and Quebec and the work done in the channel. Everyone is aware that the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal have spent a lot of money in improving that harbor and in building very expensive wharves almost from the Lachine Canal to Hochelaga. They have received large amounts for that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not a dollar.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Who is going to show the difference? When they have these large advances from the Government, how can anyone tell that they do not apply a part of them to these works?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because they are honest men and have given a report every year of every dollar they have expended. The Harbor Commissioners have provided, altogether apart from any assistance they have received from the Government, all the expenditures which they have made on the harbor of Montreal. They have issued their own debentures, they have paid the money and paid the interest, and they have given an account every year of the expenditure of every dollar which has been voted by this Parliament.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Where can we find the distinction between the expenditure of the money voted by this Parliament and the money of the harbor of Montreal proper?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The matter was investigated by an officer of my department, and he was allowed to investigate the books of the commissioners and there was an amount voted which was deducted from the amount claimed by them, and that was left as a portion of their debt. The subject was well looked into, and there was no

hiding on the part of the commissioners of any of their documents. They left their books open and there was no question as to the accuracy of the investigation.

Resolution reported.

QUEBEC HARBOR COMMISSION.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider resolution (p.) respecting the Quebec Harbor Commission.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You are not going on with that to-night.

Mr. McMULLEN. If you do, it will take till 6 o'clock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If hon. gentlemen opposite intend to prevent the conclusion which we have already arrived at of having an early prorogation, if they have changed their minds and have determined to occupy night after night and day after day in lengthy discussions, we must sit late at night or abandon any such hope.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) That is hardly fair, because in the early part of the discussion this evening I stated that I had some observations to make on the policy of the Government in reference to these matters, which would involve a discussion of some length, but, as I did not then wish to take up the time of the House, as I might have done, I think an opportunity should be given at another day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite admit that, but the hon. gentleman knows that, although he was good enough to refrain from going on with the Quebec question, other gentlemen have not done so, and the subject has been elaborately discussed. If we go on with the discussion of the Quebec question now, we shall avoid going over the same ground to-morrow. Gentlemen will not, to-night, and repeat the same speeches they have made, but, if this is postponed to another sitting, we shall have the whole thing over again and shall simply waste another day in covering the same ground. The hon. gentleman has his speech prepared, and I shall be happy to sit here and listen to him as long as he chooses to discuss the matter.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think we cannot very well entertain the hope to which the hon. gentleman has referred. So far, during the Session I think we cannot have had any more important question than we have now before us. When this is over, I do not see anything left on the paper to keep us for any length of time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think we might pass the resolutions now and take the discussion on the next stage, when there will be the same opportunity as there is to-night.

Mr. MITCHELL. The discussion on the Quebec resolution is entirely different from the Montreal question.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. AMYOT. Will the hon. Minister state what will be the net amount of the debt that the Quebec Harbor Commissioners will owe to the Government, at 4 per cent., after remitting a certain amount of bonds?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will answer the hon. gentleman presently. These resolutions propose to assume the graving dock at Point Lévis entirely as a public work. Hon. gentlemen are aware of the circumstances under which the graving dock at Point Lévis was undertaken. The money has been advanced to the Harbor Commissioners, they undertaking to pay, on the completion of the graving dock, \$10,000 a year, if it was required, over and above

SIR HECTOR LANGEVIN.

the net receipts from the work, until the debt was extinguished. It is now proposed to treat the graving dock of Quebec in precisely the same manner as we treat the deepening of Lake St. Peter, that is, to assume it as a public work. We consider that a graving dock at so important a point as the harbor of Quebec, the first great harbor that is reached in the St. Lawrence, may be fairly treated as a national work, may fairly be put upon the same footing as the the graving dock in British Columbia, which has been constructed as a public work by the Dominion, with the aid of the Imperial Government. Under these circumstances, we propose to relieve the Harbor Commissioners from any responsibility in regard to the obligation to pay \$10,000 a year, in a certain contingency, in connection with that work. We propose to assume the entire cost of that work, to have it placed under the charge of the Minister of Public Works, the receipts obtained from it to go towards the cost that it has been to the country. So far as the graving dock is concerned, the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) will see that we are putting it on precisely the same footing as we have put the deepening of the channel of Lake St. Peter.

Mr. AMYOT. We have no objection to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That, I presume, will be acceptable to my hon. friend, and I think it will be acceptable to the House. I think the House will consider that a graving dock at so important a point as the entrance to the first great harbor on our national inland navigation, as the St. Lawrence undoubtedly is, may fairly be treated as a national work. Then with reference to the harbor improvements, my hon. friend will remember that there was a sum, of \$723,000 advanced long ago to the Harbor Commissioners at Quebec, before any work in reference to their tidal dock was undertaken. On that sum of \$723,000 the Harbor Commissioners have paid, out of the revenues of the harbor, regularly, the interest and sinking fund down to the present time, that is, \$36,150 a year. Then there was a further sum provided for the Quebec Harbor. In connection with the new tidal dock and these extensive harbor works at Quebec, a sum in all of \$3,975,000 has been authorised by Parliament to be expended on the works, and of this sum \$3,241,000 has been advanced by the Government to the Harbor Commissioners at Quebec, so that there still remains available of the amount provided by Parliament the sum of \$734,000.

Mr. LAURIER. That is to say, the commissioners are entitled to receive that amount?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The commissioners are entitled to receive that amount of \$734,000 which has been appropriated by Parliament for that work. That is assumed to be the amount that will be required to complete that work. There was an arrangement that interest should be paid at the rate of 5 per cent., and a sinking fund of 1 per cent. That interest and sinking fund have both been paid out of capital. There was no other source of obtaining it. The works are not so far completed as to enable any revenue to be derived. Consequently, the Harbor Commissioners have been charged with the interest and sinking fund, and we hold the debentures of the Harbor Commissioners for the interest and the sinking fund. We propose, by these resolutions, to wipe out all the charge upon the Harbor Commissioners for the sinking fund and for the interest, from the commencement of the work down to the present time.

Mr. GIROUARD. Is that work within the port of Quebec?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid my hon. friend is not asking for information.

Mr. GIROUARD. I am very familiar with the port of Quebec, but I suppose some hon. members are not.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec Centre). The port of Quebec goes down to Portneuf, some 300 miles below Quebec.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend is asking for information I will tell him frankly that this work is in the harbor of Quebec.

Mr. GIROUARD. How far from the city.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is immediately opposite the city, it is in the river. As I said before we propose to return to the commissioners the debentures we have received to cover the interest and sinking fund down to the present time, and to reduce the interest to 4 per cent. per annum in the future; so that they will be liable for the principal amount and for the interest from the present time, at 4 per cent., the amount of interest and sinking fund having been remitted.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec Centre). Is the interest to be reduced to 4 per cent., also, on the whole amount of \$700,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not remember at this moment what that interest is.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec Centre). That amount is due on account of the redemption by the Government of the old debentures, bearing 8 per cent. interest, and I think they are now bearing 5 per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that if they paid that interest it would be only fair to reduce the interest on that additional amount to 4 per cent. in the same way. The simple interest payable on advances on the graving dock from 17th December, 1878, to 19th April, 1888, amounts to \$204,454.32, of which no part has been paid. The amount paid out of capital by the Quebec Harbor Commissioners to the Government for interest and sinking fund on the bonds deposited with the Finance Minister as security for advances made by the Government on account of harbor improvements in Quebec and the tidal dock at the mouth of the River St. Charles is estimated \$493,706.64. That is the amount we propose to remit. The amount actually paid out of their revenues by the Quebec Harbor Commissioners for sinking fund on the last-mentioned bonds is, so far as can be ascertained, \$98,621.59. The graving dock is in addition, the amount expended being \$338,000 and simple interest \$204,454.32 more.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) There appears to be some discrepancy between the figures given by the hon. gentleman and those given in the Public Accounts. Taking the amounts for the tidal dock we have authorised \$2,822,298. I desire to enquire whether any amount has been authorised since 1886?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, a year ago there was an advance.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman wishes to discuss this matter to-night, but before we take the next stage I should like him to look up the early history of appropriations made for harbor improvements at Quebec. And I hope he will be able to tell us whether the five cents a ton imposed for the purpose of paying interest on harbor improvements is still to be collected on shipping stopping at or passing through Quebec.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume so. There is no engagement in these resolutions that touches the revenue of the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is a very serious question in the interest of the whole trade of the St. Lawrence, not alone

at Montreal but as far as inland navigation extends. The history of the matter may be briefly summarised in this way: An application was made to organise a harbor trust in the Province of Quebec. The figures I am not prepared to give just now, but to supply funds a tax of five cents a ton was imposed on every vessel coming into the port of Quebec either stopping there or, I believe, in passing. We are recasting these measures now and the Government is giving up a great deal and is about to pay a large sum of money. Is it right that vessels coming to Quebec or passing through it to Montreal, Sorel or Three Rivers should be called upon to pay toll at Quebec? We are dealing with this trust on considerations of equity, and in doing so we have taken away a portion of the revenue of the port of Montreal in the interest of the public to make it a free port. Why should ships coming to Montreal pay toll on passing Quebec?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that if a vessel passes through the port of Quebec it has to pay toll?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, that is my belief.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, I think only those vessels that stop in Quebec or stop there to discharge some part of their cargo are taxed.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman may be right. There may have been some change since the matter was brought to my attention some eighteen years ago. I should like before the next the stage is taken the Minister of Public Works to be able to state how navigation will be affected by the arrangements proposed. I have not very much confidence in the management of the port of Quebec in regard to harbor improvements. I have nothing to say against the Minister of Public Works, in whom I have great confidence; but in the first step taken with respect to harbor improvements the money was thrown away. Instead of making improvements the commissioners bought a parcel of old wharves. They borrowed money at from 5 to 8 per cent.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). All at 8 per cent.

Mr. MITCHELL. While I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries they got into terrible difficulties and had to apply to the Government, and the Government agreed to take over some of the debt. An arrangement was made by which the parties agreed to take 5 per cent. per annum, the Government took over the debt and afterwards they got the Lévis dock and the St. Charles River improvements. The Minister of Public Works will no doubt be able to justify all those things. I would like, however, when he does attempt to justify them he would give us all the information that we want.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid there will be great difficulty in touching any portion of the revenues of the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec. Including the \$36,000 unpaid, and the original amount for the old works before the new works were undertaken, as I understand it they had a small deficiency last year. If you take any portion of the revenues from the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec you would leave them without the means of discharging the liability.

Mr. MITCHELL. How can we make Montreal and the River St. Lawrence, and Quebec that cheap port my hon. friend pictured so beautifully in the earlier part of this discussion. If we desire to make the River St. Lawrence a cheap port for the business of the world, we should not start at the entrance and charge five cents a ton on vessels coming to the port of Quebec, if Montreal is to sustain her own harbor and Quebec hers also. I am not going to press the matter, but I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that we should not burden the shipping with five cents a ton in that port, if it could be avoided.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There will be the usual charge for vessels using the dry dock?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course.

Mr. AMYOT. There is no difference between the Lévis dock and the new dock. It is clear to my mind that the Government should assume the charge of the Lévis dock. It is not intended for the ships coming to Three Rivers, or Quebec but the ships of the whole Dominion can use it. A certain amount paid on the Quebec dock is given back to the commissioners in the form of debentures. I want to know what amount remains in the hands of the Government on which the Harbor Commissioners will have to pay 4 per cent. in the future.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$3,975,000.

Mr. AMYOT. You see from that, the immense amount of interest Quebec will have to pay every year, and that it will be necessary for it to charge tonnage dues.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the total amount including interest and sinking fund, it will not amount to that.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will be about \$3,400,000.

Mr. AMYOT. It will be a large amount on which to pay interest. Quebec will have to charge tonnage dues and the port will be at a disadvantage, because it will cost less for the ships to go to Montreal and load and unload. Quebec was the natural harbor, but on account of public works paid for by the Dominion, you have prevented Quebec from being the natural port.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will see that the small tax of 5 cents on the shipping in the port of Quebec—not that shipping passing through, because I think it would be unjust to tax those vessels passing through and if it is done we will have to change it—the small tax of 5 cents is \$15,000 a year to the Harbor Commissioners.

Mr. AMYOT. How will that pay the interest?

An hon. MEMBER. They don't intend to pay it.

Mr. MITCHELL. What are those dues on the harbor of Quebec?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total is about \$53,000.

Mr. MITCHELL. There will be a deficiency of nearly \$70,000 per annum.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the tidal dock and the wet dock are completed at the end of the year, those docks will give a large revenue, I have no doubt.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will you promise never to come here for any more money?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I never make any such promises.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). If the Government were proposing to abolish those tonnage dues in the harbor of Quebec I would see no objection to what is proposed for Montreal, but the practical result will be that there will be a discrimination in favor of Montreal.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. You have tonnage dues of 5 cents in Quebec and none in Montreal, but you have heavy dues in Montreal on goods, and those dues are very small in Quebec. Therefore if we want to have a change in the Act we will have to put taxes on the merchandise as we do in Montreal.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.25 a.m. (Wednesday).

Mr. MITCHELL.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 9th May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Mr. DAVIN. In the absence of Mr. Desjardins, the chairman of the Debates Committee, I beg to move the adoption of the second report of the Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of this House during the present Session. That report is as follows:—

"The committee would recommend that the salary of Mr. J. C. Boyce, assistant to the chief reporter, be increased to \$1,000, to take effect from 1st January, 1887, and that Mr. Boyce's salary be paid to him monthly, as are the salaries of the official reporters; also that Mr. Brewer be granted an annual allowance of \$100 from 1st January, 1886, for services rendered; and that the clerk of the committee, Mr. E. P. Hartney, be granted \$200 for past services and an annual allowance of \$50 from the 1st January, 1886."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter came up the other day, and the chairman of the committee was asked to put it off for a few days. The report refers to three officers. Mr. Boyce is an officer appointed by the committee, and his appointment was sanctioned by the House. The other two officers, Mr. Brewer and Mr. Hartney, are officers of the House of Commons, and I would suggest that the portion of the report which relates to Mr. Boyce may be adopted, and the balance of the report may be referred to the Commission on the Internal Economy of the House of Commons. Thus we will keep the officers of the House in the hands of the Speaker and the members of that Commission, as has been done up to the present time.

Mr. LAURIER. I think I would agree with the suggestion of the Minister of Public Works. I think it is a proper thing to deal with Mr. Boyce, who is an officer of the House itself, while Mr. Brewer and Mr. Hartney are employed in another capacity. At the same time, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that Mr. Brewer gives very valuable services to the *Hansard*, and that his case should be favorably considered.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand that, and it is my intention to call the attention of my colleagues of the Commission to Mr. Brewer's special services. I would move, or perhaps it would be better that the hon. gentleman himself should move, that the first portion of the report should be concurred in, and the second part should be referred to the Commission on Internal Economy. As a motion has already been made, I will move in amendment:

That the first portion of the report in reference to Mr. Boyce be concurred in, and that the second portion of the report relative to Mr. Brewer and Mr. Hartney, be referred to the Commission on Internal Economy.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think I may say that the proposal which has been made by the Minister of Public Works will meet with the approval of all the members of the Debates Committee. It is quite evident that the point taken by that hon. gentleman is a proper one. So far as Mr. Boyce is concerned, it was felt that he had a case peculiarly deserving the consideration of the committee, and that that was the only case of hardship, and we desire to have that dealt with, and I therefore cheerfully support the amendment of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. DAVIN. As my hon. friend has informed the House, the amendment will meet entirely with the approval of the committee, especially as the chairman of the committee, as I understand, has been informed that the cases of the two other gentlemen will be considered by the authority to

which they are referred. With regard to Mr. Brewer, I may say here, that, while the Debates Committee may not be in a position to deal with his case, we would strongly impress on the Government the desirability of considering it favorably, because his duties are responsible, they are strictly responsible duties, and the responsibility is not merely such responsibility as is generally thrown upon any officer who has to perform duties requiring intelligence, but it is such a responsibility as implies integrity as well as intelligence.

Mr. COLBY. I may say in addition, and I do not know if the Minister of Public Works is aware of it, but the case of Mr. Brewer engaged the special attention of a sub-committee of the *Hansard* Committee. They examined his work, which he has been doing for years, and the nature of it, and they reported to the committee that the work was very considerable, that it was onerous, and very responsible, and they felt that it should be recompensed in some shape.

M. MITCHELL. While the subject is up, I may as well say what I think about the *Hansard* business. I must frankly state that I think it has never been conducted more satisfactorily or more correctly than it has been this year. I think the staff, one and all of them, have shown very great aptitude for their duties, and a great deal of efficiency and ability in performing them, particularly Mr. Boyce, whose duties have been very arduous, and with whom I have been more frequently brought into relations than with the others. I have always found the utmost courtesy and civility from the whole of them, and apparently they bring to bear, in the performance of their duty, as great efficiency as could be expected from any set of gentlemen.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not rise to make any objections to the consideration of these cases. But I think it involves a bad principle in going back and increasing the salaries, and giving a lump sum for past services, and then commencing to count an increase of salary from a past date. In the case of Mr. Brewer, for instance, there is an allowance of \$200 for past services, and an annual allowance of \$50 from the 1st of January, 1886. That is not only going back more than two years, but it is commencing to count an increase of salary for more than two years back. If Mr. Hartney did the work that entitles him to this additional consideration, I think it is likely that it must have been brought to the attention of those whose duty it was to see that his salary was increased. But I do not think that either in respect to superannuation or the increase of salaries, it is a good principle to go back and not only give a bonus, but commence to count the time from a date long since past, during which an increase ought to be given.

Mr. DAVIN. I ought to inform the House that we went fully into the reasons for making the recommendation, and this recommendation ought to have been presented last year in the case of Mr. Brewer.

Amendment agreed to, and motion, as amended, agreed to.

RAILWAY PIER AT POINT TUPPER.

Mr. MACDONALD (Victoria) asked, 1. How many tenders were received for the extension of the railway pier at Point Tupper, in the county of Richmond, Cape Breton? 2. To whom was the contract awarded, and for what sum? 3. What length of time was allowed by notice in Cape Breton newspapers to enable intending contractors to tender for the work? 4. Was there any correspondence with the Railway Department complaining of the length of the notice given, and asking for an extension of the time for tendering?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I may say in answer to the questions, three tenders were received. 2. The contract was

awarded to Messrs. Isbester & Reid for \$14,500. 3. The advertisement was dated 7th January, 1888; the time for receiving tenders was named therein as the 21st January, 1888; upon application the time was extended to the 27th January. 4. Yes.

SESSIONAL CLERKS.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, The number of sessional clerks employed in 1874, 1878, 1879, 1882, 1888, and the full amount paid and the wages per day or session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government has nothing to do with the sessional clerks, therefore I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman.

I.C.R.—BRANCH LINE TO MATANE.

Mr. Fiset asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant a subsidy in land or in money to any company undertaking to construct a branch railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway to Matane?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). In answer to the hon. member, I must say that to my knowledge, no such request has been made to the Government; but, at all events, the hon. member must wait till the supplementary estimates are laid before the House.

LETTER-CARRIERS IN BARRIE, ONT.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether there is postal delivery by letter-carriers in the town of Barrie, Ont.? If so, what are the gross receipts of the office, and the number of inhabitants of the town?

Mr. McLELAN. There has been one letter-carrier making parcel delivery in the town of Barrie for a year or two. The receipts were \$9,179.58. I have not the last census of the town of Barrie, and cannot give the balance of the information asked for.

PRIVILEGE—CASE OF JOHN T. HAWKE.

Mr. DAVIES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the House to a matter of some importance, of which I gave notice a day or two ago, and before I conclude my observations I shall make a motion, to put myself in order. I refer to the imprisonment of John T. Hawke, editor of the *Moncton Transcript*, by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, for alleged contempt of court. Although hon. gentlemen are generally acquainted with the circumstances of the case, I will give a short summary of the main outline of the facts, before proceeding to make a few comments on the judgment itself and the imprisonment of Mr. Hawke. The alleged libel for which he was prosecuted before the court, arose from the election trial of a petition presented against the return of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood). The hon. gentleman's opponent, a gentleman named Emerson, on the 7th day of April last, presented a petition to the court charging that a large number of acts of bribery and corruption had been committed by the agents of the hon. gentleman, and asking that his election be voided. When Mr. Emerson consented to contest the election in the first instance, he gave public notice that he intended himself to conduct it on strictly legal principles, and notified his opponent that any breach of the law in any respect would be prosecuted by him in case he was defeated. He was defeated, and so on 7th April he filed a petition in the election court. On the 16th there was a second petition filed by a supporter of Mr. Emerson called Caldwell on the same grounds, and the reason for filing the second petition was that there was some doubt whether the first petition had been correctly

entered before the court. The second petition was not served; the time of serving was extended till 1st July and it was served on 27th June. On 14th April the first petition against the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) was at issue; on 3rd July, the second petition was at issue. On 5th July Attorney General Blair, acting for Mr. Emerson, applied for an *ex parte* order to Judge Fraser to set down the case for trial. Judge Fraser granted the summons, returnable on 15th July. On the return of that summons objections were taken by the counsel for Mr. Wood to the order asked for, and Judge Fraser took time to consider those objections; but with respect to the day asked by the counsel for fixing the trial, the learned judge, as I gather from the sworn affidavits presented to the court in this prosecution against Mr. Hawke, stated that if he overruled the objection he would fix the day for 20th September. On 20th August he did so; but in overruling the objections he said he would fix December 6th as the day for trial. As soon as that fact was communicated to Mr. Emerson his counsel went to Fredericton and protested against 6th December being fixed, on the ground that it would put the petition out of court, because it was more than six months from the time that the petition was filed, and counsel contended that there were more than grave doubts whether the petition would not be entirely thrown out if the learned judge fixed the day beyond 20th September. The learned judge, after looking over the statute, as counsel in an affidavit swears, assented to the validity of the objection and promised to fix the day for 20th September. He intimated at that time to counsel, after looking over the statute, that he thought there was good ground for the objection taken, and if he had fixed 6th December it would have put the case out of court, as the time ought to be fixed within six months. A formal order was drawn up by the counsel for Mr. Emerson, in pursuance of what the judge had held, and it was presented to him for signature two days afterwards. When the order was presented to the judge for signature he again changed his mind, and said that after hearing what the opposing counsel had to say he had determined to reverse his decision, and to again fix the trial for December 6th. The counsel would not take out an order for that day, and Mr. Emerson again sent a gentleman from Moncton to Fredericton to remonstrate with the learned judge. He went to Fredericton and urged the same objections, and after a long argument Judge Fraser finally overruled the objection and fixed the date for November 8th. As a matter of fact November 8th would be somewhat about six months after the filing of the petition. The learned judge thus intimated, in the first place when the matter came before him, that he would fix September 20th; after hearing counsel for the sitting member he changed his mind and said he would fix December 6th; after it was pointed out that December 6th would throw the case out of court, he said he thought the objection was a good one, as it would throw the case six months past the filing of the petition, and again intimated his intention to fix 20th September for the trial. After hearing counsel for the sitting member a third time he changed his mind again, and said he would not fix the date within six months and eventually he did fix it beyond six months, viz.: November 8th. On 22nd October, immediately the six months had expired, counsel for the sitting member, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), immediately applied to have the case thrown out of court because the judge had fixed the day for the trial beyond the six months, and he applied to rescind the order of Judge Fraser setting down a day for the trial. That application was argued before the Supreme Court of New Brunswick on 5th November. Judgment was given by the Supreme Court sustaining the objection of the counsel of the hon. gentleman opposite, and throwing the case out of court, in which judgment Judge Fraser concurred. Of course there can be no objection to the sitting member or his counsel seeking to have the trial placed for some day beyond the time which the law allows. He had a perfect right, I suppose, to use such arguments as he thought proper to get a day fixed at a time when the trial would be utterly useless, when the proceedings would be *ultra vires*, and when the court could order the petition to be taken off file and the whole proceedings cast to the winds. Moreover, no doubt the judge of a court has a perfect right to change his mind in regard to the law after hearing the argument of counsel, but in this particular case there seems to have been an amount of vacillation on the part of the learned judge which certainly is most extraordinary. After a solemn argument, after having had his attention called to the fact that to fix the date beyond the six months would probably throw the case out of court, he virtually assented to the validity of the argument and thought it was a good one, and he decided to fix the trial within the six months; he afterwards reversed his decision and did not think the argument was a good one and decided to fix the date beyond the six months, stating that he was right in the first instance and wrong in the second. Ultimately he decided, as one of the full Court, that he had committed a fatal error in fixing the day of the trial beyond the six months, and concurred in the judgment of the court dismissing the petition. That is an extraordinary state of affairs, and it was on the facts as I have stated them that the editor of the *Moncton Transcript* made the statements he did for which he is now in prison. I think it will be fair to the House and to the judges of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick to read those parts of the articles of which they complained and for the publication of which they imprisoned Mr. Hawke. The judgment was given on 5th November, throwing the case out of court because the day fixed by Judge Fraser was fixed beyond the six months. On the evening of the same day the judgment was given the following telegram appeared in the *Daily Transcript*, and this is one of the telegrams for publishing which he was imprisoned:

"A scandalous outrage. The New Brunswick Supreme Court dismisses both the Westmorland election petitions. Advice from Fredericton state that the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, mainly comprised of defeated Tory candidates, has dismissed both the Westmoreland election petitions, on the ground of lapse of time. The lateness of the hour, 5 p.m., at which this news is received, prevents any comments on the judicial outrage, but on Monday in these columns will be exposed the most disgraceful judicial scandal the details of which have ever stunk in the nostrils of a free people. Who are the men who have done this gross wrong? For the answer see Monday's *Transcript*."

On Monday the 7th, a leading article appeared in that journal, headed "Miscarriage of Justice," in which the facts are reviewed, and the following paragraphs complained of appear:—

"Mr. Justice Fraser was the election court judge, and he insisted, as will be seen from a perusal of the affidavits published in another column, and from Mr. Emerson's address to the electors, which also appears in this issue, that the postponement of the date of the trial till November 8th would not prejudice the petition. His attention was directed by the petitioner's counsel to the possible interpretation which could be placed upon section 32, and was asked in Mr. Emerson's interest that to remove all possibility of danger, the trial be brought on at least a month earlier.

"Mr. Justice Fraser at first appeared to think there was a danger and agreed to hold the trial on September 20. Afterwards, at the instance and upon the representations of Mr. Wood's counsel, he postponed the date of the trial till November 8, and again allowed it to be understood that the date would not prejudice the petitioner's case. Now on Saturday he is represented as ruling with his other colleagues of the Appeal Court that the petitions were out of court because the date which he fixed for the trial was too late. What does Mr. Justice Fraser mean by his extraordinary conduct and decision? He certainly owes some explanations to the public for his own sake, as well as for the credit of the judiciary to which he belongs."

In the same issue the following editorial paragraph was inserted:

"A JUDICIAL POOH-BAH.—In Gilbert & Sullivan's comic opera, the *Mikado*, there is a character named 'Pooch-Bah' who holds many

offices, and as the Lord High Executioner reverses the decisions of himself in the capacity of Lord Chancellor. Thousands of people on two continents have looked and laughed at this piece of comedy as an innocent play of sarcasm, but in this Province of New Brunswick to-day the electors are presented with the spectacle as a reality.

Mr. Justice Fraser, in the election court for the trial of the Westmoreland election petition, insisted upon fixing November 8 as the date of the election trial; the Liberal petitioner's counsel more than once pointed out to him that under the statute the postponed date would, under section 32 of the Controverted Elections Act, place the petitions in jeopardy, and with this view he first agreed. But when the orders fixing the trial for September 20 were presented to him for signature, he refused to sign them and fixed the latter date in spite of the protest of the petitioner's counsel, holding that under section 32 the time for commencing the trial did not expire till some time in December, as the time occupied by the last session of Parliament was excluded from the computation of the six months.

"This was the decision of Mr. Pooch-Bah in his capacity as Lord Chancellor, and in the Supreme Court of New Brunswick on Saturday the judicial Pooch-Bah, in his capacity as Lord High Executioner, reversed his former decision and ruled the petition out on the very grounds which he formerly held were incorrect. Such is Mr. Justice Pooch-Bah Fraser's conception of law and justice."

That is the second article. In the issue of the same date of the *Daily Transcript*, there was published a lengthy letter from the defeated candidate, Mr. Emerson, recapitulating all the facts of the case and making some rather severe strictures on the conduct of the judges. In the summons which was issued to Mr. Hawke, summoning him to appear before the court for contempt, this article on Mr. Emerson's was included, but I do not understand, as far as I can gather from the judgment of the court, that judgment was given against him for the publication of Mr. Emerson's card. If it was so I would consider the judgment a most outrageous one, because if Mr. Emerson, who is a solicitor of the court, and one of the counsel pleading before the bar of the court, published any libel or offensive thing concerning the court, the court ought to punish him and not the publisher. I do not want to encumber the case with any side issues, and I understand that the court did not punish Mr. Hawke so much for Mr. Emerson's article as for those I have read, and that which I am about to read. The following day, November 8th, an article appeared in the *Transcript*—

Mr. SPEAKER. I beg to remind the hon. gentleman that it has been the invariable rule here, as well as in the House of Commons in England, that hon. members were not allowed to impugn the conduct of the judges of the land, and I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to that rule and ask him not to make any comments which would be an infraction to that rule. I do not know what he aims at now, but I would ask him not to impute corrupt motives to a judge of the land in the discharge of the duties of his office.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would remind the Speaker that it has been done in this House before.

Mr. SPEAKER. But I have stopped it. I have ruled that it was out of order already.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Was it a formal ruling?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, a formal ruling.

Mr. BOWELL. That was on a motion by the member for Ottawa, on a petition presented to the House alleging certain complaints against the judge, and upon that petition the member for Ottawa made a speech.

Mr. MACKENZIE. And this will be on the motion of my hon. friend.

Mr. DAVIES. A petition cannot affect my proceedings.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not say that. I am speaking as to the question before the House on a previous occasion; and as I understood, the hon. gentleman proposed to end his speech by a motion for the adjournment, which would certainly not be to refer the conduct of the judge to a committee of the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE. In Judge Prefontaine's case there was no petition for impeachment; there was a petition for relief.

Mr. THOMPSON. If there is a rule against attacking the character of a judge in this House it surely cannot be evaded by moving the adjournment. I take it, from what I know of the matter, that that is not the hon. gentleman's intention.

Mr. DAVIES. (P. E. I.) My object is misconceived. I am neither impugning the motives nor attacking the conduct of the judge. I am simply drawing the attention of the House to the facts. I do not know it has anything to do with Judge Fraser at all, because the judgment I am going to draw the attention of the House to was a judgment in which Judge Fraser took no part. I thought this was fair to the House when I was calling its attention to the fact that the editor of a newspaper had been imprisoned for alleged contempt of a New Brunswick court; and I do not wish to import any bitterness or any party feeling whatever into it. I should be sorry if in this matter, which I consider one of paramount importance, party politics should be included in it in any way whatever. I should be sorry that prejudice or feeling of any kind should be imported into it, for there is, I consider, a very important principle at stake, as to whether this man's imprisonment should be taken notice of by this House or not. I thought that in fairness to the court I should read to the House the articles that were complained of, and I assume that if I did not read them some hon. gentleman might say: You are acting unfairly, you have not given to the House the articles that the Supreme Court complained of. I desire to deal frankly and fairly in this matter, and, as far as I can, in a judicial spirit.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the point which arose was when the hon. gentleman was proceeding to comment on the Supreme Court in reference to Mr. Emerson's letter. I think we can avoid any doubtful matter of that kind, if it were agreed that the judgment of the court is not based on Mr. Emerson's card.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not ruled that the hon. gentleman was out of order, but I merely drew his attention to the facts which I have stated. I might cite to the hon. gentleman some rulings of Speaker Brand. The following is reported in Speaker Brand's decisions, page 85:—

"CHARGES AGAINST THE JUDGES.

"Charges against the Judges are unbecoming to be made, as there is a proper course open if their conduct is to be challenged.—The Queen v. Castro.—The expenses of the prosecution.—Observations.

"Mr. Whalley having said:—The petitions which had been presented to the House showed the petitioners believed there had been gross corruption and injustice on the part of the judges who tried the case; and he was prepared, to the best of his judgment, to prove that there was ample ground for the complaint."

"Objection taken."

"Mr. Speaker said that the question before the House was that the House should go into Committee of Supply—a question on which great latitude was allowed; but the hon. member was very severely trenching on the privileges allowed to hon. members and taxing the patience of the House. Although the hon. member was not, strictly speaking, out of order, yet it was unbecoming to charge the judges with improper conduct as he had done, for, if he desired to challenge their conduct, his proper course was to move an Address to the Crown for their removal."

Here is another decision:

"An hon. member may comment on the conduct of the judges, but he is not in order in using language that is disrespectful towards them."

This is the reason why I stopped the hon. member—in order to prevent him, if possible, breaking the rule in using disrespectful language towards the judges. Of course, he is perfectly free to expose his case, but within proper limits.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With every respect to you, Mr. Speaker, and with a desire at all times to be respectful to the Chair, I think it is hardly fair to me to imply that I was about to use disrespectful language towards the judges. I stated when I opened my remarks, and I state now, that I am not here to bring a charge against the judges, and I have no intention of doing so. My object is not to bring the judges or the courts into contempt, but to vindicate the great principle which I think has been violated. The other day, in the English House of Commons, the action of the Appeal Court in Ireland, in increasing the sentences passed on some prisoners under the Land Act, was brought before the House of Commons, and the greatest constitutional authority living, Mr. Gladstone, not only said that he thought it was proper that the conduct of the judges in imprisoning men under the Land Act should be overhauled in the House of Commons, but he thought that that was the proper place to discuss all the facts connected with the imprisonment of these men. Why, Sir, is there a divinity-hedging about the conduct and actions of these judges which prevents anyone criticising their conduct in this high court of the land? I repudiate such a suggestion. If I were afraid to impeach them and were trying in an underhand and improper way to throw disrespect on the court or the judges of the court, I would understand a reprimand coming from the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. I made no reprimand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that you did not, Mr. Speaker, but you impliedly reprimanded me, because you assumed that I was about to violate the rules of this House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman mentioned that the judgment was outrageous.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I said nothing of the kind. I said then what I repeat now, that I understood that the judgment was not given for the publication of the *Moncton Transcript* of Mr. Emerson's letter, and as Mr. Emerson was a counsel in the court and amenable to the court, it would have been outrageous if the court had punished the editor for having published the letter written by the solicitor; but I understood the court did nothing of the kind.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When I made the interruption I thought I had heard the word outrageous, and that it was applied to the judgment of the court. I am corrected by the hon. gentleman, and I think it proper that we should understand each other.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On the 8th day of November, as I was saying, there was a further article published under the head of "Dismissed Petitions." I think the only paragraph in which it was used by the court of New Brunswick in condemning Mr. Hawke was the following:—

"It would be interesting for somebody to explain why the judges of the Supreme Court of this Province cannot within reasonable time make up their minds upon the construction of a few lines of English in a statute which has been in operation in the Dominion for a decade? Will somebody also explain why it is that the judges of this Province, the majority of whom are defeated political candidates, and at least one or two of whom, it is within the bounds of possibilities, had agents in their elections who spent money freely, should now manifest such hostility to election petitions? It seems almost impossible, in the Province of New Brunswick, to bring an election petition to trial, and though we do not say that that fact is due to any hostility on the part of the judges to the Controverted Elections Act and the principle which it embodies, yet we do hold and maintain that it is a perfectly fair comment to point to that circumstance and contrast it with the other one, that petitions are invariably rejected in this Province before they reach trial, upon some pretence or other.

"If the Dominion Controverted Elections Act is not to apply to the Province of New Brunswick, for the judges of this Province, in their wisdom once declared that the Act itself was unconstitutional, then it follows that special provision should be made by the Federal authorities for the trial of the election petitions in New Brunswick.

"It is absurd for anyone to contend for a moment that all the counsel engaged in drawing up petitions in this Province make such mistakes

Mr. SPEAKER.

as to invalidate the petitions. We know, of course, at the present time, the Tory press will find it convenient to say that it is contempt of court to comment upon the decision of these judges; but we hold that no divinity encircles these men, and that their decisions are just as open to public criticism and discussion as are the decisions of any other class of public officials. The public interest demand it, and no journalist would be true to the duties of his position if he hesitated for one moment in condemning the general attitude, with an honorable exception here and there, of the judges of the Province of New Brunswick with respect to election petitions."

There was one more article and one only, in the *Transcript* of the 12th, and this is the article on which Judge King based his judgment in favor of committal for contempt:

"What induced Mr. Justice Fraser to change his opinion? Why did he, after selecting September 20, and allowing that date to be announced broadcast over the country as the date of trial, change his mind and determine upon a date in December? What were the arguments and what were the reasons presented to him out of court, to induce this change of mind, and his refusal to sign the order for the trial on September 20? Who was it that represented to Mr. Justice Fraser that that date would be inconvenient to him? Unless Mr. Powell is done a gross wrong, Mr. Powell was the attorney for the sitting member, Mr. Wood; it is reported around Sackville that he boasts of having induced the judge to change the date from September 20 to suit his convenience. Mr. Powell thinks it honorable, having induced the judge to change the date to suit his convenience, to avail himself of a legal quibble to prevent that trial, because of the lapse of time. It is a piece of sharp practice, and discreditable even to a Tory lawyer. The desire to induce Mr. Fraser to change the date of trial must have emanated from those interested in the Conservative candidate's cause; and then when Mr. Emerson's counsel discovered that the judge was bent upon changing the date, he directed his attention, as stated above, to the fact that, by a possible construction of the statute, that date would throw the petitions out of court. The judge ruled that it would not. The moment the judge had changed the date, rumors began to circulate around Sackville, evidently emanating from Mr. Powell, that, as a result of the change of date, which it is believed he induced the judge to make, Mr. Emerson's petition would be thrown out of court. Then, to the surprise and astonishment of everybody, Mr. Justice Fraser went back on his own interpretation of the law, performed his new notorious judicial somersault, and was the pantaloons of the comic pantomime to Mr. Powell's clown.

"It is to this judicial farce that judicial decisions in the Province of New Brunswick have been reduced."

I think these are all the articles of which the Supreme Court complained. I understand, from reading the newspaper reports of the judgment, that Chief Justice Allen and Mr. Justice Palmer based their judgment in favor of committing Mr. Hawke upon the ground that the article known as the Pooh-Bah article was a contempt of court—that it amounted in point of fact to imputing corrupt conduct to Mr. Justice Fraser, and that the use of the expression Pooh-Bah necessarily implied that when he changed his mind as a judge he did so from a corrupt motive. The learned judge said he understood that to be the meaning of the term, and he gave judgment accordingly. Now, the old doctrine in the law with respect to libel was that the judges of the land determined what was and what was not a libel, and the only fact they left to a jury to determine was the question of publication. Well, we know the struggle that took place under the lead of that celebrated jurist Erskine, to abolish that old system; we know that happily that old system has long since passed into the era of forgotten things, and that under our present system of jurisprudence, which has existed for many years past, not the judge alone, but the jury, is to determine whether a charge is libellous or not. The old idea that a judge should determine what was libellous and that it should only be left to the jury to determine the question of publicity, is an exploded one, and to the jury to day is committed the whole question of libel or no libel. It will be seen, however, by the proceeding under discussion that while we have remedied the evils which existed under the old law, the judges of the land, in seeking to exercise what they claim to be their jurisdiction in punishing for contempt of court, claim the power to determine what is and what is not libellous, without the intervention of a jury. In this case, we have Mr. Justice Palmer giving his judgment declaring the calling of Judge Fraser Mr. Justice Pooh-Bah to be necessarily an imputation against him of corrupt motives,

I do not think a jury could be empanelled in the Province of New Brunswick or in any part of the Dominion that would come to similar conclusion. I would not myself say that the use of this term, which is, in common use, applied to anybody who occupies two or more offices, no matter how high in the state, would have this meaning. This expression is in common use; we see it applied every day to those gentlemen who hold several offices, and the press are not afraid to use it in such cases, as a term of ridicule, without implying any corrupt motives. Why, I have seen the Finance Minister spoken of as Pooh-Bah, because he holds the office of High Commissioner in England, and, at the same time, of Finance Minister here, and nobody ever supposed that the application of that name to him implied that he was moved by corrupt motives. The wildest fanatical opponent of his has never imagined that a newspaper which used with reference to him those epithets, intended to imply that he took money in one position for doing work in another. The thing is ridiculous and absurd. The phrase is in common use, and its popular meaning is that the man to whom it is applied holds a variety of offices, and is enabled to reverse a decision in the one which he gave while holding the other. Mr. Justice Fraser held and determined that on a certain day the trial should be held and that in computing the six months the time of the sitting of Parliament should not be counted, but that the trial, which was fixed for the 8th November, should proceed on that day. Afterwards, in his character as one of the judges of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, he reversed his own decision as judge of the electoral court, and the editor of this newspaper called him Mr. Justice Pooh-Bah. The question came up as to whether, by the application of that term, the editor intended to impute corrupt motives to Mr. Justice Fraser, and the majority of the court held he did, Mr. Justice King dissenting. The latter declared that there was no intention to impute corrupt motives, but he bases judgment on this article which I have just read, in which the editor stated that Mr. Powell had induced the judge to change his mind. On this ground, Mr. Justice King came to the conclusion that the editor, in that article, implied that Mr. Justice Fraser had been induced corruptly to change his mind. Well, I think that is one of the most forced constructions that ever was put upon a newspaper paragraph. I have read the paragraph and re-read it; I have submitted it to some of my friends who have no interest in the case, who did not know the parties, and who read it dispassionately, and not one of them could give that meaning to the article. Now, the question comes before us in this way—whether the House will be satisfied to recommend the Crown to exercise its prerogative and release Mr. Hawke. I am not here to argue, it is not necessary in this case to argue, and I hope the argument will be avoided as far as possible, that the press are to have unlimited license in the discussion of matters relating to election trials. I do not argue that a newspaper editor should be allowed to publish libels against the judges or against anybody. I do not argue that such license is in the interest of the press or of society at large. I am not contending that Mr. Hawke was justified in the language he used, nor am I concerned in defending here his language. A part of that language is strong, stronger than many of us think was necessary or desirable. A man has the right to publish what he likes, but if he does, he does so at his peril. If he infringes the law, if he publishes language calculated to bring the judge or any other dignitary or person into contempt, he runs the risk of being brought before the proper court and of being tried in the proper way for his abuse of that liberty, and of being punished for it. That is not the question before the House. We are not to determine whether Mr. Hawke was guilty of having used proper or improper language; we are not to determine whether

his language was libellous or not. I contend that there is one and only one tribunal in this country competent to pass an opinion on that point, and that tribunal, I contend, is twelve sworn men empanelled as a jury. That is the only tribunal which has the right to determine cases of this kind; and, Sir, I fear that some of those who have heard the language used would say that Mr. Hawke went too far and used language altogether indefensible. Perhaps he has, but that does not touch the point. The point I wish to submit to the House is this: Have the judges of this country the power, after a cause has been finally determined, in case newspapers should publish comments upon their judgments, arbitrarily and summarily to bring the editors or publishers of those papers before them, and, without the interposition or the intervention of a jury, punish them by fine and imprisonment? That power, I say, does not, in my humble opinion, exist under the British Constitution. That power, at any rate, if it does exist, has become obsolete. That power should not be exercised, and as far as I can find, with the exception of this case in New Brunswick, has not been exercised for many years. Now, we must remember that, during the past fifty or sixty years, the law of libel in this country has undergone great changes. Perhaps I cannot summarise the matter as well as it is summarised in the language of Lord Justice Cockburn in the celebrated case of *Wason and Walters*. Lord Justice Cockburn said:

“Our law of libel has in many respects only gradually developed itself into anything like a satisfactory and settled form. The full liberty of public writers to comment on the conduct and motives of public men has only in very recent times been recognised. Comments on Government, on Ministers and officers of State, on members of both Houses of Parliament, on judges and other public functionaries, are now made every day which half a century ago would have been the subject of actions or *ex-officio* informations, and would have brought down fine and imprisonment on publishers and authors.”

Now, the language I have quoted, for which Mr. Hawke has been imprisoned, was language used by him as editor of a newspaper, in commenting on a legal decision which had been given and which settled an election trial. The judicial proceedings were over, the judgment was given, the election proceedings were out of court, and therefore there could be no possible interference with the administration of justice; and the proposition I lay down is that after a trial is ended and judgment is finally delivered, no comment, however strong, no language, however violent, which a newspaper editor may choose to publish, can be punished by the judges, except through the ordinary channels and in the ordinary way. Every man has the right to be tried by twelve of his peers; and to hold for a moment that there exist numberless Star Chambers in this country which can send a man to prison at their own discretion and judgment, because he has published language which the judges may hold to be libellous, would be to turn back the wheels of time some hundreds of years, and replace us in the state in which we then were, and out of which fortunately we have emerged, thanks to the struggles of such men as Erskine and others. We might be asked if there is any remedy for a judge who is attacked for giving an improper judgment, is brought into ridicule or contempt. I answer, yes, there is a remedy. He can prosecute the man for libel, and there is no doubt that he will get full justice in that case, not only from his brethren on the bench, but from those that are called upon to act on the jury. There is, however, the right of every court to protect itself from libellous calumny by summarily punishing the offender that should be confined to comments upon pending litigation, where a newspaper editor, during the progress of a case, publishes matter tending to impede or interfere with the administration of justice. From time immemorial, it has been held that in such cases in the interest of justice, judges must have the power of immediately punishing those per-

sons who interfere with its administration. If a man goes into a court and insults the court, everyone agrees that the court should have the power to punish him summarily. It is the same in regard to any interference with a jury, the court should have the power of awarding summary punishment. And, if any man publishes an article which is calculated to interfere with the administration of justice by turning the verdict of the jury in one direction or the other, or prejudicing the opinion of the judge one way or the other, that man should be punished. It is necessary that the wheels of justice should not be clogged or stopped or impeded by any such interference, but the position which I take, and which I think is endorsed by the best legal authorities, is that, when the case is over, when the jury are dispersed and the judge is off the bench, the judge stands in the eye of the law in the same position as any other man; he is no higher in position than the Minister of Justice, than an Archbishop of the church, than any minister of the church or any member of Parliament or any other citizen. I have no right to abuse him or slander him, any more than I have to abuse or slander any other citizen, and, if I do that, I may be punished, but it must be in a legal manner in the courts, and it would never do to admit that a judge of a court of record, if he has given a judgment and comments are made afterwards on that judgment, has the right to hale the man who makes the comment from his home, and to determine that the article he has written is libellous, and to imprison him for contempt of court. I hope no member of the House will understand me to impugn the necessary and inherent powers which all courts of justice possess, and ought to possess, to prevent the administration of justice being thwarted and interfered with. I believe these powers are rarely exercised, but they are as essentially necessary in order to preserve order and decorum in the courts, and to prevent the stream of justice being fouled. I simply take the position that, when once the judgment is delivered, that power does not exist, and, if any man libels the judges afterwards, the judges stand in the same position as other men. In regard to that matter, I should like to cite one or two authorities, but I will not do so at any great length. Hon. members will recollect the celebrated case, in Upper Canada, of *Regina vs. Wilkinson*, in which an application was made to commit the late Hon. Geo. Brown for an alleged libel on the Court. That libel was published after a criminal information had been applied for, but before it had been granted, and the two learned judges differed in opinion in regard to their power to punish summarily for contempt, Chief Justice Harrison affirming and Mr. Justice Morrison denying the power. The alleged libel was on one of the learned judges, Mr. Justice Wilson, who took no part in the judgment on the application to commit for contempt. It will be remembered that the application was made to punish Mr. Brown for contempt in publishing libellous language, as was said, pending certain proceedings then before the court. The criminal information had not been filed, and Mr. Justice Morrison remarked:

"In the case of *Birch v. Walsh*, an application for an attachment for contempt was made. The Master of the Rolls, in giving judgment, reviewed all the cases of constructive contempt prior to that period (1846). He referred to a case decided by Lord Hardwicke, who committed the editor of a paper, and after observing that the course pursued of committing for constructive contempt led to much observation, he quoted the following remarks of Mr. Hardgrave: 'If the doctrine of contempts be thus wide; if any of the great courts of Westminster Hall may construe what they please into contempt, and may under such denomination, without trial, by jury commit all persons accused of crime and also have an indefinite power of punishing by fine and imprisonment; and if all this when done be unappealable and unexamined, what is there but their own wisdom and moderation, and the danger of abusing so arbitrary a power, to prevent any court, under shelter of the law of contempts, from practising all the monstrous tyranny which first disgraced and at length overwhelmed the Star Chamber;'"

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

The learned judge quoted that extract with approval as showing that, in his opinion, judges could not punish for constructive contempts of court. The newspaper criticism published in regard to a judge after the judgment is given is termed a constructive contempt. The learned Judge Morrison went on to say:

"I now proceed to the most important point raised by this application; whether the applicant failing to sustain his rule for a constructive contempt affecting himself, is now entitled to ask the court, upon his own suggestion and at his instance, to punish his adversary for a direct contempt of court itself by the publication of the article in question—a contempt committed five months before this application—a publication which the court did not deem worthy of notice, did not think it necessary to call on the publisher to answer for. I have been unable to find any precedent or authority, or even suggestion for such a proceeding, although this arbitrary power of the court has existed during many centuries, a power, as Tindal, C. J., said, coeval with the courts themselves; and Mr. Robinson had to admit, no doubt, after the most diligent search, the absence of authority. When we consider the nature of the proposition, I should have been surprised if authority could have been found. I am certainly not disposed at this day to create a precedent for such a proceeding. On the other hand, I feel, in the interest of the administration of justice, that such an application should be met with a decided refusal. To assent to it would be opening a door to a species of application hitherto unknown—one pregnant with mischievous results, and which would be resorted to, not with the object of upholding the dignity of the court, but for serving private or political ends, or other purposes quite foreign to such an object. This is the first occasion the court has been invoked in a matter of this nature. My duty as a judge is to administer the law as I find it, but if I am at liberty to express any personal opinion upon the expediency of exercising the power of the court to summarily punish contempt not committed in its presence and not calculated to obstruct the course of justice, but by the publication of libellous matter, unfairly criticising or impugning the action of the court, or imputing unfair or corrupt motives to its members, I would venture to say that in such cases the exercise of this arbitrary power would be a questionable remedy, either for maintaining respect for the court itself, or vindicating the characters of its members. As it is an arbitrary power and its exercise cannot be questioned, it will always be regarded with jealousy and with great distrust if, unfortunately, the exercise of its power is involved, no matter how remotely, with the struggle of political parties."

This language is peculiarly apt when applied to the case which I am asking the House to consider. The passions and feelings of parties in that county of Westmoreland were unduly excited, owing to the political campaign which was going on. One party contended, rightly or wrongly, that the successful one had carried the county by the most corrupt and flagrant acts of bribery. They charged that a petition was filed in the court alleging that over 500 specific acts of bribery and corruption had been committed. One can well understand that when a judge gave as many different judgments as Justice Fraser did, one day fixing the trial within six months, another day fixing it beyond six months, and eventually placing it at a day which justified the court in throwing it out, one can well understand that the passions and feelings of those who were directly interested in that conflict, would not be very calm. They would be prompted to use, and I have no doubt they did use, language exceedingly strong; but for the court to take it up and say that their dignity required that the person who used that language should be punished summarily, and that this old power which they allege they possess, should be invoked to punish the parties, is, in my opinion, most unfortunate. The learned judge goes on to quote:

"It is far better that the judges of the courts should endure unjust criticisms and even slanderous accusations, than to interpose, of their own motion, to redress the offence against themselves when the offence committed is not committed in their immediate presence. * * *

"In every case I have been able to refer to, I find the greatest reluctance in the courts taking any step of this kind, and that the power now invoked has only been exercised when it was essential or necessary to prevent justice being obstructed or to protect suitors."

That is the principle laid down by Mr. Justice Morrison, and that is the principle which I believe to be the only sound, or defensible, or permissible principle on which courts can act; and I have no hesitation in stating myself that if it is found, eventually, that the courts possess this absolute power, that they are Star Chambers, possessing

power to send a man to prison whenever they please, without trial or appeal, it will not be long before the Legislature will intervene to take that power away from them. I do not believe they have that power, but the misfortune in this case is that when the judges claim to exercise a power of this kind, their judgment is unappealable. They are arbitrary and responsible to no one. They give a judgment, and it is alleged that from that judgment there can be no appeal; and therefore it is that I have found it necessary to bring this matter up in Parliament, that Parliament may give expression to its opinion upon it, and if that opinion is expressed strongly, I have no doubt it will bear good fruit. Now, I find that in 1883 a Contempt of Court Bill was introduced into the English Parliament by the Lord Chancellor, which came on for the second reading, and several of the law Lords, several very eminent men, expressed themselves upon this matter. I will call the attention of the House for a few minutes to the language used by Lord Fitzgerald, a judge of very great experience and learning; and as he is a very distinguished jurist, perhaps I may be permitted to read his remarks at some length. He is speaking of contempts of court, and drawing a distinction between contempts which frustrate or interfere with the administration of justice and those contempts which can properly be called merely constructive contempts of court. He says:

"But there was in addition another class of contempts, which, to distinguish them, he might call criminal contempts, for which, in many cases, the persons committing them would be liable to punishment, either summarily or by indictment, for a misdemeanor. For instance, there was the misconduct of persons in open court. A man might be guilty of conduct in open court which impaired the dignity of the court, and the court would immediately take cognizance of that which took place before the court itself, and inflict summary punishment. That, however, was a power which it was rarely necessary to enforce. He had had the honor of a seat on the bench for twenty-two years, embracing periods of great public excitement, and he had never had occasion to exercise that summary authority, but he had always felt that it was the knowledge of the existence of that power which enabled him to maintain the order and dignity of the court. If they conferred jurisdiction upon a judge, they impliedly furnished him with authority to enable him to enforce that jurisdiction, and to preserve order and dignity in its administration. He was far, therefore, from objecting to the summary jurisdiction as it at present existed, for contempts in open court, with a fine limited to £500, and a period of imprisonment for three months. But behind that class of contempts there was another still more important, which was popularly known as 'constructive' contempts of court. They arose, not in the presence of the court, not in open court, but outside the court, and not in the presence of the judge; and as to them, time and place had no application. They arose sometimes from speeches, but principally from the publication of newspaper articles in reference to some trial about to take place, or which was then actually going on."

You see his Lordship confines his definition of constructive contempt of court to the comments made with reference to a trial about to take place, or with reference to a trial which was then actually going on.

"This constructive contempt depended entirely upon the inference that the party speaking, writing or publishing, intended, in some way, to interfere with and impede the administration of justice, and they had been known to our law for a very long period. It was unnecessary to consider when the practice arose—as far back as Edward III they had it in practice—and from that time down to the present, though it was a power which was rarely exercised in modern times. There was one recorded case of a reverend gentleman, John Barker, who, having called a meeting of his parishioners in the churchyard, made a speech on local affairs, in which he spoke disrespectfully of the King's Bench, and for that was called up and sentenced summarily to a term of imprisonment; and in another case where, in a petition to the Corporation of London, the party libelled the Aldermen, and used words disrespectful of the King's Bench. He was indicted for the first and tried before a jury; but was summarily imprisoned for the last. No doubt these cases would not now be followed. In modern times this power of commitment had been confined solely to articles in the newspapers which were thought to interfere with the administration of justice. The doctrine of constructive contempt was one which he was not inclined to favor. It appeared to him that if dealt with at all, it should be dealt with on some broad foundation. The present course of proceedings was exceedingly objectionable. If an article in a newspaper appeared which was alleged to be such a contempt, and which was one from which an inference could be drawn that it was intended to interfere with the administration of justice, the party was called up summarily and the matter enquired into, the judge being at once judge of the law, of the

fact of the intention, and of the sentence, and his decision was without any power of review. That was most unsatisfactory, and there could be no doubt that the doctrine had a tendency to unduly fetter the freedom of the press, and in that light was important to them all. No doubt there was a difficulty in dealing with it; but he would rather see the doctrine done away with altogether than continue to exist in its present form. There was no such law in any of the American States. The New York Code said:

"Every Court of Record may punish summarily disorderly, contemptuous, or insolent behavior in the immediate presence of the court, tending to interrupt its proceeding and impair the respect due to authority."

"But it could not punish for publication out of court, for the remedy was by indictment; and he believed such a practice as ours of summary punishment for constructive contempt did not exist in any other country. Its effect was to enforce silence on the part of the press where the public interests required the fullest publicity and the closest criticism of what was going on. He had such an objection to the doctrine and practice, that he should prefer being guided by the maxim 'Nil falsi audeat, nil veri non audeat dicere.' He need not say that constructive crime was in all cases contrary to the genius of the English law, and that in such cases it was usual to interpose a jury for the protection of the subject. The objections to the present system were that it was uncertain, undefined and depending on capricious discretion. There would be great difficulty in defining constructive contempts, but he would suggest that it might be hedged around with some protections, and that in all cases a right of appeal should be given to the Court of Appeal. The effect of that would be to render the judges more cautious, while it would leave them free in their action; and above all, in time a series of decisions would be built up which would regulate and control the discretion of the judges in the exercise of their summary power."

It will be seen from his Lordship's remarks that while he was strongly opposed to summary punishment for constructive contempt, he was very careful to limit constructive contempt to the publication of language used either before a pending case came on for trial or during the pendency of trial, and he intimated and stated strongly that no publication after the trial could ever be construed by any judge into a constructive contempt of court. If the language used by Lord Fitzgerald is correct, the judgment given by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick has proceeded upon a false basis, and the judges acted upon an assumption that a law was in force in this country which does not exist. But I find that as lately as within the last two months this point was raised and a decision given on it in an English court. This case I refer to is reported in the *Times* of 27th March last. It was an application made in regard to the publisher of the *Era* newspaper in London for contempt of court in ridiculing the jury for having given a certain verdict in an action for libel. Notice of application for a new trial had been given, and it was contended in this application that the action was still pending, and therefore, inasmuch as the action was pending, the publication of language calculated to throw ridicule on the jury was contempt of court. The article suggested that but for the stupidity of the jury they would not have found the verdict for the plaintiffs, and the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Field and Mr. Justice Stephen are instructive, because they show that in their opinion no language written or spoken of the jury or the judge after the proceedings are terminated can by any ingenuity be construed to be constructive contempt of court. This is the latest decision that has been given, and as it seems to be *apropos* of the case before the House, I will trouble hon. members with reading it. Mr. Justice Field said:

"The article complained of the jury that they had not found a proper verdict, and the writer used language which he had better not have used, and which was not in good taste. It was not wise or right when a jury had given a verdict to hold them up to ridicule. The writer should consider that the jurors had endeavored to do their duty, and if it was merely a question of censure, he should be disposed to concur in the observations made by Mr. Murphy. But the court was asked to punish Mr. Ledger for this article, and they must have strong grounds for taking that course. Now the proceeding for contempt was for something serious, a contempt in the face of the court or an interference with the course of justice. Suppose, for instance, this article had been published on the morning of the trial so that it would be in the hands of the jurors, it would be an interference with the course of justice, and would merit summary punishment. But this was a jurisdiction to be exercised with care and caution, and upon grounds which did not apply here. There was an undoubted right to make comments upon the conduct of judges or jurors, and Mr. Murphy, with his usual fairness,

admitted that if the article had been published before the notice of application for a new trial it could not have been complained of. But surely the liability of the writer could not depend upon a notice having been given of an application for a new trial. Suppose the new trial refused by the court and an appeal brought. Is the right of a public writer to be in suspense for two or three years. The case would have lost all interest by that time. In that view the right of comment would not be of much value. What then was the principle to be adopted? It must be this, that the article must be such as to influence the trial of the case and prevent the tribunal from coming to a just and impartial decision."

The learned judge lays down the law very clearly in conclusive language, and shows that no application after proceedings are terminated can be construed to be a constructive contempt of court. Mr. Justice Stephen, an eminent judge, followed. He said:

"He thought that the power possessed by the court of committing persons for contempt for articles in newspapers, calculated to prejudice the fair administration of justice, was one of the utmost importance and essential to the due administration of justice. But it was a power which ought to be used as seldom as possible and almost entirely with reference to the interests of justice. No doubt the principle in which the power was to be exercised was very vague, and unavoidably so. All that could be said was that the court must be satisfied that there had been something to interfere with the course of justice or likely to do so. Suppose, for instance in a case which affected a political party or a religious body, there was an article strongly pressing that the jury ought not to give a verdict in favor of or against such party or such religious body. That would be a contempt of court, undoubtedly, which would merit severe punishment. But when the trial had taken place different considerations applied. The court had then done its work, the jury had given their verdict and they were given over to criticism and comment, and of that they could not complain."

The learned judge there gives the whole thing in a nutshell. After the judge and jury have done their work and a verdict has been given and their duty discharged, they are liable to the same criticism and comment as other public officers, and if that criticism and comment is unfair and unjust and transgresses those limits which the law prescribes, the parties complained of can be punished by proceedings being taken in the proper way, by criminal information or by an ordinary suit for libel, and they can be punished, I submit, in no other way. The learned judge goes on to say:

"That was so in the present case, and though it was said defendant had given notice of an application for a new trial, if it was granted a considerable time must elapse before the second trial, and then it was not probable that anyone who had the article would be on the jury or that he would recollect or be influenced by it."

So in this case I am quoting, although there had been notice of an intention to move for a new trial, that was not held to be a reason for the exercise of this summary and arbitrary power, inasmuch as justice had already been administered, and therefore the court would not take knowledge of that language as a constructive contempt of court, and they left it to those who thought they had been wronged to initiate proceedings in the ordinary way. There is a remark made by the eminent Master of the Rolls, Jessel, who, in trying the case of *Plating Company vs. Farquharson*, 17th Chancery Division, 55, gave his opinion on this point in these words:

"Unless the court is satisfied that the publication is a contempt which interferes with the course of justice, of course the court ought not to interfere."

These authorities are more than sufficient in support of the position I take that after judgment had been given by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, dismissing the election petition, the judges who gave that decision were then open to the same criticism and comment on the part of the press as any other public officials. If the comments exceed the fair bounds of legitimate criticism they can be punished, but they ought to be punished in one way and in one way only; by invoking the authority of the courts through their ordinary channels and empannelling a jury to decide on the libel and so punishing the defendant when he has done wrong. I make no claim for immunity from punishment of any editor who libels another man. I make no claim for a

Mr. DAVIES.

license of the press, which would interfere with the free, fair and fearless administration of justice by those to whom this great and essential duty is entrusted. I do not desire even to call in question the arbitrary power of the judges of the land, summarily to punish those who, during the pendency of litigation, publish articles calculated to impede, delay, or defeat justice. Such powers are necessarily inherent in the court, and their maintenance is essential for the proper administration of the law. It may be that Parliament may see fit to limit and define the powers of the judges in this regard, as has been done in the United States and in England; it may be necessary to regulate this power by providing in all such cases an appeal to a higher court, and I think it probable that Parliament may interfere before long in that direction. But my contention is that the inherent, necessary and admitted power of the courts should not be allowed to be extended to the punishment, arbitrarily and summarily, of those who, after the termination of the legal proceedings, discuss the conduct of either the judge or the jury. When they have discharged their functions they stand in relation to the press on the same footing as other citizens. If an editor libels them he should be punished. But he should be punished only after a trial by his peers and by the ordinary process of the law. The doctrine that he can be dragged before the judge whose conduct he has commented on, and be summarily punished, heavily fined and sent for months to prison, without any of the safeguards which the law throws around the meanest citizen is a relic of barbarism, is opposed to the genius of our constitution, and calculated to inflict a mortal stab upon that freedom of public discussion which our forefathers sought so hard to establish, and to which we owe so much of our highly prized liberties. Judges are only mortal. They are subject to the frailties, passions, and prejudices of ordinary men. They often do wrong; sometimes commit great injustice, and must be subject to that open and fearless discussion which is our greatest safeguard against wrongdoing on their part. If either a judge or jurymen misconducts himself, it is intolerable that such misconduct should go unrebuked. It is intolerable that the judge himself should without any appeal, and without trial by jury, arbitrarily and summarily determine, first whether the criticism is fair, and next what punishment should be awarded. It is necessary in the public interest, it is desirable for the proper maintenance of the dignity of the bench itself, it is essential in the interests of the freedom of the press, that any decision upon the fairness or justness of the criticisms should be determined by the ordinary tribunals in the ordinary way. If any man, occupying a distinguished public position is unjustly libelled and attacked, the law is open and there are deputies; let him implead his accuser. If a governor general, a prime minister, an archbishop, or bishop, or clergyman, is assailed in the press with libellous vituperation and abuse, he cannot arbitrarily and without trial hale the offender to prison. Such a power, if asked for, would be met with a shout of derision. A judge must not stand in any different position and excepting in the case when the attack interferes with the administration of justice, he must stand on the same level with the ordinary citizen. We cannot afford to revive or tolerate the revival of numberless Star Chambers or allow in the present day the application of the pernicious doctrine that the greater the truth the greater the libel. An independent judiciary is one of the bulwarks of our civil liberties, but freedom of public discussion is another. Both can co-exist. To allow the judiciary under the pretence of maintaining its independence to muzzle the press by conceding to it the right after the determination of legal proceedings arbitrarily to decide without trial by jury how far criticism may go would be to strike a fatal blow at

both bulwarks. It would destroy one and change the independence of the other into tyranny. No modern precedents can be found to justify the latest assumption of power by the court of New Brunswick. You will seek in vain in the records of the tribunals of justice in England, in the United States, or in Canada, for any justifying precedent. The imprisonment of Mr. Hawke for comments made by him upon the conduct of the judge who tried the election petition against Mr. Wood, after the final determination of that trial, is unjust and indefensible, and such an arbitrary and tyrannical stretch of the powers of the court as in my opinion justifies and demands the interference of this Parliament, as the highest inquest of the land. No man should be allowed to publish articles scandalising any of the courts of the land. It is safer, however, to allow such publications, than to tolerate their arbitrary and illegal punishment. I am not concerned in justifying all the language used by Mr. Hawke—much of it was very severe. Some of it might be hard to justify, but no one acquainted with the facts will deny that the circumstances called for severe and searching criticism, or that the conduct of the judge was reprehensible. If Mr. Hawke had offended, if he had libelled or scandalised any member of the court, he could have been prosecuted in the ordinary way, before the ordinary tribunals, and, if convicted, would have been punished like any other offender. But what I claim, and all I claim is, not immunity from punishment, but a fair, honest, impartial trial. I deny that he got or could expect to get that in the way he was tried. A jury and a jury only could determine whether his criticisms were libellous. His judges were his accusers; the offence was a charge of libelling those very judges and of scandalising their court. The trial, therefore, offended against that first principle of British law that "no man shall be a judge in his own cause." It cannot be said to come within the rare exceptions which allow that principle to be invaded. The prisoner was denied the right of having his case submitted to a jury of his countrymen. He was tried and punished arbitrarily, summarily, and, I venture to submit, unjustly. He is in my humble opinion unjustly imprisoned. The sentence was bitter, unnecessarily severe, and if the position I have taken is correct, involves a violation of some of our most cherished rights. He has no appeal but that which every alleged criminal has, an appeal to the Crown for justice. In my opinion the prerogative of the Crown should be exercised in his behalf, the fine remitted, and the prison doors thrown open, and it is with the hope of obtaining such a result that I have ventured to bring the case before this House. I move the adjournment.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great attention to the observations which the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., has made to the House, and I recognise to the fullest extent the importance of the question, from the point of view from which he has treated it. I can understand that sympathising as he does with the editor who has been imprisoned, and taking a professional view of the case, it is reasonable to expect that he should go into the subject with some minuteness and care, and give to the House the benefit of the views which his training and experience enable him to present. But I am unable to understand the logic of the hon. gentleman in pressing the House earnestly for nearly two hours, for the purpose of making a case for the interference of Parliament and concluding that speech—referring it must be remembered, to the case of a man, who is now lying falsely imprisoned, as he says,—concluding that long case, which he has made for the immediate and prompt interference of Parliament, by a motion that the House do now adjourn. In so far as the hon. gentleman has intended to present his argument in favor of executive interference in the case

of Mr. Hawke, I submit to his own judgment, that his argument was not well founded or well addressed, and for these reasons: The hon. gentleman based his contention entirely on the ground that the decision of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick was against law and oppressive to the subject who is now confined. I pass by for the moment the circumstance that if Mr. Hawke is falsely imprisoned, as the argument of the hon. member would lead us to suppose, he may have an ample remedy. He has, in the first place, his writ of *habeas corpus* from the judges of the Province of New Brunswick. The hon. gentleman will remind me that these were his accusers and these were his judges, notwithstanding which, by the mandate of Parliament, they are obliged to grant the writ under an enormous penalty for its refusal. But if he should fail to obtain his writ for any reason from them, he has the right of application to five other judges in this city, far removed from the Province of New Brunswick, everyone of whom has concurrent jurisdiction with the judges of the Province of New Brunswick. But passing by that question for the moment, as I said I would, as to whether Mr. Hawke has not a sufficient remedy for a legal wrong done to him, without coming to the executive, I would remind the hon. gentleman that, in so far as his argument is based on the contention that the judgment of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick is wrong, the executive of this country cannot be regarded as a court of appeal from the Supreme Court of New Brunswick. The constitution of this country divides the Government of this country into three branches, the legislative, the executive and the judicial, and every one of these branches is entirely free from the control of the others. I can no more advise His Excellency to reverse the decision of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick on the ground that it is against law than the Supreme Court of New Brunswick can decide that we ought not to pass a statute.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How did the hon. gentleman act in the case of the imprisonment of an editor in Calgary by Judge Travis?

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is addressing himself, not to the case of a conviction by a stipendiary magistrate, as was the case he has just referred to, but to the case of a decision of five or six judges constituting the Supreme Court of the Province of New Brunswick from whom there is no appeal whatever; and I do not hesitate to say, in so far as I can bind myself by any opinion I may express as regards the ground on which executive interference may be suggested on my part, that I refuse every application which is based purely on legal grounds, when the person suffering under sentence has an opportunity of seeking the decision of the highest court of this Province on the legal question he wishes to raise, or having had that opportunity, has availed himself of it, and has had judgment pronounced against him, I think it would be the height of presumption in me to go to His Excellency tomorrow and say that, notwithstanding that the Legislature of the Province of New Brunswick in their wisdom have made that court supreme in these matters in that Province, I ventured to advise His Excellency that their judgment should be summarily reversed by him, and the punishment which they have thought it their duty to impose should be undone, without a single observation to present to His Excellency from anything the hon. gentleman has said this afternoon, indicating that there was a single mitigating circumstance surrounding the offence when committed, or a single sign of contrition on the part of the offender. Now, in order that the House may be satisfied as to what the circumstances of this case were, I feel compelled, not merely in justice to the accused person, but especially in view of the high position of those whose conduct and judgment have been arraigned this afternoon by the hon. member for Queen's, to detain

the House for a few minutes in narrating the circumstances which gave rise to this judgment, and the circumstances which immediately accompanied it. I feel the more bound to do so because I do not understand the facts of the case to be as they have been set forth by the hon. member for Queen's. When the hon. gentleman was good enough a few evenings ago to inform me that he intended to bring this matter to the attention of the House, I asked him to give fair time in order that I might communicate with persons at a distance; but I am able to say to the House that in the few observations I will make, I will present the facts to the House solely on the statements furnished by Mr. Emmerson, the candidate against the sitting member, not using any facts furnished to me either by his opponent in the litigation or by the judges of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, with whom I have had no communication on this subject whatever. Now, Sir, there was an affidavit made, in the first place, by Mr. Emmerson, the petitioner, and another one by Mr. Gregory, his counsel; and in so far as I am stating the circumstances connected with the disposition of this case, I am stating circumstances which are detailed in these affidavits; and in so far as I am questioning the existence of other facts, I am questioning them because these affidavits contain no allegations of them. We know that it was of vital importance to the petitioner that he should make out the best case he could, and present all the facts he could to strengthen his petition when these affidavits were made. As the hon. gentleman has said, there was an election in Westmoreland county, in which the sitting member, Mr. Wood, and Mr. Emmerson were the candidates. There was a petition against the return of Mr. Wood, and a cross-petition against Mr. Emmerson. Those petitions having been got ready for trial, an application was made to Mr. Justice Fraser to fix a day when they should be tried, and on the 15th of July Mr. Fraser sat in the first instance to hear a motion to fix a day of trial, and he sat afterwards, on an adjournment, on the 9th of August to hear the conclusion of the argument. When he sat to fix the day of trial, the counsel for the sitting member came before him, and urged certain objections to the regularity of the petitions and of the notice to fix the day, and certain objections as to the right to have a day fixed at that stage of the proceedings at all. Mr. Justice Fraser heard those objections and he reserved judgment upon them. But it is true, as the hon. member has said, at least I assume it to be true, because it is so stated in the affidavit of Mr. Emmerson, that at the argument against fixing the day of trial, it was mutually agreed, and assented to by the judge, that if the day should be fixed, it would be the 20th of September. On the 13th of August, four days after the arguments on those objections were concluded, Mr. Justice Fraser gave judgment against the objections, and it only remained for him to fix the day of trial, which, if matters stood as they were when the application was made to him, would have been the 20th of September. The counsel for the sitting member contended that those objections were so well sustained by the authorities which he presented to the judge, that he ought in fairness to have the right of appeal, and that if the judge fixed the 20th of September his appeal would be cut off, as the trial of the petition would be going on before the appeal could be heard. The judge being impressed with that view, intimated that he was disposed to fix a day in December instead of the 20th of September, in order that time for an appeal might intervene, and there can be no imputation against his good faith in taking that step. The day he proposed to fix was the 6th of December. Now, let me call the attention of the House to the provision on which the fate of this petition really turned. The 6th of December would be more than six months after the date on

Mr. THOMPSON.

which the petition was presented, and the statute on this subject provides:

"That the trial of every election petition shall be commenced within six months from the time when such petition has been presented, and shall be proceeded with from day to day until the trial is over; but if, at any time, it appears to the court or a judge, that the respondent's presence at the trial is necessary, such trial shall not be commenced during any Session of Parliament."

And these words were added:

"And in the computation of any trial the delay allowed for any step or proceeding in respect of any such trial or for the commencement thereof as aforesaid, the time occupied by such Session of Parliament shall not be included."

Now, what was the action of the petitioner, Mr. Emmerson? He urged, it is true, to have the earliest possible day fixed; he wanted the 20th of September fixed, and if that day could not be fixed, he wanted an earlier day; and he instructed Mr. Gregory, in Fredericton, to make the same contention before the judge. He did so, not because in the slightest degree he held that the six months would include the period of session, for he entertained no fear that the petition would be thrown out in consequence of the time of the session counting. It was simply because he wanted urgency for his petition, and wanted it to be proceeded at the earliest possible day. I have Mr. Gregory's affidavit here, and find from it that, as far as he is concerned, all that was said when this subject was broached was that there might be a doubt upon the subject, and that it would be better to be on the safe side and have the trial proceeded with within the time. There was no argument upon the question; that question was never presented to Judge Fraser, and let me call the attention of the House to what the right of the petitioner was, at that time, if he had entertained any doubts. It is known that the judge, by his own action, threw the case over the six months period. All that Mr. Emmerson then had to do was to ask the judge, under those circumstances, and in view of an appeal being pending upon the judge's decision of the preliminary objection, to extend the time for bringing on the trial. The provision of the statute is as follows:—

"The court or a judge may, notwithstanding anything in the preceding section, from time to time enlarge the time for the commencement of the trial, if, on application for that purpose, supported by affidavit, it appears to such court or judge that the requirements of justice render such enlargement necessary."

There was ample ground in the existence of this appeal and in the fact that it could not be heard whether by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick or of Canada or by whatever court to which the appeal might be taken, until the six months period had expired, for making this application, but Mr. Gregory attached so little importance to this that although he intimated to the judge it would be better to keep on the safe side, he never moved to have that extension of time allowed; neither did Mr. Emmerson mention the subject to the judge or anybody else, and he had so little idea that he was losing his right by the fixing of a later day and so little idea of urging that contention before the judge, that we find in a letter which he published over his own signature, dated the 7th November, 1887, these words:

"My own opinion is that the construction given by Mr. Fraser"—

The counsel for the sitting member, I presume—

"to section 32, when seeking an extension of time for the trial on Mr. Wood's behalf is the correct one, and lawyers quite as able as any who appeared before the court on the argument of the question agree with my view; but unfortunately a majority of the court, including Judge Fraser, who has reversed his first decision, have decided the other way, and unfortunately there seems to be, under the law, no appeal from this judgment to a higher court."

Mr. LANDRY. It is to Mr. Justice Fraser, the writer refers, and not to counsel.

Mr. THOMPSON. Perhaps so. The hon. member for Queen's (P. E. I.) was so misled by the information he

got on this subject that he presented the case to the House in this way: That the petitioner's counsel were endeavoring to have the difficulty avoided, as regards the six months, and that Judge Fraser insisted on forcing that difficulty on them; whereas, when the matter went before Judge Fraser, Mr. Emmerson declares he was of opinion that that made no difference whatever. There was no application whatever made to extend the time, and that question was never argued before the judge at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. It is not essential to the argument, but the statement I made, and which I based on Mr. Gregory's affidavit, which the hon. gentleman says he has before him, was that he went first to Fredericton and raised the preliminary objection to the judge, and when the judge intimated that he would fix the day beyond the six months, he raised the objection that the hon. gentleman is dealing with.

Mr. THOMPSON. He drew attention to the fact that doubts might exist on that subject; and although I am strictly within the mark in saying what I said, I do not want to press the argument further than this, that while that subject was mentioned, as I think it was, it was never argued before Judge Fraser. It would be, of course, very satisfactory if judges could always know what the true interpretation of the law is, without the assistance of counsel at all and without opportunity for reflection. But unfortunately judges are fallible like other people, unfortunately they not only have to change their opinions sometimes, but they require the assistance of counsel, in arguing cases before them, in order to enable them to come to a right conclusion. Judge Fraser, when acting on this point, was acting on one of the most difficult portions of our statute law. He was acting on a provision, on which I confess my own deliberate and unbiassed opinion changed two or three times before I came to the conclusion I now have reached, which is that he was distinctly right in his last judgment. He was acting on a section on which judges in almost every Province have differed as to its true meaning; he was acting on a section on which I believe the judges of Ontario are now utterly at variance in opinion as to its true interpretation; and he was acting on it without having had the advantage of the question being argued before him, for an expression only had been given to a doubt, and he believing, as the affidavit shows he did, that the time of the Session would not count, in consequence of the strict words of the proviso I have read, fixed the later day. It surely will not be assumed that he did so for the purpose of defrauding the petitioner of his right, but that, as he avowed in the presence of both counsel at the time, he did so for the purpose of enabling an appeal to intervene, in order that he might be corrected, if wrong in the judgment he gave on the objections which were taken. Having fixed the 6th December, believing he was safe in so doing—and so did the petitioner believe, as he tells us in the letter I have read—the objection was taken that the time fixed for the trial was beyond the six months limit, and that the time of the Session must count, because there had been no judicial determination that the presence of the respondent was necessary at the trial. Under these circumstances, the question was brought before the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, and by the judgment of the whole court, it was decided, as it has been decided by the Supreme Court of Canada, and by the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, and by some of the Ontario judges and some of the Nova Scotia judges, that the time of the Session must count, under such circumstances as existed in that case, and the petitioner lost his right. Now, it is true that Judge Fraser concurred in that decision. It is unfortunate that, in the first instance, he made a mis-

take, and there can be no doubt that he did make a mistake. It was a mistake, however, in which, as I have shown, not only many other judges, but many other eminent lawyers in Canada, concurred; and it was a mistake as to which the petitioner in this case, after a full adjudication on the question, has declared solemnly, over his own signature, that he concurs in now. Now, the best thing and the most honorable thing that Judge Fraser could have possibly done was to correct his mistake, and to avow that he was wrong. We can easily see that the circumstances must have been exceedingly painful to him, as it always must be painful to a judge to know that a suitor, by a mistake of his, has lost his right, but that should be no reason whatever why the judge should not correct his mistake and inflict another wrong on the other suitor, who, in this case, was the sitting member. What kind of honor and consistency would Judge Fraser have had, if, after having made that mistake in fixing the day of trial too late to keep the petitioner alive, he had turned round, in order to cover his mistake, and said: "Well, I have inflicted that injury on the petitioner, but will endeavor to redress it by upholding my judgment in the interest of the petitioner, and at the expense of the sitting member, who, under a true construction of the law, has the right to represent the county for the next five years?" Now, under these circumstances Judge Fraser was violently assailed, and it does seem to me most important, having mentioned the necessity, in fairness and honor, of a judge reversing his judgment, when he finds it was wrong, even if he finds an injury has been done to a suitor, that then, if ever, in the interests of justice, calumny should be silenced, and the judge should not be subjected to insult. But in this case, what course did the convict take? I admit that he had a perfect right, not only as editor of a newspaper but as a private citizen, in letters or in any other way, to criticise the judgment of Judge Fraser, and to show that Judge Fraser was wrong. He had a right to urge that a judge who had made a mistake in law, as Judge Fraser did, should not sit upon the bench, although that would be very extreme, but, under the law of England, under the law of America, and under the law of Canada, and of every country where there is a free and independent judiciary, the one thing which he could not do was to impute corruption to the judge. Let me show the House what Mr. Hawke did say. I will endeavor to avoid any debatable ground in speaking of the several judgments of members of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, in which it was unanimously decided that Mr. Hawke was punishable for contempt. On the 8th November he had published an article which was headed "A Scandalous Outrage." I understand from the hon. gentleman opposite that in regard to some portions of that article some members of the bench did not regard them in the same light as other judges did, but, when I read the article, I do not think the House will think that this was anything but a statement that Judge Fraser was corrupt and had been influenced to change his opinion from right to wrong by corrupt influences, whereas the truth is that he changed his opinion from wrong to right, as we know by the decision of the highest legal authority in this country. The article to which I refer was headed, as I have stated, "A Scandalous Outrage." Then there was another heading: "A Judicial Pooh-Bah." In that article it is stated:

"This was the decision of Mr. Pooh-Bah, in his capacity as Lord Chancellor, and in the Supreme Court of New Brunswick on Saturday, the judicial Pooh-Bah, as Lord High Executioner, reversed his former decision, and ruled the petition out on the very grounds which he formerly held were incorrect. Such is Mr. Justice Pooh-Bah Fraser's conception of law and justice."

The hon. gentleman opposite intimated that these expressions were mere trifles, that we would consider them trifling if applied to us, accustomed as we in Parliament are to the greatest calumnies.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I spoke of the expressions in the public press.

Mr. THOMPSON. I mean expressions used to members of Parliament. The hon. gentleman intimated that no offence could be taken at the words "Mr. Justice Pooh-Bah Fraser," as the same term has been used in regard to the Minister of Finance.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said that no one could impute a corrupt motive to the man using that phrase.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is because public men in this country are unfortunately every day exposed to the vilest language, and he said that consequently a man should not be punished for applying that kind of language to judges on the bench. The hon. gentleman thinks that no punishment should follow in a case of that kind, because such terms have been administered in liberal doses to members who sit on both sides of this House. I have nothing to say now in regard to the propriety of such language being used to public men, but it is in the interests of the free administration of justice that the men who sit on the bench, apart from the hurly-burly in which we live and struggle day after day, should be free from such attacks. They have no reply and their vindication must depend very largely on the respect and confidence of the people among whom they live. It is contrary to justice and to fair play that they should be assailed by language such as that, and that the language which is permitted in regard to public men should be allowed to be used in regard to the judges of the land; and I think that the thoughtful and intelligent members of the press would not claim that they are entitled to use such language. The Chief Justice says:

"It cannot be denied that this article does, and was intended to bring Mr. Justice Fraser and his proceedings on the election petition into public ridicule and contempt to a very great extent. The very designation of him as 'Mr. Justice Pooh-Bah Fraser' would, even to those who had neither witnessed nor read the comedy, indicate that the term 'Pooh-Bah' was applied to him as one of contempt and of ridicule."

The hon. member is therefore mistaken in supposing that the Chief Justice signifies that this is punishable only as an imputation of corruption. It was sufficient that it was contemptuous and ridiculous for it to have all the characteristics of "contempt." The Chief Justice goes on:

"But I think it goes much further than mere ridicule; and, admitting that it was not so intended, the effect of it was at least to insinuate and to lead the public to believe that Mr. Justice Fraser was induced to change his opinion as to the completion of the six months for bringing the petition to trial for the same reasons that Pooh-Bah reversed his decisions from time to time, which anybody who has either read or witnessed the comedy would know to have been that he was bribed."

But that was not all. On the 12th November, this article was published, to which I ask the careful attention of the House:

"What induced Mr. Justice Fraser to change his opinion? Why did he, after selecting the 20th September and allowing that date to be announced broadcast over the country as the date of trial, change his mind and determine on a date in December? What were the arguments and what were the reasons presented to him out of court to induce this change of mind, and his refusal to sign the order for the trial on September 20?"

I think the hon. member will agree with me that, when it is stated that a judge is induced to decide any matter in court by what transpires out of court, that is an accusation of the lowest infamy that any judge could be guilty of.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think he was charged with that.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, he was charged with that—

"Who was it that represented to Mr. Justice Fraser that that date would be inconvenient to him? Unless Mr. Powell is done a gross wrong, it is reported round Sackville that he boasts of having induced the judge to change the date from September 20, to suit his convenience. The desire to induce Mr. Fraser to change the date of trial must have emanated from those interested in the Conservative candidate's cause; and then when Mr. Emmerson's counsel discovered that the judge was

Mr. THOMPSON.

bent upon changing the date, he directed his attention to the fact that by a possible construction of the statute that date would throw the petition out of court, the judge ruled that it would not. The moment the judge had changed the date rumors began to circulate round Sackville—evidently emanating from Mr. Powell—that as a result of the change of date, which it is believed he induced the judge to make, Mr. Emmerson's petition would be thrown out of court. Then, to the surprise and astonishment of everybody, Mr. Justice Fraser went back upon his own interpretation of the law; performed his now notorious judicial somersault, and was the pantaloons of the comic pantomime to Mr. Powell's clown."

Now, I am under the impression that Hawke was charged with that article, but whether he was charged with that article or not, it was in evidence that he published that article, and he did not deny it himself; and I think the argument of the Chief Justice was a fair one, that it could be used in interpreting the expression "Mr. Justice Pooh-Bah Fraser" which was contained in the article, and which the hon. member for Queen's admits he was charged with having published. Now, as regards the imputations conveyed in that last paragraph, I fail to see the cogency of the hon. gentleman's argument that a libel is for the jury and not for the court, or the ground for his statement that there was no juror in the country who would have found that statement libellous.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I merely expressed my personal opinion.

Mr. THOMPSON. It was the hon. member's sincere opinion, I have no doubt. It is my sincere opinion that no juror in the country would say that was not libellous, who was not a perjurer.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) All I ask is that he should be tried in order to ascertain whether you or I are right.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, fortunately, or unfortunately, for Mr. Hawke, and I think fortunately, he has not yet been tried for libel—perhaps he may yet be. He has been tried for a milder offence, and a penalty has been inflicted upon him which could not have been inflicted if he had been indicted for libel and a conviction had been found under that paragraph. Now, then, as regards the fact which transpired that the judge had committed an error in the first instance, in supposing the date would be in time. If he committed an error on a most difficult question of law, he committed an error that might have been avoided by the action of the petitioner himself, either in calling the judge's attention strongly to that point, and arguing it before him, or by asking to have all doubts removed by an extension of the time for bringing the petition to trial. Now, as regards the course which matters subsequently took, let the House observe that the condemnation by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick was not in vindication of Mr. Justice Fraser alone, it was in consequence of the imputation there conveyed against the action of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick itself as well. Mr. Justice Fraser was only one constituent member of that court, and he was not one of those who condemned Hawke. As regards the character and standing of the judge against whom this imputation was conveyed, of being influenced, either by political feelings or by other corrupt motives, to change his opinions from right to wrong, I feel bound to say, knowing Mr. Justice Fraser, and standing here in an assembly of gentlemen who do not know him, that while I admit he made that mistake, and while I regret that he did so, in consequence of any possible injury which may have been done to the petitioner, as well as on account of the strictures that followed, I feel bound to say, I repeat, in view of the imputations upon him, that if there is one man in Canada to whom those imputations could not be properly applied, it is Judge Fraser. I have known him before he went upon the bench, and I have known him since he went upon the bench, hardly personally at all, but as

a public man, as a professional man, and subsequently as a judge; and I have known him to be honest, painstaking and scrupulous to the last degree as regards the rights and interests with which he had to deal. When this matter came before the court, let the House observe the position in which Mr. Hawke stood. Interrogatories were put to him by which he might, if he pleased, have avoided the consequences which subsequently fell upon his head. Mr. Hawke might then and there have done one of two things—he might have proved, as he could have done, that he was not a liar in the insinuation he made—that the charge was true, or if he were an honorable man and worthy to be a member of the press of Canada, he might have honestly disavowed the insinuations and expressed regret that he had made them. The House will understand the force of the appeal which has been made from the other side for executive clemency, when I say that down to this moment he has not offered a vestige of proof that the insinuations were true, or the slightest contrition for having made them.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The Minister of Justice, in justice to Mr. Hawke, whom he is assailing, ought to say that when these interrogatories were put to him he was in prison, and on the advice of his counsel, refused to answer, because he challenged the jurisdiction of the court.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no objection to that statement being made, or giving Mr. Hawke the benefit of it. I am not speaking of the interrogatories which were put to him after he was imprisoned for the contempt. Before that he was only imprisoned by his own choice, for rather than give his own recognisance, he went to jail in order to give himself the solemnity of a martyr; and if he was in custody when these interrogatories were put to him, he was in custody by his own choice. He was just as capable of being free and answering them, or of taking any other ground of defence, as I am, or the hon. member is, at this moment. Now, Sir, I shall endeavor not to detain the House very long, but I must say that I disagree, from beginning to end, with the grounds which have been offered by the hon. gentleman for assailing the correctness, from a legal point of view, of the judgment of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick. I have to say with regard to the authorities which he cited, to the quotations from Lord Fitzgerald, and the opinions which were cited from the judgment of Mr. Justice Merrison, and various others, in regard to constructive contempt, that there will be no difference between us except as to the definition of the words "constructive contempt." There has been a good deal of loose expression with regard to the difference between actual and constructive contempt. In the passage which he read from a speech of Lord Fitzgerald, there is a good deal of loose expression and confusion as to constructive contempts, and a good deal that would lead one to suppose that an actual contempt is a contempt committed in the presence of the court, and a constructive contempt, as distinguished from that, is a contempt committed outside of the court. Now, that is not, I think, the correct distinction. It is to be borne in mind, when we are considering these authorities who say that constructive contempt cannot be committed after a judicial proceeding is over, that there are, in the first place, those contempts which consist in throwing ridicule upon the court, or publishing libel upon it, and then there are those which, while not conveying ridicule or stigma, interfere with the course of justice. For instance, it is a constructive contempt, at certain stages of the trial, to publish the proceedings, to publish the evidence, or to make even a fair comment upon the evidence. It is a constructive contempt of court to arrest a witness who is on his way to a court of justice, or who is returning from a court of justice; it is constructive contempt of court to assail the character of a suitor, or to arrest a suitor in

any way that will impede his prosecution of his suit, or to intimidate a jury or a grand jury. All these may not be actual contempts, but they are constructive contempts, because while showing on their face no derogation from the dignity of the court they really interfere with the freedom of its proceedings. But there are other contempts, especially those which convey imputations of corruption against the judges, or which are actual interruptions of the progress of the business of the court while the court is sitting, both of which, whether the former transpires after or before the trial is concluded, are actual and not constructive contempts of court. As regards the first, I have to agree with what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has said, that they should not be regarded as constructive contempts of court if the proceedings in the cause are over, that after the proceedings are over and after the decision has been rendered, in the words of the decision cited by the hon. gentleman and which was given in March last, all the parties to it are open to public criticism.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Judge and jury.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, judge and jury. As I have said this election petition being over, it was perfectly open to Mr. Hawke to say that the judge was wrong or was weak, or anything else within the region of fair criticism; but when he went out of the line of fair criticism and made a malignant attack on the personal character and motives of that judge he committed, not a constructive contempt, but an actual contempt, and so it was decided by the court. A contempt of that kind has been punishable by the courts in England on proceedings precisely like these, as the hon. gentleman read from the passage he quoted from Lord Fitzgerald, since the reign of Richard III down to last year, for I can cite, if it is necessary, English precedents down even to last year, and in the United States from the time that courts of jurisprudence in that country were constituted down to the present time.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Mr. Justice Stephen says he is unable to find the cases.

Mr. THOMPSON. No; Mr. Justice Stephen was not referring to actual contempts, but merely constructive contempts—that is to say matters which may be considered contempts only on the ground that they interfere with some proceeding and cannot so interfere after the trial is over; but attacks which vilify the court, or the judge, or the jury, or the grand jury, and which have a tendency to intimidate such officers or to decrease the respect due to the court after the trial is over, these frequently, and in late days, have been decided to be contempts of court. Mr. Justice Stephen did not mean anything else, because he knew that both in the judicial and in the parliamentary history of his own country there was the case, not five years ago, of Mr. Dwyer Gray. He was editor of the *Dublin Freeman*, he was high sheriff of Dublin and member of Parliament, and in his capacity as editor of the *Dublin Freeman* he made severe comments and reflections on the conduct of the jury which had just returned a conviction in the Hynes case. He had stated that their verdict was influenced by drunkenness, and, editor of the *Dublin Freeman* as he was, high sheriff of Dublin as he was, member of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom as he was, within twenty-four hours he was sent to gaol under a sentence of three months' imprisonment and a fine of £500 sterling, and he was ordered to find heavy sureties to keep the peace after he should come out of prison. Mr. Justice Stephen could not have meant anything else than what I have indicated, because a man of his eminence and learning, one of the greatest criminal lawyers of the present age, if one may not even extend that term to other branches of jurisprudence, he knows that that case is expanded on the parliamentary and judicial history of Great Britain. Dwyer Gray's case was made the subject of enquiry in Par-

liament, and on the committee that investigated the question of privilege which arose under that decision there sat some of the ablest men of England, Ireland and Scotland, and the effect of the report they made was that there was no necessity for pursuing the case further as a matter of privilege. But, in consequence of the notoriety which that case gave to the law of contempt, it was made a reason for the Government introducing a Bill in the Session of 1883, in the House of Lords, to amend the law relating to contempt of court. Now, the amendments that were proposed are significant, I think, in this discussion, in which we are told that it was an old and rusty weapon which was refurbished in this case, and one which should be put beyond the reach of the court. The amendments that were proposed were in these directions: they were, first of all, to give means for enforcing the decrees of the court without inflicting imprisonment for contempt; they were to limit the jurisdiction of the judges to commit for contempt to the extent of £500 fine and three months' imprisonment, and they likewise afforded an appeal in case of conviction for contempt. It may be that it will be wise to adopt, at some day, and, perhaps, at no distant day, a provision for an appeal in all cases of contempt; but, leaving this case out of the question, which I will not anticipate, there is certainly in the judicial records of the country no reason for saying that the power which has been vested in the courts from time immemorial for adjudging cases of contempt shall be removed, and there is no urgent reason for asking this House to adopt legislation, for in this country the limits which the Bill of 1883 proposed to establish have never yet been reached in any one case. And I observe that although the case of Dwyer Gray was made the subject of enquiry by a parliamentary committee it was not proposed by any member of the House of Lords—the Bill did not reach the House of Commons I believe, at all events it did not become law—to take away from the courts the power to punish for contempt even though, to use the hon. gentleman's expression, the court in a certain sense sat as judges in their own case.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is time they did it.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman may be of that opinion, but he differs in opinion from the wisest men of the Anglo-Saxon race in every part of the world who have given consideration to this subject.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not know that.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) That is not so.

Mr. THOMPSON. The reason is not very difficult to explain to the hon. gentleman. It has been considered necessary for the existence of the courts, and for their independence and for the proper exercise of their authority, that they should be clothed with these large powers—powers which it is true may be abused as all powers may be, but which are to be exercised under the strict responsibility which attaches to the judges in respect of all they do. It would be digressing to follow that argument just now, but I will return to it in a few moments. I was stating the case of Dwyer Gray for the purpose of recalling to the hon. gentleman's mind some modern instances in which this power has been enforced. In another case, the case of Craddock, these were the circumstances: He and another person were accused of a crime. He pleaded not guilty; his confederate in crime pleaded guilty, and was removed from the dock. Craddock underwent his trial and was acquitted. The other man stood aside for sentence, and as Craddock passed out he said: "When you get out I will get even with you for spitting on me." He went to prison that day, under sentence of a year's imprisonment, for contempt of court for interfering with the administration of justice. In another case which was decided only last year, or at all events not longer ago than 1883, these were the circumstances: It was a case in which a judge of the High Court of Justice was sitting in

Mr. THOMPSON.

Chambers, and two solicitors having a sharp legal argument before him, they took their departure and went down stairs, and one of them shook his fist in the other's face. Although the proceedings in which the dispute occurred were concluded the solicitor was punished for that contempt, and that was only a year or two ago.

An hon. MEMBER. Was it in the precincts of the court.

Mr. THOMPSON. No; not in the precincts of the court.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was in the precincts of the court.

Mr. THOMPSON. The precincts of the court had nothing to do with it, but did not the hon. gentleman ask us what sacred line was drawn around the court house? Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that the protection which extends to the judge while on the court house steps, should not extend to him after he passes the court house gate, and that a judge is sacred on the bench but you can thrash him within an inch of his life when you get him outside the precincts of the court. Here is the case to which I refer as reported in the Law Reports:

"A solicitor who had attended the hearing of an application before a judge at Chambers in the Royal Courts of Justice, immediately after such hearing and while the parties were on their way from the judge's room to the entrance gate of the building, made use of grossly abusive expressions and threatening gestures to the solicitor on the other side in relation to such application.

"Held that such conduct in relation to proceedings before a judge at Chambers was a contempt of court punishable by attachment.

"*Ex parte Wilton* discussed."

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Does the hon. gentleman say the proceedings had ended?

Mr. THOMPSON. Certainly the proceedings about which the altercation arose had ended.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman will see that the man who made the affidavits swore that he was threatened and that made it a contempt. If it had not been for that it would not have been a contempt.

Mr. THOMPSON. Lord Esher says:

"It is not necessary to constitute a contempt of court that the contempt should be in court or that it should be a contempt of a judge sitting in court. All that is necessary is that it should be a contemptuous interference with judicial proceedings, in which the judge is acting as a judicial officer. This proposition is laid down in terms in a learned judgment prepared by Wilmot, C. J."

Further on he says that time and place have nothing to do with the matter. Now we come back for a moment to the contention which was suggested to me by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and which is suggested indeed by another consideration, as to the ground on which this large power, as I admit it to be, is conceded to the judges. Let me recall it to the House for a few moments. In the first place the courts are armed with the power not merely for their own protection, but for the protection of the people who do business before them, for the protection of witnesses, and for the protection of suitors who resort there. Let me suppose the case of a suitor having no access to the press and another having access to the press, being the proprietor or controller of a public paper, able to attack and intimidate a judge on the bench, able to influence the opinions of a jury, able to influence the conduct and demeanor of witnesses and the freedom with which they should give their testimony. Is it to be conceded that the suitor who has access to the press should be permitted to use that, to the disadvantage of his opponent in that suit?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Of course not, and the hon. member opposite says no.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does anybody else claim that?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, the hon. gentleman's own statement, that the judges should not sit in judgment on their own case, claims it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have not made any such statement, but I intend to deal with that before I get through.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. member had better consult *Hansard* before he says he made no such statement. He said the sooner the power was taken from them the better.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did say the sooner that power was taken from them the better, but you put words into my mouth that I have not uttered.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman need not trouble himself by saying that I put words in his mouth that he did not utter. Those are the words that came across to this side of the House, and if he did not mean to say that judges should be deprived of the power of adjudicating on contempts in their own courts, let him say so.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will tell you by-and-bye what was my language.

Mr. THOMPSON. I dare say the hon. gentleman will be able to say something by-and-bye different from what he said a few minutes ago.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will be able to set you right on what I said two moments ago.

Mr. RYKERT. Keep your temper.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will not have any Jesuitical interpretation of what words I used in this House.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the York Farmers' Colonisation Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. McCulla.)

Bill (No. 97) to amend the Act to incorporate the Board of Management of the Church and Manse Building Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, for Manitoba and the North-West.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 80) to wind up the Bank of London in Canada.—(Mr. Milla, Bothwell.)

Bill (No. 114) to amend the several Acts relating to the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto (from the Senate).—(Mr. Small.)

THE CASE OF JOHN T. HAWKE.

Mr. THOMPSON. A few moments before recess, while I was addressing myself to another branch of the argument, the hon. gentleman, who brought this matter to the notice of the House, made a suggestion across the House to me, which caused me to divert for a moment from the line of argument I was pursuing. The interruption or suggestion he made was to the effect that Mr. Justice Stephen, in giving judgment in a case in the High Court of Justice in England, two or three months ago, said that he had been unable to find any precedent whatever for holding that to be a contempt of court which was a comment upon a case after the case was concluded. That led me to refer more particularly to the case of Mr. Dwyer Gray; and before resuming the argument I was endeavoring to present when the House rose, I must revert to that case for the purpose of making one or two other observations, to show what appears to me to be the meaning and effect of that case. It is true that the ground on which sentence was pronounced against Mr. Gray was the view of the learned judge, Mr. Justice Lawson, that

the severe strictures which were made in the Dublin *Freeman* on the conduct of the jury in the particular case in which they had just found a verdict of guilty, tended to impede the course of justice by intimidating jurors, who might be called to discharge duties as jurors in other cases during the commission that was then going on.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That is exactly the difference; the commission was sitting.

Mr. THOMPSON. There are many differences in the case. But I am going to point out that the difference is not one of principle at all. It is simply one of detail in that case which I revert to for the purpose of making these explanations. It is true that, in all probability, the punishment was excessive. The judge himself probably thought so, because after the commission had adjourned he mitigated the punishment to some small extent. The point, however, is this: that that was a proceeding for contempt in which there was an adjudication that an article reflecting upon the conduct of the jury was a contempt, although it was published after the trial and proceedings were over.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman, I am sure, wishes to state the facts fully and clearly, and will not object to my interruption when I say that the contempt of court was in relation to the first case brought before the commission, and the learned judge held that the reflections made by Mr. Gray in the article, for publishing which he was tried for contempt, probably would affect the result of the other cases.

Mr. THOMPSON. The ground on which the judge proceeded was his view that the article tended to impede the course of justice at that commission, and the point I make is this: that he held that to be so, and that being so it was a contempt, notwithstanding the fact that it was a criticism upon a past trial. Now, the argument which was made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), if it meant anything at all, upon that point of making a constructive contempt of observations upon a past trial—the pith of the argument presented to the House by him before dinner was that when once a trial was concluded, the judge, the jurors, and everybody connected with the case were handed over to public criticism and there could be no contempt; and that was the sense in which my hon. friend referred to the case decided in March last in the High Court of Justice. The answer to the argument that comments upon a past trial cannot be held even to be a contempt, is that there are numerous instances, and Mr. Dwyer Gray's case is one of them, in which comment upon a past trial has been held to be a contempt. I admit that the element was there that it impeded the due administration of justice, and this must be the effect in every case.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the case of Mr. Gray, Mr. Justice Lawson was sitting on a commission appointed to try a number of cases, and the first case was one of the same nature as others which were to follow; and Mr. Gray having made comments upon the first case, which the judge thought was calculated to impede the administration of justice with respect to the remaining cases before the commission, he held that Mr. Gray was guilty of contempt of court.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thought the hon. member had understood me, but he evidently has not, and I will again state the case. Mr. Justice Lawson sat under commission holding the assizes in Dublin, to try a number of persons charged with having committed outrages in Ireland. The first was a capital case, in which the jurors arrived at the conclusion that the prisoner was guilty. The trial was over, and, according to the doctrine which the hon. gentleman presented to-night, the judges, the jurors, the witnesses, and everybody connected with the case, were handed over to

public criticism, as they were in this case in New Brunswick; and the hon. gentleman's sargument went this far: that no matter what that public criticism might be, it could not be held to be a contempt, even constructively, and could not be held to interfere with the due administration of justice, because the trial was past and gone. Now, I mention that case as one in which a comment upon a trial which was past was held to be a contempt, was held to interfere with the due course of justice, and that solely because it passed the bounds of fair criticism.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I think the ground upon which that was held to be a contempt was that it was an interference with the course of justice.

Mr. THOMPSON. I might go further than that, and admit that there is no contempt unless it is an interference with the course of justice, and the only point of difference between the hon. gentleman and myself is, that I say that a comment upon a trial after it is over may interfere with the due course of justice, and that it was so held in the Dwyer Gray case. How it may interfere with the due administration of justice is for the court alone to decide. There were thousands of people in Ireland, and many people in the British Parliament, who did not see how the comments in that particular case could interfere with the due administration of justice, but it was held by Mr. Justice Lawson to interfere because it insinuated that the jurors had come to that conclusion by intoxication, and in this case, also, the question as to how this interfered with the due administration of justice was for the judges alone to decide. They decided it. In the one case, corruption was imputed to the judge, and in the other case, corruption was imputed to the jury, but both of these comments were after the trial, and although the circumstances were different the principle was the same. In the case in Ireland, the court held that this was a serious imputation on the jury affecting them in regard to cases which they might have to decide, and in New Brunswick in this case, the judges viewed with grave disapproval the attack on a judge who had simply made a mistake on a very different point of law, because it was an imputation on the integrity of the bench and an attempt to intimidate judges who might have to pronounce such decisions hereafter. I do not propose to sit in judicial review on that decision, because the judges must decide whether the due course of justice has been interfered with. If the hon. member will turn to the place in the English *Hansard* where that case is discussed on the motion for a committee of enquiry into the breach of privilege, he will find that, although that was a case in which one of the leading members of the Irish party in the House of Commons was subjected to severe punishment including imprisonment, the leader of the Irish party, Mr. Parnell, in discussing it, in regard to the limits which should be put to the action of courts of justice in contempt cases, distinctly admitted that in that case the judge was quite within his right, and was fairly within the law. I was about to call the attention of the House to the reasons which exist in the mother country, which exist in the United States, and which must necessarily exist here, for the maintenance of this power in the hands of the judges. Necessarily the courts are the guardians of the property and of the liberties of our people, and it is absolutely necessary that the humblest individual who goes into one of our courts should have the same protection as the greatest; that, when he goes into a court, although the whole tide of public opinion should be strongly against him, and the press too, he should have the same justice which is granted to any other individual; but, if the press can freely impute motives to the jury or to the judge who gives judgment in favor of the party against whom the public opinion and the press of the country have been aroused, then there will be great danger to the proper power and the impartiality of the bench. The oath of the judge, and the oath of the jurors, and the oath of every one

Mr. THOMPSON.

who is connected with the administration of justice, is not only that he will administer it without favor, but also without fear. Everyone who is connected with the administration of justice is human. Everyone who testifies in the box, or acts as a juror, or sits on the bench, is amenable to public opinion, and, if, when giving testimony or giving judgment in favor of a person against whom the press has aroused public opinion, the witness, juror, or judge is open to such disgraceful attacks as had been made in this case, the due administration of justice must be interfered with, and I can understand why the judges of New Brunswick have so understood this libel. There were two remarkable cases in New York, in which two of the greatest criminals of modern times were concerned. One was the case of Tweed, who was convicted on a large number of charges, and was sentenced to severe penalties. Not only had the public opinion of that State been aroused against him, and organisations formed to punish him, but it took years to bring him to justice; and, although the whole public sentiment and the whole moral sentiment of that great commonwealth was against him, the judges were fearless enough, after the sentence had been pronounced, to set the verdict aside. Quite lately, another great criminal was convicted in that State. Public opinion pursued him with every weapon which it could use, and the press pursued him also, but immediately after his conviction, his sentence was set aside. It is with the view of preserving that same independence of the bench which will brave public opinion, and will brave the press also, that the law has surrounded the judges with the discretion of punishing calumny in regard to the bench. Another reason is that which I directed the attention of the House to before dinner—the fact that judges, from their position, have necessarily no opportunity of reply. We are accustomed in Parliament to be assailed in regard to our motives and conduct, but we are able to reply and defend ourselves, we have friends and party allies who can answer for us. But the judges must necessarily be removed from personal conflict and precluded from entering on their own defence. It is absolutely necessary that the judges should be in a position where they may give their judgments, not only without affection but without fear—as in the Tweed and Sharp cases in New York—and, further, it is necessary that a judge should be fearless in reversing, if he so desires, his own decision when he finds he is wrong, as Judge Fraser did in this case. But there could be no such independence on the bench if the judges are to be assailed as they were in this case by the imputation of the worst motives. If that is to be permitted, it will be found that the people who will accept judicial offices will not be the men most worthy of them. Now, I want to call the attention of the House again, as briefly as possible, to two or three authorities, for the purpose of showing to what extent the press has the right of criticism. I will read from the case which the hon. gentleman cited, *Regina vs. Wilkinson*, and from the opinion of Chief Justice Harrison. At page 101 he will find this doctrine laid down:

"In Huggonson's case, Lord Hartwicke said: 'There cannot be anything of greater consequence than to keep the stream of justice clean and pure, that parties may proceed with safety both to themselves and to their characters.'"

Chief Justice Harrison remarks:

"This language has been often quoted with marked approval."

Now, at page 92:

"While the right of public discussion in matters of public interest is important and should be protected, even while involving the publication of defamatory matter, it is not in the public interest to be permitted, unless conceived in a fair spirit, in the spirit of fair discussion and not in a spirit of reckless or inconsiderate imputation No public writer is allowed to impute improper motives to any man, unless there be something to justify the imputation—something more than the mere belief of the writer that what he wrote was true."

Again, at page 96:

"The judgment of the court, consisting of several judges, is the result of the opinions expressed by the several judges, or the majority of them. The result may be attained by different judges for different reasons. The honest expression of these reasons, whether the judge be in the majority or minority; whether reflecting on parties to the suit, witnesses or strangers, whose names necessarily appear in the proceedings, must be equally privileged and equally protected."

At page 97:

"The process of attachment for contempt must necessarily be as ancient as the laws themselves, for suits without a competent authority to secure their administration from disobedience and contempt, would be vain and nugatory. A power, therefore, in the supreme courts of justice to suppress such contempts by an immediate attachment of the offender, results from the first principles of judicial establishments, and must be inseparable to every superior tribunal. * * * * * The power is now held to exist in every court of record, whether of superior or inferior jurisdiction. If an inferior court attempts to usurp jurisdiction, a superior court may interfere and prevent it."

At page 107:

"The temperate and respectful discussion by the newspaper press of the determination of our courts of justice is not to be interdicted, but the mere invective and abuse, and still more, the imputation of false, corrupt, or dishonest motives to those who are engaged in the administration of justice, is not to be tolerated."

Again on the same page—and these are not the mere dicta of Chief Justice Harrison himself, but in every case he is stating the opinion of eminent English judges:

"It certainly was lawful with decency and candor to discuss the propriety of the verdict of a jury or the decisions of a judge, and if the defendants should be thought to have done no more in this instance, they would be entitled to an acquittal, but, on the contrary, they had transgressed the law, and ought to be convicted, if the extracts from the newspapers, set out in the information, contained no reasoning or discussion, but only declamation and invective, and were written not with a view to elucidate the truth, but to injure the character of individuals and to bring into hatred and contempt the administration of justice in the country.

"Cases may happen in which the judges and jury may be mistaken. When they are, the law has afforded a remedy; and the party is entitled to pursue every method which the law allows to correct the mistake. But when a person has recourse either by a writing like the present, by publications in print, or by any other means, to calumniate the proceedings of a court of justice, the obvious tendency of it is to weaken the administration of justice, and in consequence to sap the very foundation of the constitution itself."

I ask the consideration of the hon. gentleman to that, as he asked me, in contrasting this case with Dwyer Gray's case, how while in that case the cause of justice might be impeded in relating to future trials, the course of justice might be impeded here when this proceeding was passed, and no other petition was to come on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman refer to the case he has just quoted?

Mr. THOMPSON. I am making that observation in reference to the effect which a criticism imputing improper motives may have upon the course of the administration of justice, whether past, present or future. The imputation of improper motives, according to the language of the Chief Justice, or a calumny on the proceedings of a court of justice, has the obvious tendency to weaken the administration of justice, and in consequence to sap the very foundation of the constitution. Lawrence, C.J., in an American case said:

"It is the power of the press, honestly, fairly and temperately to criticise the courts of justice in regard to cases which have passed from their jurisdiction, so long as the action of that court is correctly stated, and the official integrity of the court not impeached."

That is expressly laid down in reference to past cases, the limitation of fair criticism which exists in relation to libel, and in relation to other cases of contempt. In the same case, the same learned Chief Justice said:

"We wish to call the attention of the press to the limits which circumscribe their comments on judicial proceedings, and to remind them of the obligations imposed upon them by the great power which they confessedly wield, especially do we desire to keep the judicial reputation of the state free from the appearance of dishonor and to prevent the growth of distrust in the minds of our own people, that would cer-

tainly follow the circulation of articles like the one under consideration if permitted to go unrebuked."

Then at page 112, the language is this:

"Journalists as well as others, are prevented, in a country where law is properly administered, from taking the law into their own hands. A law which would permit a person aggrieved by an expression of opinion by a judge in the discharge of duty, to chastise the judge, would be worse than no law, whether the chastisement take the form of personal violence or vituperative language, there is equally an offence against the law."

I need not carry the argument any farther; I need not carry it to the limit which the hon. gentleman himself suggested by his arguments a little while ago, when he stated that in relation to a past trial there could be no interference with the administration of justice, and when he intimated that, at any rate, the offence was punishable only if it occurred within the precincts of the court. If the limit is to be drawn there, when the trial is over, and the court is closed, and the judge has left the precincts of the court, if the person who assails him is not punishable for contempt of court, then the effect is this: that every person who wishes to arouse popular feeling in a case in which the popular feeling is susceptible of being aroused, as we find to be often the case, he can bring that state of feeling to the point of inciting personal violence against the judge, and yet be free from punishment. Now, there are one or two other authorities which I must cite, because the hon. gentleman told me that Mr. Justice Stephen had been unable to find them, and I would here call his attention to the fact that he was mistaken in supposing that Mr. Justice Stephen had said that in his judgment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I read the judgment *verbatim*.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Justice Stephen declared in that judgment that he had been unable to find precedents. I do not want to appear to be accusing the hon. gentleman—which I am not doing at all—of misquoting; therefore I refrain from reading the judgment of Mr. Justice Stephen, but the hon. member was mistaken. There was a celebrated case in Chicago in which the grand jury, having found certain bills against the publisher of a newspaper, was stigmatised and accused of improper motives in that finding, and as that is the land of liberty, and the centre of advanced principles, as regards personal rights and the rights of the press, let me ask the hon. gentleman's attention to what is there laid down. I am quoting from the Central Law Journal of 1876, vol. 2, page 250:

"The power to punish for contempt is inherent in every court and not derived from statutes. It is the power of self-defence, and without it courts could not resist aggression. It includes all acts tending to impede, embarrass or obstruct courts in the due administration of justice. All such acts are regarded in law as done in the presence of the judge, and are actual contempt. The position that courts can only punish as contempt acts done in the court room is supported by no authority, English or American. What is a contempt is to be determined with reference to the tendency of the act to obstruct the due administration of justice and not by reference to the place in which it is done. Constructive contempts are not all those committed out of the view of the judge. An act which has no tendency to obstruct justice, but only to wound the feelings or offend the personal dignity of the judge, is at most only a constructive contempt. A grand jury is a part of a criminal court, and while in session, engaged in the discharge of its official duties, is entitled to its protection. An editor of a widely circulated daily paper, making in it vindictive and virulent attacks upon the personal character of grand juries for their action in indicting him, which attacks he well knows will be read by them, while the grand jury is still in session, is guilty of conduct tending to obstruct justice."

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Hear, hear,

Mr. THOMPSON. The authority to which the hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," is directly in point, if he will only substitute "the court" for "the grand jury." In that case it is true the grand jury were sitting and were likely to read that statement, and to be affected by it. In this case the imputation was upon the court, which certainly has not ceased to exercise its functions. This opinion continues:

"Such acts tend not only to obstruct justice by improperly influencing the conduct of the existing grand jury but of the petty jurors when sitting in court, and who might be called upon to try the indictment tending against such editor. Such contempts are actual not constructive. Editors have the same and no greater rights and are subject to the same responsibilities as other citizens."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am glad I have succeeded in partially convincing the hon. gentleman. I hope to remove all his doubts. These observations were made by the Lord Chancellor of England on March 8, 1883:

"The jurisdiction in matters of contempt was in its nature a penal jurisdiction, and depended very much on the discretion of judges. It was exercised summarily, and in a manner which was entirely exceptional. It was impossible not to see that a jurisdiction of that kind was liable from time to time to provoke censure which, though it might be entirely unmerited, could not be met and answered by the distinguished public servants who were the subjects of attack. They could not vindicate their conduct; and it was therefore detrimental to the interests of the public service that they should be unnecessarily exposed in the discharge of their duties to such criticism. The considerations to which he had drawn attention appeared to apply with additional force when it was remembered that the power of committing for contempt might be exercised by every single judge of the Superior Court, and within narrower limits by the judges of inferior courts. There was yet another reason for legislation. A judge, even if he pronounced a sentence which might be severe, by no means wished to be more severe than was necessary, and would willingly diminish the severity of the sentence upon the submission of the offending party. Orders of imprisonment for contempt were generally indefinite, it being expected that the offender would make some apology of amends."

I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this statement:

"But there were men so obstinate that they would never make submission. They like playing the part of martyrs before any audience, however limited; and they would prefer to remain in prison for an indefinite time rather than submit themselves to the law. In such cases thoughtless people were apt to censure the judges. And when the contempt consisted in disobedience to the orders of the court the obstinacy of the offending party might entirely prevent that which was the main object of the punishment—namely to enforce obedience to the order of the court. The offender had the power by his obstinacy of still rendering the order ineffectual. If, therefore, their lordships while limiting the power of imprisonments could at the same time provide some better means of enforcing the orders of the court they would undoubtedly be doing a good thing."

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is that the same debate in which Lord Fitzgerald took part?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is the debate on the Contempt of Court's Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was for ecclesiastical offences.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, not at all. That was the kind of contempt in reference to which it was proposed to substitute another penalty for imprisonment, but there was no such change proposed in relation to comments on judges and in relation to publications which obstruct the course of justice. If I must repeat the argument in order to remind the hon. gentleman of it, I say: although the subject of contempt was canvassed in the debate on the Bill which was founded on the case of Dwyer Gray, there was no proposal from anybody that the power of adjudicating on contempt should be taken out of the hands of the judges, or that the penalties should be made any less for an offence of this kind than had been inflicted on Dwyer Gray. The hon. gentleman made an argument to the House of this kind: He said that the same rule should apply to contempt as has been applied by the change of the law with respect to libel, and that the matter should in every case be submitted to a jury. The House will perceive at once, when it reflects upon the peculiar nature of contempt, the inapplicability of that remedy. In the first place, from the very nature of the offence the punishment, if it is to be inflicted at all, must be inflicted at once. It is intended quite as much with a view to prevention as with a view to cure; and I would like to ask this: Suppose we introduce into the law of contempt the principle which now prevails in regard to the law of libel, and that is that the prosecution should be taken by indictment, what position would the court occupy which found

Mr. THOMPSON.

its jurors, suitors, witnesses, bailiffs, sheriffs and everybody connected with it maligned and the course of justice obstructed? They must, forsooth, submit to have the course of justice absolutely thwarted in all the proceedings that can possibly be affected and wait perhaps till next year to have the case brought before a jury in some other part of the country. There is this fallacy in the hon. gentleman's argument also: It would not apply to cases of what the hon. gentleman calls constructive contempt, where the contempt is a mere obstruction to the progress of justice by interfering with the officers of the court. But he would have this invidious principle introduced: If a man commit ordinary contempt of court, then, according to the hon. gentleman's contention, he might be brought up and punished at once under the law relating to contempt, because he says that would interfere with the due administration of justice. But if the offender was sufficiently bold to add to his offence that of libel, then summary proceedings should not be taken to punish him, but the proceeding should be by indictment. So the greater the offence—the more grievous the contempt—the greater immunity the offender would have, and the greater chance to escape, and the greater certainty of securing delay. Let me call the attention of the House one moment before I conclude, to the cases to which the hon. gentleman has called my attention—one of them decided in the High Court of Justice in March last, in respect of which the hon. gentleman was under the impression, and he gave the House the impression, that there was a decision that there could not be, in relation to a past proceeding, an adjudication that a comment was a contempt. I have read that case carefully, and I think the hon. gentleman will come to the same conclusion as myself, after a little reflection upon it, that it does not decide anything of the kind. That was an application made by a suitor, to have the editor who had made strictures punished for contempt. He made it after the verdict, and while the case was pending under an application for a new trial. The two judges, Justice Field and Justice Stephen, who delivered the judgment in that case, carefully abstained from saying that they had not the power to grant the application. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe they were convinced they had the power, but they merely decided that it was not a proper case in which to exercise that power. It must be admitted that upon an application of that kind made by a suitor in the court—I am distinguishing between proceedings for contempt which originate with the court itself, and those in which the suitor calls attention to the contempt—it must be admitted that the application is one for the discretion of the court. The judges there treated it so, and in the exercise of their discretion they declined to give the attachment which was asked for. But there is not a syllable in that decision from beginning to end to sustain the contention that a reflection upon the proceedings in a past trial cannot be treated as contempt. I must revert for a moment to two points which escaped my recollection, and which have just recurred to it now. To resume for an instant the argument with reference to the inapplicability of the libel proceedings, allow me to quote to the House again an American authority, and a very high one—the *Albany Law Journal*—which wrote on this question in 1871. It is all the more applicable, because it was stated that there were old doctrines, doctrines belonging to by-gone times in the old country, and that they had no application in this country at all. This is what the commentator says upon the proposition that the ordinary proceedings for punishing contempt must be abandoned, and proceedings by libel resorted to:

"The insulted judge must go to law before some other tribunal, with every one whom his decisions offend. He must quit his business in court, and leave the bench and travel to inferior courts and give his attendance upon them, neglecting in the meantime the duties which belong to his office * * *. No one would be afraid to offend; the delay of punishment and the numerous chances of escaping it, would disarm the

expected punishment of all its terrors. Nor would the insulted court ever think of the attempt to cause the infliction of punishment under so many discouragements. No waver does he get through one set of controversies, than some other dissatisfied suitor assails him with equal courage and involves him in others. He must go again and forever through the same routine of vexation and trouble. Well may a judge shrink from the perpetual conflicts which he has to maintain in vindication of opinions in which he has no individual interest, and the unceasing calumnies to which he is exposed for the protection of others."

Now, the hon. gentleman cited to some extent the decision in the Brown case, from the opinion of Mr. Justice Morrison. Mr. Justice Morrison dissented from Chief Justice Harrison, and from my reading of the views expressed I find that Mr. Justice Morrison differed from Chief Justice Harrison solely on the grounds that the contempt which was complained of, being an attack upon Judge Wilson, had been ignored by Judge Wilson, had been ignored by the court, and was only brought to the notice of the court by the suitor who attempted to take up, in his own interest, the reflections cast on the court. Mr. Justice Morrison said that the delay which had taken place completely put it out of the power of the suitor to avail himself of such remedy, and all the comments which were read this afternoon, and the whole judgment of Mr. Justice Morrison, in dissenting from the opinion of Chief Justice Harrison, is based not upon the doctrine, at all, that there can be no contempt in relation to a past trial and no punishment for contempt in cases of that kind, but solely because the suitor who desired to avail himself of the power of the court in that instance was disarmed, because of delay and negligence in taking up the proceedings. The hon. gentleman asked me how I reconciled the view which I had expressed with the view I expressed on a former occasion, in reference to the case which occurred at Calgary. I have no hesitation in saying that the two cases have as marked a distinction between them as cases could possibly have. At the same time every case of the exercise of judicial powers of this kind must, I insist, depend upon its own merits. I admit that the powers of the judges with which they are armed in relation to punishment for contempt are severe; they are unlimited; they are exceedingly exceptional in the particular that they have to be exercised by the party who is himself aggrieved, and the very fact that those powers are so exceptional, so severe and so arbitrary, are reasons for attaching the highest and strictest responsibility on those who undertake to use them. Therefore, while I maintain, as I endeavored to do this afternoon, that those powers exist, and that their existence ought to be maintained, I am willing to go the full length of conceding that their exercise ought to be guarded with the strictest criticism on the part of those who have the right to criticise, and the strictest responsibility with regard to the consequences to the judges themselves. Assuming that those powers were possessed by the two judicial officers, the one class in New Brunswick and the other in Calgary, which I do not admit in regard to the last, except for the purposes of the present argument, we have to consider the cases in which they were exercised for the purpose of seeing whether they were exercised anduly. In the first place I was of opinion that the magistrate in the North-West Territories did not possess the high jurisdiction he undertook to use. He was an inferior magistrate, armed, it is true, with great powers by statute in relation to the administration of justice in the North-West Territories, but not possessing, I think, the inherent powers, in relation to the summary proceedings for contempt which he undertook to exercise.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Had he not the power of a court of record?

Mr. THOMPSON. For certain purposes, and not at all necessarily following that he has the summary right to punish for contempt. There are loose expressions as to the powers of courts of record, but when we come

to consider them we will find that broad definitions do not work very well. There are many justices of the peace in this country who are entitled to hold courts of record, and are not entitled to send to prison persons who may criticise their proceedings. In that case, whether he had jurisdiction or not, the procedure by which he undertook to exercise it, was wholly irregular. It was a case, moreover, in which the judge was acting alone. In this case the powers have been exercised by the whole bench, and the judge himself, who was the aggrieved party, not sitting upon the determination of the case. The calumny which was made the subject of the proceedings for contempt in the New Brunswick case, were calumnies against Mr. Justice Fraser—it is true, indirectly they were a reflection upon the court itself, but they were directly imputations against the motives and integrity of Mr. Justice Fraser—and the adjudication has been made by judges of co-ordinate authority who constitute the full bench in that Province. Furthermore as to the reason why one might be disposed to review the decision of the magistrate in the North-West and decline to review the decision of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, on legal grounds such as were presented this afternoon, one might well take this distinction: that in relation to the proceedings in the North-West the editor was absolutely without any remedy, and there was even no *habeas corpus*. There was no appeal to the Supreme Court, either in relation to the proceedings for contempt—as to which I admit there was no appeal here but there was no jurisdiction in any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada to grant a writ of *habeas corpus*.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How would *habeas corpus* remedy the matter? They could not bring before them by a writ of *certiorari* the proceedings under which Mr. Hawke was imprisoned, and, therefore, they could not determine the legality or illegality of those proceedings. They would be bound by the recitals of fact that in the face of the warrant, and these recitals would not show whether the contempt was one they had a right summarily to punish or not.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman is right in the contention he presented to us this afternoon, the court is absolutely without jurisdiction and he pressed that argument so far as to contend that this man was right in declining to answer interrogatories.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will not surely put that in my mouth. I said that the court was within its jurisdiction if it imprisoned a person for contempt of court during the pendency of any proceedings, and that if he was brought up before the Supreme Court of Canada under a *habeas corpus*, the warrant under which the jailor would act would not show whether the contempt was committed before or after the end of the legal proceedings, and as that court had no power to bring up the proceedings by *certiorari*, they would be bound simply by the recital of facts on the face of the warrant itself, and could not therefore determine whether the court was right or wrong in imprisoning him.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is impossible for anyone to tell that without seeing the warrant under which he is committed. But when I spoke before dinner about an application for the writ of *habeas corpus*, I was answering the argument of the hon. gentleman, which was proceeding on the irregularity of these proceedings. That is not the point I am now dealing with. What I am insisting on with regard to the Calgary case is this: that as to the ground taken that there was no jurisdiction for the magistrate to inflict the penalty or make the adjudication, the editor was completely without redress, because, although the warrant might give him a release under the writ of *habeas corpus*, he had no right to apply for it to any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada. As regards the particular proceedings that took

place in the Calgary case, the hon. gentleman put the question to me how I interfered in the Calgary case if I could not interfere here. I will state how the interference took place. The magistrate thought fit to communicate his decision to me for the purpose of getting my observations upon it; and, after the doubt as to his jurisdiction had presented itself not only to my mind, but I may say, perhaps without breach of confidence to the highest judicial authority in this country, I communicated to Mr. Travis by telegram a message like this:

"I think that the prisoner should be released, and your authority will be better preserved if his discharge is your act rather than that of the executive."

Now, it only remains to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite, who are pressing this case for the purpose of getting executive interference, to the point, before they press it any further, as to whether there is any authority for the executive to interfere at all in such cases. In the case of Mr. Green, which was discussed in the English House of Commons six or seven years ago, it was stated by the Home Secretary that enquiry had been made, and it was found that there was no precedent whatever for exercising executive interference in cases of contempt. That, it is true, was in relation to a proceeding in which the imprisonment was for the purpose of enforcing an order of the court; and the prisoner remained in contempt; but in consequence of the abolition of the court or some circumstance of that kind, it had been absolutely put beyond the power of the tribunal which imprisoned him to discharge him. Notwithstanding that, it was the opinion of the Home Secretary, after consultation with the highest legal authorities, that the power of executive interference did not exist. In a later case, I think that of Mr. Dwyer Gray, the Lord Chancellor of England stated in the House of Lords, that precedents had been searched for, and that there was no precedent whatever for executive interference in a case of contempt. It is true, there has been a distinction drawn between classes of contempt, cases which were in the line of compulsion and cases which were of a punitive character.

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

Mr. THOMPSON. Necessarily criminal. The distinction was established only by a decision of a recent date in the Court of Appeal in England. It is a modern distinction, and there is still no precedent whatever in England for executive interference in cases of contempt, whether punitive or otherwise. In all probability, the natural effect of the decision making that distinction would be that executive interference might be had in cases where the punishment was of a punitive character. At the same time, no distinction has in practice been established, and there is no precedent for a case of that kind.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I did not intend to take any part in this debate; but after the position taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, I feel that, situated as I am, it is only right for me to address the House on this subject. The hon. Minister certainly has taken an extraordinary course in this matter. I would have hoped that, situated as he is, as Minister of Justice in this country, as the Attorney General holding a quasi-judicial position, he would have approached this subject in the judicial spirit in which my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) approached it. The question which my hon. friend put before the House was with regard to the exercise of the power by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, which my hon. friend questioned, not only because in his view it was improperly exercised, but also because, if there was such a power in the court, he thought the attention of the Government should be called to it, with the view of abolishing that anomaly in our jurisprudence.

Mr. THOMPSON.

The hon. Minister has devoted most of his attention this evening to points on which we do not disagree. He has made an elaborate defence of Mr. Justice Fraser, and he has also endeavored to point out that the exercise of this jurisdiction exists where there has been an interference with the administration of justice. On either point there has not been the slightest difference so far as we are concerned. I feel a certain delicacy in speaking on this subject. I do not intend to impugn or attack the Supreme Court of New Brunswick; but I must say that if this power does exist, it has been exercised, I will not say in an improper, but certainly not in a judicious manner. The members of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick are gentlemen before whom I appear as a practitioner, and they are friends of mine; and so far as Mr. Justice Fraser is concerned, I do not differ from the hon. Minister in regard to his high character. I have known that hon. gentleman as a judge; we were admitted to the bar together; we enjoyed friendly relations while he was at the bar; and while I regret that his conduct in this case has been a little injudicious, I must say that I have every faith in his honesty and integrity. In that respect, there is no difference between us in this House at all. I must say that the hon. Minister of Justice has not met the argument of the hon. member for Queen's. He has made an elaborate argument upon points on which we do not differ, and it seems to me that my hon. friend, whom I have seen at the bar and whose manner of arguing a case I have admired, was in the position of a distinguished friend of mine and a namesake of the hon. gentleman, when, before our court he was asked—after he had very elaborately before that court argued a point of law—by the Chief Justice: "Mr. Thompson, do you really believe what you are arguing?" "Well," he said, "if it comes to that, I do not, but I want to make the court believe it, if I can." I think my hon. friend is very much in that position, and I do not blame him for it. He is holding a brief and trying to argue it. I would be quite willing to leave it to the honest convictions of my hon. friend to say whether he is right or not, because I believe he is too good a lawyer to have any faith in the law he has expounded to-night. The first point my hon. friend put was with regard to the writ of *habeas corpus*. If any one of the judges of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick was called on to issue that writ, what would be the result? It would be simply the order or warrant upon which the party was committed, in order to ascertain if the court had the jurisdiction to commit him for the case which appeared upon that warrant. No court could go behind that warrant to ascertain why he was put there. My hon. friend knows that quite well.

Mr. THOMPSON. I know nothing of the kind without seeing the warrant.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I put it, that if, on a warrant of *habeas corpus*, the warrant was that Mr. Hawke was committed to the custody of the sheriff of the county of York for contempt of court, attested by the hon. the Chief Justice, signed by the clerk, and under the seal of the court, no court in this Dominion has the power to discharge him, and my hon. friend knows that.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not dispute that for one moment, but according to the argument addressed to us this afternoon, no such warrant could have been issued.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That must have been returned. The return must have been a return to the sheriff of the county of York asking: By what authority do you hold this man in your custody? And the answer would be: By the authority of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick which committed him for contempt of court.

Mr. THOMPSON. That would not be the return at all.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I do not know if the hon. the Minister of Justice has seen a copy of the attachment which has been issued in this case. It was simply to arrest him for contempt of court. The attachment in Mr. Hawke's case I have not seen, but I have seen attachments in similar cases, and therefore speak of what I know. My hon. friend has put forward a defence of Mr. Justice Fraser as if he had been attacked for having changed his mind. Now, what I contend in this case is this: That his Honor Mr. Justice Fraser's attention was called to this point, and while the hon. the Minister of Justice is right in saying that the point was not argued before him at any great length—

Mr. THOMPSON. The question is whether in New Brunswick the writ of *certiorari* is available with the writ of *habeas corpus*.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think not. Do you ask to the court itself?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think not.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is in all the other courts of Canada, except the Supreme Court of New Brunswick.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). No doubt the writ of *certiorari* applies. The Court of New Brunswick and any Supreme Court has the right by writ of *certiorari* to bring up the record from inferior tribunals, but I know of no power in a court to bring up on a writ of *certiorari* the proceedings before themselves. The proceeding is in the Supreme Court. How then can it be brought up before that court on a writ of *certiorari*? The only case in which a court can bring up proceedings against itself is what is called a writ of error, *coram nobis*. Can a court issue a writ of *certiorari* to itself? I never heard of such a thing. What is the writ? It is from an inferior court to a higher court, to renew the proceedings of the former. I am not speaking of the effect of an appeal from Cæsar to Cæsar, but of the power of the court itself. My hon. friend informs me there is a *habeas corpus*, and has also put forward the statement that Mr. Hawke had the right to justify himself on the interrogatories. I am not going to discuss what he had a right to do on the interrogatories. What he did do was to dispute, not only the jurisdiction of the court, but he availed himself of what is the right of every man. He sheltered himself under the right to refuse to admit to what might lead to criminal prosecution. Put a man in an ordinary court of justice, and let him tell the judge that to answer a certain question might subject him to a criminal prosecution, and the judge will hold that he has a right to refuse to answer. Mr. Hawke refused to answer. On this point I would like to refer to the answer made by Mr. Horace Greely, when he was brought before a judge for contempt of court. His answer was this:

"For answer to the interrogatories filed and served on him says that he is now and ever since its formation has been the principal editor of the newspaper called *The Tribune* and is one of its proprietors, by being a stockholder of the corporation that holds the same. That, as such editor and proprietor he is subject to all the responsibilities that justly pertain to that relation. Believing that this avowal is a substantial answer to all the interrogatories propounded to him, he most respectfully declines to answer any questions that may expose any of his associates in the editorship and publication of said newspaper, in the discipline of this tribunal, preferring to abide the consequences, be they what they may."

I will add what the court did in that case. The court decided that no disrespect was intended, and discharged Mr. Greely. So much with regard to the points made by my hon. friend as to the question of interrogatories. Now, we come to the real, the serious question, which is the

one my hon. friend intended to bring up. It is the question of the position of the courts, not only of New Brunswick but of the whole Dominion, with regard to this power. My hon. friend has pointed out that in days gone by, the judges held the decision of the question whether an article was a libel or not, was in their power to decide. The old doctrine, that the decision as to what constitutes a libel was a question of law with which the jury had nothing to do, and that the only question for the jury to decide was the publication, is now obsolete. When in Parliament the law was altered, we find that the question of libel was made a question for the jury to decide, and thus it is that the judges of New Brunswick, in order to sustain the position they have taken, have to go back to cases of remote date for the purpose of establishing a precedent to Chief Justice Wilmut in the case of *Rex vs. Almon*, when the latter was indicted as the publisher of Junius' letters, which for their language, their bitterness, and their calumny, if I may use the terms my hon. friend has used, far exceeded any of the articles now complained of. My hon. friend has failed to show any authority in the present day. He has read the language of the justices as to what is the right, and what we contend is that, in the present state of society, the present position in which we stand, it comes to the question of libel or no libel. We should come to the standpoint laid down by Erskine and Fox, and let a man be tried by his peers, and by a jury of twelve of his fellow countrymen. The hon. gentleman says that, if that were followed, the judges would have to come down from their high station and be tried by their inferiors. If Her Majesty's representative in this Dominion were libelled, he would have no power to commit a man for contempt, and, if judges are placed in that position, is it not for the public safety and for the freedom of the press that they also should seek the ordinary tribunals? I am not here to defend these articles or to say whether they were right or wrong. In my opinion, they were too strong and were not justified by the occasion, but that is not the question. The question is whether the courts should have that arbitrary power and should be accusers, judges and executioners. My hon. friend says that Mr. Justice Fraser took no part in the decision. It is true that he did not; he very properly retired from the bench at that time; but I was present in the court when the proceedings took place, and the first article which was read was a reflection upon the court, and it was so held, and consequently the judges were passing an opinion in regard to themselves. My hon. friend elaborated at great length the point that Mr. Justice Fraser did right in correcting a mistake. I agree with him in that. I think, when a judge comes to a conclusion that he was in error, he ought to correct the mistake; but, it is most unfortunate that, when Mr. Justice Fraser's attention was called to that mistake—and the Minister of Justice does not dispute that his attention was called to it—he did not give that consideration to it which he afterwards gave. No doubt in that he is fortified by the decision of judges in other courts who had taken the same view, and he had a perfect right afterwards to change his view and correct his decision, and I do not find fault with that, because we find that judges often change their opinions after hearing arguments. That, however, is not the question. The question is that, after the matter was disposed of, after it had become a matter of the past, a record of judicial decision which was past and gone, the court should be supposed to have a right to bring a party up who chooses to criticise them. If my hon. friend is right, there is no limit to that. Mr. Hawke might have waited for two years and then criticised the decision, and, according to my hon. friend, he could still be made amenable. I put it to the hon. gentleman, if that article had been written on the 1st May instead of being written in November, would Mr.

Hawke have been amenable to the jurisdiction of the court when six months had passed? In regard to the Dwyer Gray case, my hon. friend spoke as if the court was sitting when the articles were written. It was not. The court had closed. My hon. friend from Westmoreland seemed to be very much interested in that case, but it is very strange that his counsel did not appeal during the six months, but waited until the end of the term, and then applied on the ground that the time had elapsed. It was a very nice little catch.

Mr. THOMPSON. Had there not been a decision in the meantime by Judge Wallbridge?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I have no recollection of such a decision, but it is singular that at the beginning of the term there was no application made, but at the end of the term it was made. My hon. friend used the term "convict" in regard to Mr. Hawke. I am not here to defend or justify Mr. Hawke or the position which he took. I think this matter takes a broader ground. It is based on broader grounds than the mere individual, but I think it is unfortunate that the Minister of Justice should have applied that term to him. He is not a convict. He has been fined and imprisoned, as Mr. Dwyer Gray was fined and imprisoned when he was high sheriff of the city of Dublin and a member of Parliament, but I do not think that term was ever applied to him. The hon. gentleman has referred to that case and also to the Johnson case, which he read from the January number of the Law Reports. That was a case of actual contempt of court, where, in going out of the court the man said, he would pay him off. That was committed in the *aula regis*, in the presence of the Crown, because the judges are supposed to represent the Crown, and he undertook to make a threat against the party in the *aula regis*, which was just as much a contempt as if he had struck the judge on the bench. In the judgment of Lord Esher, it is clear that the case was pending on an interlocutory proceeding in the courts, and that, an order having been served on a solicitor to produce papers, before he went out of the court, he made this attack on the other solicitor, and used this opprobrious language which they held was not a constructive contempt of court but an actual contempt of court. What I want to draw the attention of my hon. friend to is that the Johnson case was an interlocutory case, that it was a matter in Chambers, that it was a matter then proceeding, and, in consequence of the order of the court, this difficulty arose between the two solicitors. The court might have taken up the proceeding, because the man was an officer of the court, but it did not take that ground, but took the ground that it was an actual contempt of court. My hon. friend did not rely so much on that case, but he put forward the Dwyer Gray case as being exactly a case in point, and he turned up the Parliamentary proceedings in reference to the matter of privilege. But this is not a question of privilege, and in the Dwyer Gray case, what was the position? He was the sheriff, and had to summon the jurors in that case, and he used some extraordinary remarks in his newspaper. Mr. Justice Lawson had been appointed to try several cases of a similar character under a special commission issued for that purpose. Mr. Dwyer Gray, as editor of the *Freeman*, made strong remarks on the conduct of the jury in the first case tried. All the cases turned on the same point, and it was supposed that the language would bias the jurors in the other cases. It was not in reference to the case that was past, but it was supposed that it would bias and influence the jurors in the cases that were to follow. Now, when we come to the decision of Justice Lawson, we find that it does not support the proposition put forth by my hon. friend. In that case a panel of jurors was in existence from which the jury had been drawn and cases had been tried and convictions obtained, and similar

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

indictments were drawn in other cases. After deciding that the articles were contempt of court, Justice Lawson said:

"I think the earlier ones containing these atrocious allegations about the exclusion of Catholics from the jury, are especially a contempt of court, and they are written for one purpose and one purpose only, to excite in the minds of the gentlemen of that persuasion, attending upon the jury panel, an idea that they are ostracised, or unfairly dealt with and the intention is that when any Catholics are called upon a subsequent jury there should be an impression left on their minds which would prevent them and interfere with them in the due and proper discharge of their duty."

Justice Lawson says that when the Catholics, who, Dwyer Gray says were ostracised—that when they went on a subsequent jury, the impression left by these articles upon their minds was such as would interfere with the proper administration of justice. He says:

"In my opinion jurors, of all persons in the community, require to be protected in the discharge of their duties. As to judges, that is not much matter; they are probably able to protect themselves; but jurors come here and act without fee or reward; they undertake, not voluntarily, but compulsorily, the most arduous duties."

Then again he says:

"I think the position of Mr. Gray greatly aggravates his offence. I think he owed a duty to the court which he has most seriously neglected. If there were imputations against these gentlemen, there was a mode of obtaining a proper enquiry; if there is an imputation against the Crown for having packed a jury, after the commission is over that may be enquired into in the proper place; but during the pendency of the commission, to attack the Crown for packing juries, and jurors for acting improperly on insufficient evidence, and to attack the judge for rejecting evidence which he ought to have admitted, that is a state of things which cannot be tolerated."

Mark the emphasis which Justice Lawson puts upon the case—during the pendency of the commission, not after the commission was over. Then we find that subsequently, when he reduced the fine, he said this:

"The power of the superior court to commit for contempt in part of the common law of England, and is essential in order to protect the free administration of justice. It should, however, be used strictly in defence of the proceedings of the court for the protection of suitors, and all those engaged in the administration of justice, including jurors, witnesses, and those engaged in the conduct of the prosecution and defence of criminals."

My hon. friend said it was a contempt of court to arrest a witness, and in seeking precedents, he brought forward the case of a witness arrested which was held to be a contempt of court. Now, I have had some experience at the bar with regard to witnesses being arrested, and I never heard that it was a contempt of court.

Mr. THOMPSON. I can satisfy the hon. gentleman on that subject in five minutes.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In our practice I never heard of such a thing. If I have a right against a man to arrest him, if he is protected by the process of the court, he simply asks the protection of the court. But how does any one know whether a man is a witness or not? If there is an attempt to arrest him, he applies to the court and gets protection. But that has nothing to do with this case. In the case the hon. gentleman cited it would come within the doctrine laid down, and upon which there is no dispute, because it would interfere with the administration of justice and prevent a man attending for the purpose of giving evidence. Justice Lawson goes on to say:

"If these are attacked, a prompt and immediate check must be applied, for to wait for the result of an ordinary trial of the offender would be to deny any remedy, because the mischief would have been completed before the remedy could be applied. It had been at all times used to check and restrain the publication of articles calculated to prejudice pending proceedings; and its exercise in the Tichborne and other cases in England, has had a very salutary effect, and the very knowledge of its existence, though it is not called into action, tends to check improper license."

Now, Mr. Speaker, Justice Lawson there refers to the Tichborne case. There was the case of Onslow and Whalley. While that case was being tried before Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, a number of gentlemen, members of Parliament,

went down and made inflammatory speeches to prejudice the case, and they were brought up and fined on the ground that the speeches they delivered, although members of Parliament, were such as would tend to interfere with the administration of justice. After these gentlemen had been brought before the Queen's Bench and fined, on a decision of Justice Blackburn—no doubt the Minister of Justice is familiar with it—Mr. Skipworth, a barrister, chose to go down to Bristol, I think it was, and make a speech attacking the decision of the court in their finding, and he was brought up and fined and committed to prison, because at that time proceedings were pending in the case of the Queen against Tichborne. In the Dublin case Mr. Justice Lawson went on to say :

" During the course of my judicial experience, I have only had occasion to exercise it once before the present time, in a case at Belfast, to which I referred in giving judgment in the present case. I was presiding over an important commission, at which a great number of prisoners were to be tried for the Belfast riots. An article was written in a local journal after the first important conviction had taken place, impeaching the conduct of the proceedings and calculated to prejudice the minds of jurors and prevent them from the free exercise of their judgment in the other cases pending. It was brought before me, on motion, by those representing the Attorney General, and I visited the publisher with fine and imprisonment. An attempt was made to quash that order in the courts above, which failed, the result being that the fine was paid, having been with some difficulty and delay collected from his friends, and the injurious publication instantly seized. The proceedings of the court were carried on without further molestation, and Belfast was restored to tranquility. I regret to say that a precisely similar attempt was made with respect to the present commission, at a time when every legal and law-abiding citizen throughout the Empire was congratulating himself that at last a way had been found by judicious alteration of the place and mode of trial. Still adhering to the ancient lines of the constitution of escaping from the paralysis of justice under which, for so many years, complete impunity had been enjoyed by offenders of a certain class, and then the forces of the law seemed at last likely to cope unsuccessfully with crime and outrage, at that critical moment the publisher of a widely circulating journal endeavored, by a series of articles, to discredit the proceedings of this commission and to destroy the moral effect of unimpeachable verdicts, by representing that they were arrived at by packed juries selected on a principle of religious sectarianism, the publisher being himself the sheriff who was bound by his office to aid in the administration of the law."

So much for the strong case, in fact the only case by which the Minister has attempted to impugn the position taken by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), that after the proceedings are over, after the matter is closed, criticism by a newspaper is a subject for judicial proceeding. The Minister of Justice has said that when judges are maligned the offenders should not go unpunished. If the hon. gentleman will go down to the Supreme Court he will find recorded the case of a judge against a man for libel. Judge Walkem, of British Columbia, before he went on the bench, was attacked as Attorney General and charged with having committed gross frauds, and that he was therefore unfit to be a judge, he was asserted to be guilty of corruption as Attorney General and therefore guilty of corruption as a judge. What did he do? He did not seek the protection of the court, but he went before a jury and got a verdict and showed the accusation to be a scandalous libel. If Mr. Hawke had exceeded the limits, let an indictment or criminal information be laid against him, and if, after the jury decided that he had exceeded the bounds of just criticism and was guilty of a foul and scandalous libel, I think no punishment would be too severe in such a case in regard to libel on a judge. The hon. gentleman has referred to the case of Sharpe, and mentioned that after a long time Sharpe was brought to justice. After Sharpe's conviction, and when Judge Barrett had refused a new trial, his attorneys got an order, I think from Chief Justice Ruger, to stay proceedings before the Court of Appeal in New York. When the case was brought before that court, it was decided that the conviction was wrong, and they ordered a new trial. The articles in the press of New York, as compared with the articles written by Mr. Hawke, were extremely severe, and it was openly declared that Chief Justice Rutger and the

Court of Appeal had been bought. Any lawyer who read the judgment of Judge Peckham, who delivered the judgment in the Court of Appeals, would not hesitate to say that the judgment was correct, and that evidence had been improperly admitted. No doubt the hon. Minister would concur in that decision, yet the press of New York had no hesitation in charging Chief Justice Ruger and the Court of Appeal with having improperly stayed proceedings and declaring, that if Sharpe had been a poor man the judgment of the court below would not have been reversed, and no attempt has been made by the court to bring those newspaper editors before them for contempt. The hon. gentleman referred to the court of New York and the case of Judge Lawrence. The code in the State of New York is this :

" Every court of record may punish disorderly, contemptuous or insolent behavior in the immediate presence of the court tending to interrupt its proceedings and impair the respect due to authority."

So the very case cited by the hon. gentleman shows that it is with reference to interference to the administration of justice. The Minister of Justice also referred to the case of Dallas against Ledger and the decision given by Mr. Justice Field and Mr. Justice Stephen, and the hon. gentleman put forward very ingeniously those decisions; but they put forward very clearly the view that judges and jury might be criticised after the case is over. The hon. gentleman also quoted a case in Chicago. The case was that while the grand jury were in session and during the continuance of proceedings connected with the administration of justice, a newspaper editor published an article which was calculated to interfere with the administration of justice or to bias the grand jury in that case, precisely as Mr. Justice Lawson put it in the Gray case, where there was an attempt to bias Catholics put on the jury in subsequent cases. This case is not, however, at all analogous to the case now under discussion, because in the present case it was after the proceedings had been closed, whereas in the Chicago case it was when the grand jury was in session. The hon. gentleman also referred to the Calgary case, and he said the judge was acting alone. I say he was a judge of record, and as such he had the same power as the judge of the highest court in the land. The hon. gentleman admitted that he was a court of record to some extent. If he was a court of record at all, I do not care to what extent, the same power that is possessed by the Supreme Court of Canada in this particular goes down to the lowest court of the Dominion. If Judge Travis sitting there as a stipendiary magistrate was a court of record he had the same power as the Chief Justice of Canada, whether sitting alone or in connection with his brethren on the bench. In that case I understand the Minister of Justice acted as a court of appeal and reviewed the decision; and the hon. gentleman has the same right to review the decision in this case, if he chooses to exercise it. I understand—and I believe the hon. gentleman was in power at the time—that some time ago a man was indicted in Quebec for a libel on the mayor of Quebec, who is the highest civic officer. It was a foul and slanderous libel on the occupant of the civic chair. The offender was convicted by a jury, not by the mayor himself, but by a fair and impartial tribunal and was sentenced to fine and imprisonment, and if I am correctly informed the imprisonment and fine have been remitted by the Dominion Government acting through the Minister of Justice.

Mr. THOMPSON. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows why. He knows I did not review that case; that the fine was not remitted, but that on medical certificate. I ordered his release, as I have already informed the House.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. I understand that when the imprisonment was remitted that involved the remission of the fine. A few

words with regard to the power of appeal. The late Judge Ramsay, of Quebec, addressed a letter to Judge Drummond, and was fined. He took the case to the Privy Council and they ordered the fine to be remitted. Then the cases of Pollard, in Hong Kong, and Wallace, in Nova Scotia, were also in point. I simply wish to show that when these cases were brought before the Queen in Council the Judicial Committee recommended the Crown to remit the fines in those cases respectively. The matter has of course gone a little farther than what may have been intended. First, as to the right of the courts, I need not repeat again the language of those noble Lords who have been referred to by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), where judges of the standing of Lord Fitzgerald, have given their opinion, and Lord Bramwell who stands as one of the most experienced judges in England entirely agreed with Lord Fitzgerald. We find those judges saying that it was a power rarely exercised, and we find in a late case to which my hon. friend has referred, Mr. Justice Field and Mr. Justice Stephen speaking of it as a vague and undefinable right. The judges of New Brunswick are my personal friends and I know that they stand in high estimation for integrity in the Dominion. I do not impute the slightest vindictiveness to them, but I think it is unfortunate that this matter has been brought to the position in which it is now. In a case like this I would like if the court had been allowed to stand on its own high position and dignity. If judges fearlessly and honestly do their duty the people of this country will support them; no matter what libel or slander may be cast upon them, it will never stain the ermine if they do their duty fairly. There is no suspicion as regards the high integrity of the judges of the court in New Brunswick, and I would much prefer under those circumstances that they would have allowed this matter to remain as it was. I believe the true and correct position of the case is put forward fairly in the *Empire* of a few days ago. As I can use no better language in expounding what I believe the proper principle to be maintained in this case than that which is used in that paper, I will read it. In the preceding part of the article they express no sympathy for Mr. Hawke, but on the contrary they do not at all justify his course. The *Empire* says as follows:—

"While the common law stands as the justification of the courts for punishing contempt, we may expect it to be exercised from time to time. Some judges who have been attacked in the press, and not only their law but their motives questioned, have—as we think wisely—passed over the offence, relying upon their high character and their eminent public services as their shield and protection. There are, we believe, few judges in Canada who might not do the same. Judge Fraser of the New Brunswick Supreme Court, a gentleman of the highest reputation, might safely have done so. As matters have gone, there is now a personal contest into which party politics have largely entered, and out of which no good to the bench or the public can come. The editor of the *Transcript* might have written against Judge Fraser until doomsday without injury to the judge's reputation, whereas now he is elevated to an importance he does not deserve in the public eye, and the judges of the Supreme Court are practically put on their defence in connection with a case out of which can come no honor for them. The question too is raised as to whether judges should be allowed to punish journalists for expressions of opinion delivered in their newspapers after the public trial of cases of public interest. A judge's right to maintain order in his court when engaged in hearing cases is unquestioned; without the exercise of this prerogative, courts of law might be paralysed and their usefulness destroyed. In such cases committal to prison on the *ipse dixit* of a judge is right enough. But we think the time has come when men engaged in discussing public affairs of the nation in public journals should be relieved of the danger of being sent to prison as criminals on the personal order of a judge, without trial by their peers. There can be no doubt of the idea of judges sitting as accusers, judges and jury, all in one, being repugnant to the ideas of personal liberty and independence which prevail at the present day. The country is governed by intelligent public sentiment, and judges, like other officers of the Crown, may safely rely upon enlightened public opinion for their protection. Their public services, their impartiality, ability and high personal character form a better protection than can be secured through committing offenders to prison or the imposition of fines and costs. We recognise the fact that the law, while within the reach of judges, has been seldom appealed to, and that unjust criticism of the decisions of our courts is seldom seen. This is due not to the fact that the power of imprisonment is in the hands of judges, but to the general belief that the judges are fair minded,"

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

honorably, capable men, and to a general recognition of the social necessity that exists for preserving a bench without reproach. Under all these circumstances, it would seem to be time to declare that there should no longer be that anomaly in our constitution which enables one of Her Majesty's subjects, of his own motion, to arrest and imprison without trial another subject of Her Majesty for offences alleged to have been committed in connection with the exercise of the liberty of public discussion. The judges should, in our opinion, be placed on the same footing as other citizens. If they are libelled in the press, if they are falsely accused, let them appeal to the courts and to a jury of their fellow countrymen, who will not fail to see that ample justice is done."

I look upon that as an exposition of the proper position in which this matter should be placed. I am one who is prepared to uphold and maintain the dignity of the bench. I will be one always ready to defend that respect and honor which should be paid to the judges, but I do think it is an anomaly in our procedure that judges can sit as accusers, and as judges, and jury and executioners, over a matter where the party accused has no chance of being tried by his peers. I do not believe that such a proceeding is at all necessary for the maintenance of the dignity and the position of the bench. I quite agree with the writer of this article that the bench can sustain their own position, and that fair-minded and honorable judges will always maintain the respect of the public, and that by their dignity on the bench, by their judicial decisions, the judges will maintain that respect which should be accorded to them. If it is assailed, I believe that all right-minded men in Canada will rally around them and protect them. I believe that such protection as is guaranteed by the public opinion of the country, will be far beyond any punishment or fine they may place on any editor, or anyone else who chooses to assail them through the columns of a newspaper. I would like to have not said anything on this subject. I would have preferred to have remained silent in this matter, not only from my professional but also on account of my personal connection with the judges of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick. I have the highest respect for them. I have been before them for a great many years, and notwithstanding what was said either against the court or Mr. Justice Fraser, I believe that if the matter had not been brought to its present position there would not be the slightest stain of any kind upon the bench, and that the respect in which they are now held by the people of New Brunswick would still have remained intact and untarnished by any remarks that were made.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Everyone admits, Mr. Speaker, the undoubted privilege of a member of the House of Commons to challenge the conduct of the judiciary of any Province where there is supposed to be a case of hardship or inhumanity, as we are members of the high court of Parliament. We all recognise, however, that this great privilege is one singularly liable to abuse, and that we, in the exercise of our freedom, may pervert this privilege into an engine of mischief. We feel the danger the greater for the reason that the men accused are absent men, and that they are men the maintenance of whose exalted reputation is of supreme importance to the whole country. I think the House may be congratulated upon the excellent temper that has been shown by all the speakers who have taken part in the debate; although some weeks ago when this matter was discussed, we had occasion to regret that remarks so severe were uttered, as were then uttered. If the question before the House were a Bill for the amendment of the law of contempt, I might agree with one-half of what has been said by the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) and the hon. member for the city and county of St. John (Mr. Weldon). But the matter before the House is not to amend the law of contempt, we are not in committee on such a Bill, and we are not discussing the second reading of a Bill in this direction. The precise question before the House is this: Shall we urge the hon. Minister to exercise his executive clemency in respect to Mr. Hawke, who now lies in the county jail in Fredericton?

I have followed the argument of the hon. gentleman who has moved in this matter, and the only reason he has given is this: That as the law of England stands to-day, there is no precedent in the English authorities for the imprisonment of one whose contempt is of the character of scandalising the court after the judicial proceedings have terminated. The hon. gentleman distinguished between three species of contempt—first, those which are contempts in the face of the court, and therefore obstruct business; second, those which are prejudicial to the interests of parties when the cases are *sub-judice*—and he agreed that these two classes were punishable in a summary manner; but in respect to the third species of contempt, which had the effect of scandalising the court, weakening its authority, and lowering it in the estimation of the people after the case was closed, he said there was no English law affirming the power of a court to commit. I affirm that the cases which the hon. the Minister of Justice has cited themselves abundantly support him in the position that there was power, and that the Supreme Court of New Brunswick rightly interpreted the English law, whether it be humane and wise or not, when it punished Mr. Hawke for the very strong and offensive words which he wrote in the *Transcript* newspaper. The hon. member for St. John county cited among his cases the case of *Rex vs. Almon*, and I will read a short paragraph from the opinion of Chief Justice Wilmot in that case in which our contention is affirmed. This is cited by Chief Justice Harrison in his judgment on the "Big Push" case:

"The arraignment of the justice of the judges is arraigning the King's justice; it is an impeachment of his wisdom and goodness in the choice of his judges, and excites in the minds of the people a general dissatisfaction with all judicial determinations, and indisposes their minds to obey them; and, whenever men's allegiance to the laws is so fundamentally shaken, it is the most fatal and most dangerous obstruction of justice, and, in my opinion, calls out for more rapid and immediate redress than any other obstruction whatever; not for the sake of the judges as private individuals, but because they are the channels by which the King's justice is conveyed to the people. To be impartial, and to be universally thought so, are both absolutely necessary for the giving justice that free, open and uninterrupted current, which it has, for many ages, found all over this kingdom, and which so eminently distinguishes and exalts it above all nations upon the earth."

I commend those sober and weighty words to the hon. members opposite. Reference was made once more to the Johnson case; and I affirm once more, despite what hon. gentlemen opposite say, that the Johnson case is a case of the third class, that of scandalising the court after the case is closed. It is the case of two solicitors, one of whom used abusive language and threatening gestures towards the other. Their conduct does not seem to have obstructed the business of the court; it occurred somewhere between the entrance to the building and the judges' room.

Mr. WELDON (St John). But while the case was proceeding in court.

Mr. WELDON. (Albert) The judge had apparently gone out of his room; but it did not obstruct the business and did not prejudice the rights of the parties in the case. Lord Escher affirms:

"It may possibly be that I have too much restricted the doctrine on the subject by suggesting that there would be a limit of time or space with regard to the question whether such conduct amounted to a contempt. It may be that there would be no such limit of time or space, provided the acts done or expressions used could be considered an interference with the course of justice."

I think it is within the spirit and the words of that ruling to consider that Mr. Hawke's articles published in the *Transcript* newspaper might be an interference with the current of justice. With reference to the case in the *Law Times*, from which the hon. gentleman cited the opinion of Sir Fitzjames Stephen and Mr. Justice Field, the hon. gentleman I know inadvertently stated that Sir Fitzjames Stephen had found no cases affirming the existence of any power for punishing this kind of contempt. The hon. gentleman was inadvertent in stating that, for Sir Fitz-

James Stephen said nothing of the kind. I have read the whole case. The case is not at all similar to this one. That was an action of libel against a newspaper, this is a case of contempt. There the words complained of were uttered on behalf of little children who were singing on the stage; the newspaper published them in the interest of humanity; it used strong but temperate language; and no one would attempt placing these words of the *New Era* side by side with what was written by Mr. Hawke. Let me read a few words more from the "Big Push" case. At page 111 are these strong words of Chief Justice Harrison:

"Let it be understood, once for all, by the press of this Province that a defamatory attack upon a judge of a superior court for a judgment pronounced by him with other judges in court, is more than a contempt of the judge who is maligned—that it is a contempt of the court of which he is a judge; and that the court has the power to punish an affront thereby offered to the court."

At page 113 reasons are given for the existence of the doctrine that we are laying down:

"There is no privilege for any man in Canada, under the pretext of the public good, rashly to assail in the public press any of our judges for his conduct on the bench, and to impute to the judge assailed conduct so wicked and corrupt as to render him wholly unfit to occupy the distinguished and responsible position of a seat on the bench."

These are the words of Chief Justice Harrison. He distinctly lays down the rule that newspapers are not privileged to make such attacks. The strongest case cited by the hon. member for Queen's in support of his position, that the third species of contempt is not punishable in a summary way, was that referred to in a speech of Lord Fitzgerald in the House of Lords five years ago. I have the *Hansard* from which the hon. member read, and let me say that immediately after the speech of Lord Fitzgerald is a speech of another eminent lawyer, the present Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Coleridge, in which he dissects entirely from the view taken by Lord Fitzgerald. I will read a few words of it:

"He could not agree with his noble and learned friend behind him (Lord Fitzgerald) that a material alteration should be made in the law as to constructive contempt. Judging from his present experience, he thought the practical importance of the subject had been a good deal overestimated. He himself had never imprisoned but one man for contempt, and that was only for twenty-four hours; and he was a person who could not be got rid of without ordering his removal out of court in custody. But with regard to constructive contempt, his noble and learned friend had forgotten that offences were sometimes committed, not in the face of the court, which, nevertheless, impeded the administration of justice."

He goes on to speak of certain causes of offence, and says further:

"He had hardly ever seen persons committed for contempt except in cases where the contempt was outrageous; and he did not believe that instances of constructive contempt were at all common. He thought, therefore, it would be better to leave the matter where it was, and there was no reason to believe that judges would exceed their powers. A court of appeal could not be such a good judge of what particular act amounted to constructive contempt as the judge who had tried the action in which the contempt had been committed."

But let me say that the hon. member for Queen's misstated the views of Lord Fitzgerald. He said that Lord Fitzgerald declared that the law of England, in 1883, was that there was no power to commit for contempt after a case is closed. Now, Lord Fitzgerald, on the contrary expressly says that the law of England regards such acts as contempts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.L.). I did not say that.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). You did. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, but I took his words down, because I knew that he was making an inexact statement of the law, and *Hansard* will show which of us is right. The hon. gentleman stated that he had read Lord Fitzgerald's opinion, and that Lord Fitzgerald's opinion was that the law of England to-day declares that there is no such power as this for committing for contempt after the case has closed,

Lord Fitzgerald was asking for reform of the law, and he stated the law to be exactly the opposite of what the hon. member for Queen's has said it is, and Lord Fitzgerald's opinion is all the more valuable because he believed the law to be harsh and unwise, and required to be amended; and, at the time, he was speaking in committee on the second reading of the Bill to amend it. So that Lord Fitzgerald, the hon. gentleman's main witness, is an adverse witness. The real reasons given by the hon. gentleman, I will not follow. I think the question is one to be settled by authority, and I think the authorities in those five cases are clearly with us. But hon. gentlemen opposite have raised some imaginary dangers in this connection. They state that this is an alarming power with which to clothe the judges. In answer to that, I would say that with the experience we have had for years, we have not found that this power has been abused, we have not found that there have been any serious complaint regarding its exercise; and that though we have a long history in this country, no one can point to any abuse of that power. The judges are amenable to public opinion, they are chosen from the highest ranks, they are selected from the best men in the country, and they are in the highest degree amenable to public opinion; and I will hazard the statement that to-day the representatives of the leading papers of the country, the gentlemen in the gallery would much rather, if at any time, in the heat of temper, spurred by momentary passion and impatience, they should write what might be considered libellous, they would far rather have their case submitted to any of the superior courts of the Provinces for adjudication than to any jurors; and, like honorable gentlemen, if they had made a mistake, they would be willing, when they came to their sober minds and their party feeling had cooled down, to apologise for their attacks. Our English constitution provides sufficient remedies against the abuse of the power to commit for contempt. A judge is not above the law, assuming our theory is right as to this doctrine of contempt. Under the Imperial Acts of 1782 and 1818, which Acts have been declared by the Crown lawyers to be in force in colonies with constitutions like our own, the Governor in Council can remove an offending judge, if immediate action is required; and if not, it will be time enough to obtain a remedy when Parliament is sitting. He can be removed by the Crown upon a joint address of the two Houses.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Can a judge be removed without the addresses of both Houses of Parliament?

Mr. WELDON (Albert). No doubt he can under the Imperial Acts of 1782 and 1818, which have been declared to be in force in the colony of Victoria, which has a constitution in this matter precisely similar to our own. In the constitution of the colony of Victoria, there is a section similar to section 99 in the British North America Act, which provides that the judges can be removable on the joint address of the two Houses; and the opinion was given by Sir William Atherton and Sir Richard Bethell, the one Attorney General and the other Solicitor General in England, that in the colony of Victoria in 1862, and again in 1864, in New South Wales, these Acts of 1782 and 1818, which empower the Governor in Council to remove a misbehaving judge, were undoubtedly in force.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Statutes so late as those are not held to be in force in this country.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). If the hon. gentleman will give the matter more attention, I am satisfied he will come to a different opinion. Another material contention of hon. gentlemen opposite was that this power was unnecessary, and that a judge has a proper way of vindicating himself under the law of the land. They argue that a judge has an action of damages, and can institute criminal proceedings to

Mr. WELDON (Albert).

vindicate his character. I answer that by saying that, under our constitution, a judge holds an altogether exceptional position. Our constitution declares that he shall not be dragged into the courts either to vindicate his rights or to defend himself, and, therefore, he is given this effective remedy. I can only express my regret that this trouble has arisen. An unwise young man went down to the east and brought into political discussions there an acerbity hitherto unknown. He ran amuck against everything and everybody, and by-and-bye ran amuck against the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, which has that sterling old English quality of self-respect. His friends say that he is a young fellow of good impulses, and I am not going to say a word against him. He is in jail, and can thank himself for it. He wanted to be a martyr and he has achieved martyrdom; and he is not entitled to as much sympathy as, under other circumstances, all generous hearts would feel for him, because, after his first offence he continued defiant, against the advice of his best friends, strong friends in his own party, who said to him: You have done wrong, your words were too strong, you have fallen under the ban of the law, and should apologise. But disregarding all these representations, he refused to retract what he had said, and consequently has gone to jail. I was glad to hear the manly words of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) in vindicating the character of Mr. Justice Fraser, and I desire to endorse what he said. For many years Judge Fraser's long, honorable, and useful life has lain before the public like an open book. When he was in politics, his life was by the consent of both parties held, in a singular degree, to be blameless. The foremost exponent of Liberal principles in New Brunswick—I mean no disrespect to any member from New Brunswick sitting opposite—for many years, the late Mr. William Elder, who was a member of the New Brunswick Legislature for years and was considered the ablest Liberal in the House, although he differed from Mr. Fraser in Dominion politics, had so high an admiration for his integrity and ability that he gave him his unwavering support, and his confidence in him was simply the tribute of respect to his high personal character.

Mr. LISTER. I shall ask the attention of the House this evening for a very few moments while I attempt to reply to the statements of the hon. the Minister of Justice and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I listened with close attention to the speech of the hon. the Minister of Justice, and I must say that, so far as I am concerned at all events, the speech made by him was disappointing. If the hon. gentleman had been applying to the court for criminal information against the gentleman now in jail, or if he had been prosecuting that gentleman under an indictment for libel, I could have understood his speech. I think he was hardly fair in the statements and arguments he made in answer to the speech of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). That hon. gentleman opened his address by stating he was surprised that the hon. member for Queen's had not made a motion asking the Government to take some steps in this matter, but the hon. gentleman must know that, if the hon. member for Queen's had made such a motion and placed it upon the Order Paper, it could not have been reached this Session, and that if he had made this motion on going into Supply the supporters of the Government would have been bound to vote it down as a motion of want of confidence. My hon. friend from Queen's, in moving this resolution, has been actuated solely by the desire to have this case carefully and judicially discussed; and if it is shown that Mr. Hawke is improperly imprisoned, if it is shown that there is any doubt at all as to the right of the court which imprisoned him to grant that order, the object in bringing this case before the high court of Parliament is to have right done in the premises and to obtain the release of the

gentleman in question. Now, hon. gentlemen have spoken of the high character and the integrity of the judges in the Province of New Brunswick, and the position they occupy. So far as these gentlemen are concerned, I have nothing to say. I know nothing against them, I know nothing for them, and I have a right to presume that, occupying the position they do, they are honorable men; but, in this case, there is a broader and a greater principle at stake which affects the liberty of the press in this country and the rights of the people, and the question is whether they shall be imprisoned by tribunals other than those which we have been accustomed to look to? That is the question which this high court of Parliament has to consider, and in arguing this question the hon. gentleman who has just spoken and the Minister of Justice have endeavored to justify the action of the court in New Brunswick on the ground that this man, who did not commit a contempt in the face of the court, who did not commit what is called by them a constructive contempt, was guilty of a contempt in scandalising the court after all proceedings had ended, and that that justified the court in exercising the great powers which the Minister of Justice says they possess. These are dangerous powers, powers which are dangerous to the safety of the people of this country, and, instead of extending them, the object of Parliament should be to contract them. They are a remnant of an age which has passed away, of a power which existed in the past of the judiciary of the country, and which should not exist in a free country such as we have. Rights have been granted to us, and one of those rights is that a man shall not be deprived of his liberty except upon the verdict of his peers and to say that the judiciary shall be encouraged in bringing a culprit, as they call him, before them, trying him without evidence, being themselves the prosecutors and the judges, to say that this should exist in this country is advancing a theory which is dangerous to the liberties of the people and should be restricted if it does exist. But I contend that no such power exists in the judiciary of this Dominion. I say that the right to commit for contempt exists where the contempt is committed in the face of the court, and where it is necessary for the preservation of order and the dignity of the proceedings that the person who interferes with the court in its proceedings should be committed, and it exists where a person slanders or libels the court in a proceeding then pending, and that for the manifest reason that such an article must be an interference with the proper administration of justice. To tell us that, because a man happens to be a judge, he is over and above the law, is to state an absurdity which will not find a resting place in the thinking minds of this day. It is for the preservation of the public and for the preservation of the dignity of the courts that this right is given to the courts, and the moment the object ceases, that moment the right of the court to inflict the penalty ceases also. To tell us that because a man is a judge of a court he has a right to take a power to himself that no other citizen of the country, whether high or low, possesses, is to tell us something which we cannot receive and which does not exist. Suppose for a moment that Judge Fraser had been a drunken judge, that he had been drunk upon the bench, shall it be said that the publisher or editor of a paper who is bold enough to come forward and denounce him shall be committed to prison for a libel upon that judge? Judges are but human, and have no greater rights than other citizens of this great country, and to say that because he is a judge he has exceptional power given to him greater than any other citizen enjoys is monstrous and absurd on the face of it. The hon. gentleman talks about a *habeas corpus*. He knows as well as I know that such an argument is absurd. To whom would they apply for the *habeas corpus*? To the very Judges who had already condemned the man to imprisonment and

fine. The hon. gentleman knows that the warrant issued and that the commitment was for contempt and that the court at Ottawa would have no power to interfere because they could only look at the warrant and could not go behind that warrant. The hon. gentleman took up a great deal of time in proving that Mr. Hawke had committed the crime of libel, and that the judges were justified in finding him guilty of the offence. I repeat that it is of no consequence whatever whether a libel was committed or not. That is not the question before this House. The question is whether those articles, written after the proceedings had terminated, libellous though they may be, gave the judge a right to take upon himself summarily to find this man guilty of libel. Hon. gentlemen on that side of the House have failed to produce one single authority to show that the judges possess such a power as that. They do not possess the power, they never did possess the power, and they have never exercised it, and I challenge hon. gentlemen to produce a case parallel to this in the last fifty years where a judge has attempted to exercise this power in Britain or in the colonies. These decisions and authorities have been read to the House over and over again this evening, and I will trouble the House for a moment with an extract from the judgment of Mr. Justice Lawson in the Dwyer Gray case:

"It has been at all times used to check and restrain the publication of articles calculated to prejudice pending proceedings; and its exercise in the Titchborne and other cases in England has had a very salutary effect, and the very knowledge of its existence, though it is not called into action, tends to check improper license."

There is nothing whatever in this case to show that the libel for which Dwyer Gray was convicted was committed subsequent to the proceedings then pending. As a matter of fact, this shows that there were a large number of cases pending, and the questions involved were the same in each. The alleged libel was published in regard to the first case, and the effect was to interfere with the due trial of the cases which were to come on afterwards. In that case the libel was looked upon as affecting pending proceedings. He says again:

"Having regard, however, to the principle I have laid down, that the exercise of this power is intended only to protect and secure the due administration of justice, I am bound now, at the close of this commission, to consider whether the law has been sufficiently vindicated by what has already taken place. Mr. Gray has been now six weeks in custody; he must pay the fine of £500 which I shall not remit. The attacks upon the proceedings of the court ceased at once, and have not been since renewed, and I am bound to say that a considerable change for the better has taken place in the tone of the paper; the trials are all concluded, and the action of the law officers and my order have been effectual in preventing the course of justice from being impeded."

Such being the case, I charge that what has been done here by Judge Fraser is a direct attack upon the liberties of the press of this country. It is dangerous to the commonwealth for that reason; and I say that unless the law is clear and manifest that the judges had power to commit Mr. Hawke for that alleged offence, then the executive should step in and relieve him from the punishment which has been inflicted. I say that the power is one which this Parliament should not extend; it is a power which, if it ever existed, should be contracted by an Act of this Parliament. But if there is any question as to the power of the judge to inflict this punishment, then I maintain that it is the duty of the Minister of Justice to advise His Excellency that the penalty should be remitted, and Mr. Hawke released from jail. Sir, the case of Dwyer Gray shows that that course was pursued. It is not alleged that since these alleged libels were written, Mr. Hawke has printed anything further in his paper which can be called a libel upon the judges of New Brunswick. Such being the case, I say it is a matter which ought to be considered by the Minister of Justice, and that Mr. Hawke ought to be released from imprisonment. How can the Minister of Justice distinguish between this case and other cases which have come under his notice, and

upon which he has acted? He has attempted to distinguish between this and the Calgary case. I say that attempt has been a failure. The judge in Calgary was a judge of a court of record, and being a court of record it had all the incidences of that court, and the judge had all the powers of that court; yet when he had committed the offender in Calgary, the Minister of Justice exercised his undoubted rights and advised the judge at Calgary to release the prisoner who had been convicted. Sir, let us come to the city of Quebec. There we find that Mr. Maguire had been convicted of a most scandalous libel upon Mr. Langelier, now representing one of the divisions of Quebec, and he was convicted by a jury of his countrymen. Did the Minister of Justice there refuse to exercise executive clemency? Did he then question the right of the executive to interfere with the sentence which had been passed by the court? No, Sir, he remitted the fine, I believe, and ordered that the person who had been convicted should be released from imprisonment. These are only two cases, and doubtless a number of other cases could be produced. Now, such being the fact, it being shown that the right which the Minister of Justice contended for, the right to convict this man before the judges of the court of New Brunswick for a libel upon that court, is according to his own contention, a doubtful one; as it is a doubtful power, and in the interest of the British subject, the Minister of Justice should exercise the undoubted power which he possesses of advising His Excellency to release Mr. Hawke from jail. Now, he says that if Mr. Hawke asked pardon, had apologised to the court, had withdrawn the accusations that he made, nothing further would have been done. Sir, when Mr. Hawke believed honestly that what he had stated was true, I ask any man here if it would not have been unmanly on his part to withdraw these statements. There was, as I said, a great principle at stake in this case and that was the freedom of the press. If he had done that, he would have admitted that the judges of New Brunswick had a right to fine and imprison him for the offence which he was alleged to have committed. I say it has not been shown here to-night that any offence was committed. The preponderance of authority shows that the judges of that Province, or of any other Province, in this Dominion, have no power to convict for a libel such as was written in this case, if it was a libel; because it was written and published subsequently to the termination of the proceedings before the court. Sir, there is a great principle involved in this case, there is the question of the liberty of the press in this country. We need not go back in history for more than a hundred years to see the terrible struggle that was made in those days for the liberty of the press against the tyranny of the Crown. Sir, are we to go back to those days again? Are the people to fight over the battles that were fought less than a hundred years ago to retain the liberty which they enjoy to-day? or are they to go back and restore the obsolete power which the Minister of Justice says that the judges of this country have to-day? Sir, it is a great advantage to the people of the country that the press should be absolutely free, and any attempt on the part of the administration here to strangle or to fetter that press, is a blow at the liberties of the people. Sir, I will read to you the words of Sheridan upon this question:

"Give me but the liberty of the press and I will give the minister a venal house of peers,—I will give him a corrupt and servile House of Commons—I will give him the full swing of the patronage of office—I will give him the whole host of ministerial influence,—I will give him all the power that place can confer upon him to purchase submission, and overawe resistance; and yet, armed with the liberty of the press, I will go forth and meet him undismayed; I will attack the mighty fabric he has reared, with that mightier engine I will shake down from its height, corruption and lay it beneath the ruins of the abuses it has meant to shelter.

Sir, that is what the press of this country needs, and if the pretensions of the Minister of Justice are correct, I say he is striking a fatal blow at those liberties.

Mr. LISTER.

Mr. DAVIN. If the ghost of Richard Brinsley Sheridan were in our midst this evening, I am sure that spirit would feel greatly complimented at the way his words have been dragged into this discussion. Sir, I think that the House is to be congratulated on the wide reach of historical knowledge, on the legal acumen, and the great regard for the liberty of the press, that the hon. and learned gentleman, who has just sat down, has displayed. With a delicacy which cannot be too much admired, after the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) had, in an elaborate argument, sought to grapple with the Minister of Justice, this hon. gentleman said he rose to answer the Minister of Justice, and my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), and, Sir, he has made a magnificent answer. The way he made that answer was to take a case that had already been quoted and requoted, and he reshaped that single case. Then he stated that this was a terrible affair, because the liberty of the press was in danger; the palladium of English liberty was in danger. Why, Sir, what analogy is there between the small power a judge has of imprisoning for contempt of court, and the power of the Crown as it existed in Mr. Sheridan's mind, when he penned those magnificent sentences? Sentences that in that day were eloquent because they were appropriate, but quoted here in a case like this, it is like building a Corinthian portico to a hut or to any other building more contemptible still. That question as to the danger of the liberties of the press was a living question in the days of Sheridan; it was a living question when Robert Hall wrote his celebrated apology for the liberty of the press, of which, he said, if he used very strong language it must be remembered it was "an apology for a dead friend." It was a living question when Junius was imprisoned; but the time has entirely gone by, and the hon. gentleman's speech, and much of the speaking we hear in Parliament and out of Parliament, and much of the writings we find in our journals and in our books show that we are governed by phrases.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is that what you call them?

Mr. DAVIN. No, those are hon. gentlemen. I can bear the support or opposition of either the Conservative party or Liberal party, but when the "third party" rises in its might I am crushed. I can stand a good deal, but I cannot stand that. Seriously, can one imagine—I do not wish to use strong language or wish to be harsh—more intolerable buncombe than that sort of talk about the liberties of the press which we have heard here to-night? Why, we have come to a time when any thinking man will say this, that the great force in every English-speaking constitutional country is the press; that is the force which is actually at the present time without any restraint whatever; and if there is a danger to liberty in a great republic, in a country like this, in England to-day it is not from a crowned head, it is not from a government, it is from the tyranny of the majority, and in a free country such as we have here, where the greatest licence is allowed to the press, to talk of the freedom of the press being endangered is perfect nonsense. The real point is whether the freedom of the individual is not endangered. I am not going to travel over the legal arguments which have been presented by my hon. and learned friend, the Minister of Justice, in a speech that I say was the emanation of a master mind; I am not going over the cases discussed by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon); I will not reason this as if I was arguing a case *in banco*, but, if I may dare to use the expression, if it is not presumptuous in my mouth, I will endeavor, during the few minutes I shall trespass on the House, to argue this case in the spirit of a statesman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I said if it would not be considered presumptuous—some hon. members seem to think it would be

out of place; but I did not intend, if I should succeed in the effort, to erect a standard that would reflect on any hon. member. The proposition that was laid down by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and by the hon. gentleman who answered the hon. Minister of Justice was this: that a contempt cannot be committed after the case is over. They argue that a contempt must needs sarily be an obstruction to the course of justice, and they seem to think that the course of justice could not be obstructed unless by something which should have reference to some individual case that was actually pending in court.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Or a similar case.

Mr. DAVIN. I say that the course of justice can be impeded if the Act tends to lower the dignity of the judges upon the bench. I once heard one of the best and most distinguished judges that ever presided in England—a man not only of great legal acumen, not a mere case lawyer, not a mere huxter of cases, but a man of eminent abilities, a man of wide reading, a man of great literary power—I mean the late Chief Justice Cockburn—say to an eminent barrister, who was using language that he thought disrespectful: "I do not care a pin about you, but I must remember my office." And what he meant was this: that he, the Chief Justice of England, could not in the interests of the people of the United Kingdom have allowed such language to be used, although personally, he could regard with condign scorn the language of that man. And I say the Chief Justice of New Brunswick, in the interests of the course of justice in that Province, could not have allowed such a course as Mr. Hawke pursued to go on unless he was false to his duty and to the claims of his position. Another proposition that was evidently in the minds of those hon. gentlemen was this: That for a couple of attorneys, or a couple of bellicose barristers, to have quarrelled within the precincts of the court, would be a grave contempt of court—a thing which, within my own memory and observation, has been punished, and punished promptly in Toronto—it would be a very grave thing for a couple of those gentlemen to have a quarrel within the precincts of the court, or for one to shake his fist in the face of the other, but it is no grave contempt of court for a man to write in newspapers which are circulated broadcast throughout the length and breadth of the community, statements calculated to lower the judiciary, not only calculated to lower it, but maligning it; not only calculated to injure the course of justice and to impede the course of justice and make the course of justice less efficient, but also calculated to inflict injury on the personal character of the judge, to reduce his authority in the court and his influence on the people in that court, and in cases brought before him to discount him to a very great extent. There is no comparison between the two cases. The one is a far greater contempt than the other; the one is far more injurious than the other; the one is a very serious thing indeed while the other might have no effect whatever on the course of justice. I suppose if there is a man in this House who would be jealous, I will not say more jealous, but if there is a man who would at all events be expected to be as jealous as any man in Canada, or in the three kingdoms, about the freedom of the press, it would be myself. But it is because I know what great things the press has done; it is because I know what the liberty of printing has done for the world; it is for that reason that here in this House, or wherever else I am, by pen or by voice, I will always protest against the view that the license of the press is synonymous with its liberty. The hon. gentleman from Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), in this House, referred to certain language intended to be contemptuous as applied to the hon. the Finance Minister, and he very properly said that politicians are accustomed to that sort of thing. They bear with that

sort of thing, and there is a reason why they might be expected to bear it which does not apply to the judges. The judges cannot come into Parliament, or go on the platform and enter into a wordy warfare with persons who traduce and malign them, and try to lower their authority, while a politician can. But will any fair-minded man say that it is not a lamentable thing, that it is not injurious to the country, that it is not injurious to the press, that it is not a thing to be regretted, and which we ought to seek to reform, that the press of the country, in discussing its public men, never shows the least regard for truth? Is it not a lamentable thing that if a man devotes the best years of his life to his country, and wastes his time, as some people would think, and wastes his money, and seeks by eminent services to win enduring gratitude in the hearts of the people among whom he lives—is it not a lamentable thing that we must wait until he is dead to have one word of truth said of him by his opponents? I make these remarks merely in passing, because the hon. gentleman who preceded me has raised the question of the freedom of the press. There is no question of the freedom of the press here; there is no freedom of the press endangered here; we are not dealing with the power of a court, we are not dealing with a despotic king.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). We are dealing with a despotic court.

Mr. DAVIN. I am speaking of the political court. We are not dealing with a Parliament that is not firmly based on the people's will, but we are dealing with the power given to the judges to protect them, and to protect them in the interests of the public. The only question is this: has the court in this case exceeded its power, or has it not? Sir, I think that from the arguments and cases quoted by my hon. and learned friend the Minister of Justice, and by my hon. and learned friend the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), no sensible man in Canada—and this is not a question of politics—can doubt but that the judge was within his right, and no sensible man, and no student of constitutional history can doubt but that the exercise of the power is one that is useful to the country. I will say in regard to the general question of the law of libel—because it has been glanced at and I want to show what my position is—as applicable to newspapers, that, if that question were before us, I would be prepared to suggest some amendments. Although, Sir, I hope whenever it does come up, this House of Commons will ponder well how far they ought to go and how closely they ought to watch this great power of the press—great for good, and like other institutions also great for evil if it be not directed by educated and by high spirited men.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not intend to take any particular part in this discussion to-night, in relation to the question of whether Mr. Hawke was guilty or not guilty of the offence for which he has been committed to prison, but I may be excused after what has been said if I express some opinions in relation to that matter. My interest in this question was mainly directed to the doubt which the Minister of Justice assumed, in reference to what the press of this country could do and could not do; what they were justified in saying, and what they were justified in not saying in relation to questions which affected the judiciary of the country. I may first deal with Mr. Hawke. Before this afternoon's discussion I had given the matter very little attention beyond the fact that I had seen in the newspapers that Mr. Hawke had been charged for having committed some offences against the judiciary of the Province, of which for one of the counties, I am the representative. I happen to know personally and individually every member of the bench of that Province, and personally I have respect for those men. The particular judge whose conduct has been referred to in relation to this matter,

was born and brought up within a mile of where I was born and brought up myself. I know him perhaps better than anyone in this House knows him. I have known him from boyhood and I was at school with him. I knew him during his studies. I have watched his course as a public man. I have known him upon the bench and I believe him to be an honorable man. Whatever may have been his faults in later years, if any, I will not speak of them—the press has spoken of them—but I say that I believe him to be an upright, honorable man, and one that I would have the most perfect confidence in were I before him in a trial in which I was personally interested. But Mr. Fraser is like other men of his class. Judges of the courts of New Brunswick, or of any other Province of Canada, or of the Supreme Court of this country, are all fallible men. It has been questioned whether, in the course of their judicial conduct, their actions may be criticised by the press of this country. I claim, Sir, as one of the members of the press of this country, that we have a right to criticise them, and I dispute the position taken up by the hon. the Minister of Justice in relation to this matter. Are we going back to a century ago and to what the law was then? Do we not know that the Parliament of England had privileges a century ago that they have not to-day, and dare not pretend to exercise to-day? Do we not know that men have been brought before the bar of the Parliament in England and have been arraigned there because of some imaginary offence against the privileges of the House of Commons of England? What is the fact to-day? Do you find men brought up there to-day and arraigned in the way they were arraigned 100 years ago, as gentlemen are trying to construe the power of the courts of this country to arraign men as they were arraigned a century ago? No, Sir, I recollect not very many years ago and my hon. friend the right hon. Premier will recollect, that one of his *protégés* insulted a prominent member who sat on the Opposition side, in the most gross and outrageous way. That man was arraigned and he was brought to the bar of this House; but it was a farce. This House while having powers recognised for centuries dare not exercise them. Do we not know that a returning officer of the Crown, a man who was charged and was known to have corruptly exercised the powers with which he was entrusted, was arraigned at that bar of the House within the recollection of many members here present, and when everybody knew he was guilty, what were the powers of the House? Did they exercise any powers over him? No, Sir; those imaginary privileges which existed a century ago dare not be exercised to-day in the Parliament of Canada. Why, then Sir, are those powers which the judges claim, this power for committing for contempt which they claimed a century ago, why should that be continued in force in the advanced and enlightened age in which we live? Whether Mr. Hawke was authorised in saying what he did say or not I do not pretend to know. My own impression is, from what I have heard to-day, that Mr. Hawke went too far in his criticisms on the bench of the country. I am frank to admit that; but, Sir, that the bench should have taken notice of them in the way they have done I do not believe. Sir, looking at the authorities which have been read on both sides of the House, I dispute the right of the court to commit any man for contempt for a transaction that occurred after the trial was over. That is the point on which I intend to speak to this House. I do not pretend that the press should have unlimited license. The press, like every other institution in this country, whether corporate or individual, is amenable to the laws of the land if it trespasses on the rights of anyone. If I, in the exercise of my rights as a journalist, assail my right hon. friend at the head of the Government, as I have done in no measured terms, and with some basis, I consider, of right and justice to the public, I am amenable for it, and he has a remedy. If, on the other hand, a

Mr. MITCHELL.

judge attempts to exercise an authority over me which I conceive he has no right to exercise, and attempts to enforce a right which authorities two or three centuries old may have given him, and which he may attempt to resuscitate into existence in the present advanced age, I will endeavor to resist him; and I wish this House to understand that as one connected with the press of this country I shall never be deterred by the revival of those old laws from criticising public officials from the highest to the lowest in the land. The gentleman who is about to leave us, Lord Lansdowne, has been amenable to criticism in the columns of the *Herald*, as my right hon. friend has been, and whoever succeeds him will be subject to the same criticism; and if it should be necessary in the public interest to criticise the judges of the highest tribunals in this country, they would find that the *Herald* would, in the face of the opinion given by the hon. Minister of Justice, deal with them, but would endeavor to deal with them within the limits of those rights which the press is entitled to exercise. Sir, I do not pretend that the press has a right to criticise in an unfair or illegitimate way the conduct of public men. I say that right should be kept within reasonable limits; but when I hear the doctrine laid down by a Minister of the Crown that after a public trial has been completed, and after gross outrages have occurred in the conduct of that trial, the press of the country is not to criticise it, but that there is a sacred class in this country, a class of people who are above and beyond criticism, then, Sir, I must distinctly dissent from that doctrine; and I hope one shall not be bound by any rules such as the hon. Minister of Justice has laid down to-night. Sir, this debate is one of a much more serious character than it may seem to a great many hon. gentlemen. We are not alone testing the question whether Mr. Hawke shall be set at liberty or not; that is a matter which is an incident, from the standpoint from which I speak. We are discussing the right of free criticism upon our public men, upon our judges, our governors and those who rule over us; and if we, at this advanced age, permit the opinion to get abroad that a court, no matter how high they may be, can muzzle the press of the country, or summarily punish them at their own sweet will, and they themselves being the judges, then all I can say is that we have retrograded and gone back to the state of things which existed two centuries ago. Sir, it is useless taking up time in discussing the matter; but I could not allow this discussion to close without entering my protest against any such doctrine. I will not deal with the question whether Mr. Hawke is guilty or not, for it has already been dealt with most amply and I think most ably by the hon. gentleman who took up the gage in this matter, and who has reflected credit upon himself for the manner in which he has put Mr. Hawke's case before the country, I must say that upon the decision which this House may arrive at to-night—whether or not it will sanction the extraordinary doctrines of the hon. Minister of Justice, and the fulsome adulation which my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Davin) has given to the Government of the day—whether it will adopt the views entertained by these gentlemen, or support the reasonable proposition put forth by the hon. member for Queen's—depends largely the extent of the freedom to which the press of this country will be entitled. Sir, the right of the press is one thing and the illimitable license of the press is another; but at this age we cannot limit the right of the press to discuss and criticise the conduct of public men, no matter whether their positions may be those of governors or ministers of state or judges; and I want to let these hon. gentlemen know that there is one man at all events in this country who will perhaps give them an opportunity of testing the question if the public interests demand it.

Mr. RYKERT. Name.

Mr. MITCHELL. You do not require me to name him ; you know who he is—one who will not hesitate to criticise them from the Chief Justice down to the lowest official. Sir, this discussion will arouse an echo throughout Canada ; and whatever may be the action of the Government in relation to the imprisonment of Mr. Hawke, whether he is granted his liberty or not, this discussion will arouse a public sentiment throughout this country ; and if the feeling of this House is against maintaining the liberty of the press and the right of free discussion, it will have an effect that some hon. gentlemen may feel at the next opportunity the public may have to deal with them.

Mr. CASEY. We have heard all sorts of arguments on this question. We have heard the legal argument advanced by the hon. gentleman who brought the matter up ; we have heard the very legal and very technical reply of the hon. Minister of Justice ; we have had the height of Irish eloquence from my hon. friend from the North-West ; and I think it is time for some one who is neither a lawyer nor an editor to have something to say on the question. It seems to me that the hon. Minister of Justice, and all the other gentlemen who have spoken on that side, have shown the highest degree of ability in avoiding the real question at issue in this case. The hon. Minister of Justice justified the proceedings of the judges, and attacked the statements contained in the alleged libels published by Mr. Hawke. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island stated clearly when he brought the matter up that he was not concerned to justify the statements of Mr. Hawke, and that he did not intend to attack the judges ; and, therefore, the matters treated of by the hon. Minister of Justice were entirely beside the question. The question is this, whether we shall allow the judges of our different courts to be prosecutors, witnesses and judges in their own case. Sir, I think the magnitude of this question fully justifies any discussion that has taken place, and would have justified even more vigorous action on the part of this House in the matter. My hon. friend from Perth pooh-poohs the question, and seems to consider that he could never be concerned in a matter of this kind. Now, it might possibly happen that even my hon. friend from Perth might have occasion to express his opinion on the action of the judge in some matter of this kind, and might very inconveniently be brought before the very man who considered himself insulted by the hon. gentleman, and who would be allowed under the law to avenge his own personal injury. I say this is a great constitutional question, and I am one of those who maintain that the action of the judge was unconstitutional, un-British, un-Canadian and outrageous, and I cannot denounce in too strong language the principle that any judge who feels himself personally aggrieved should have the right to wreak his vengeance on the offender by committing him to jail without the formality of a trial before any impartial tribunal—without taking the evidence and without having any process of law at all. This House knows that this practice, this relic of the barbarism of the middle ages, has gone out of use in England, and that in England, the home of prerogative, the home of tradition, the one country of all others where the judiciary is more respected than elsewhere, the judiciary has given up, of their own free will and pleasure, and their action has been endorsed by statute, this prerogative, which was intended in the rude middle ages to protect them from insult. If in England, that country which we call so old-fashioned, this prerogative has been given up, why should it exist in Canada ? And, coming nearer home, we find that in the United States this prerogative of commitment for contempt of court without a trial no longer exists. Why, therefore, should it exist in Canada ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Why ?

Mr. CASEY. A number of hon. gentlemen opposite ask me why, but not one of them so far has said why. The hon.

the Minister of Justice himself has not said why. He devoted himself to justifying the action of the judges in the case which Mr. Hawke criticised, and he devoted himself to picking out flaws in the criticisms of Mr. Hawke. I do not say that those criticisms are justified, but I say that the action of the judges was none the less unconstitutional, un-British and un-Canadian, and that the Government should find means to prevent such action in the future. I am not attacking the judges for their action in the matter. I have no doubt that they suppose their action was sanctioned by precedent and by the law ; but if they were correct in that opinion, I urge that it is time the law was changed. We cannot afford to have a number of petty despots established in Canada with power to imprison for any time they like all those who, they may consider, have offended or insulted them. A number of years ago, a similar case came up in Ontario, the case of the Hon. Geo. Brown, who was charged with contempt of court for certain criticisms on Judge Wilson. The House is familiar with that case. It was established, as the result of that case, that the press had the right to criticise the action of judges, and that the judges have not the arbitrary right to commit journalists for contempt of court in consequence of such criticisms. The case was argued by Mr. Brown himself, who was not a lawyer, before the judges, and they concurred in his view and dismissed the decree which called on him to show cause why he should not be committed for contempt of court. That is the constitutional view of the case ; and if the law does not bear out that view, it is the duty of the hon. Minister of Justice to see that the law is changed. Publicity is not only the sole safeguard of our liberties, but also of the dignity of the bench. Some people may suppose that the action taken by the judges in New Brunswick, showing personal resentment for a personal attack, maintains the dignity of the bench, but I hold that such action lowers the dignity of the bench. It is only by agreeing to the proposition that the standing of the bench is so high that all its actions will bear the light of publicity, and the fullest discussion in the press and elsewhere, that the dignity of the press can be maintained. The only manner in which the dignity of our judges can be maintained, in which the right of free discussion which belongs to every British subject can be secured, in which the constitutional liberties of this Empire can be carried into effect in Canada, is to provide that, apart from the mere proceedings in court in regard to which the judge must have summary power, a judge is only an individual citizen like any other, and should have his remedy in law like any other for any libel he has suffered, and should not have the arbitrary power to avenge personal insults in the way adopted in this case. I am glad the hon. member for Prince Edward Island has taken up this case. I am glad there has been this full discussion on it. But I am deeply sorry to find the Minister of Justice has chosen to look upon this question rather in the light of a party question than in the light of a judicial question. I hope that he has only taken this course on the spur of the moment, and that, after mature consideration, he will see the force and justice of the points urged by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island, and I will conclude with the hope expressed by that gentleman at the close of his speech, that the ventilation of this matter will lead the Government to see that it is their duty, as the guardians of public and personal liberty, free discussion and the dignity of the bench, to exercise the clemency of the Crown and to relieve Mr. Hawke from the penalty which, however he may have deserved it, should not have been imposed on him in this particular manner.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not at all disposed to prolong the debate. I am perfectly satisfied that the object I had in view has been obtained by our having had a free discussion upon the more salient points which belong to the case

of Mr. Hawke; and I would not have risen at all at the close of the debate, but for a remark which the hon. the Minister of Justice made, and which I think was hardly fair to myself. The hon. gentleman stated that, after making a two hours' speech—he was only an hour astray, but assuming him to be correct, it would not make much difference—I had ended with a simple motion to adjourn, and he intimated that, if I was serious, I would have made a motion of a very different character. I think that was hardly fair or generous on the part of the Minister of Justice, because he knew that it was perfectly impossible for me to make any motion other than I did make. He knows that I could not to-day have made a substantive motion embodying the views which I hold in reference to the imprisonment of Mr. Hawke. If I had waited for the next motion to go into Committee of Supply, I might have waited until next week, and, if I had moved on that, I would have been met by the Government with the charge that I was not seeking to vindicate the freedom of the press as I understood it, but simply to embarrass the Government by putting forward a motion which must be met by them as a motion of want of confidence. My object was not to catch a vote of the House of Commons, but to elicit what the real opinion of the House of Commons was in reference to the arbitrary exercise by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick of this power which they claim to possess; and I think hon. gentlemen will do me the justice to say that, in my remarks, I did not once challenge the exercise by any superior court in this Dominion of the necessary and inherent powers which are essential for the maintenance of the honor of the court or the due administration of justice. There was a statement made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that the liberty of the press was a living question once but a perfect farce now. I did not quite understand the line of his reasoning, but I may say that the Star Chamber was a living power once, but it became dead. Thanks to the efforts of the friends of British liberty, after years and years of persistent effort it became dead, but its corpse has come to life in this Dominion, and we have the member for Assiniboia, who claims to be a Liberal exulting over the resurrection of that dead corpse. That hon. gentleman says that the course of justice may be impeded by the publication of criticisms after the proceedings have ceased, and that the language used by Mr. Hawke was calculated to bring the court into contempt. I will read one sentence from the judgment of Mr. Justice Morrison in the case of *Regina vs. Wilkinson*, which I think is a complete answer to the argument of the hon. gentleman:

"Respect to courts cannot be compelled. It is the voluntary tribute of the public to worth, virtue and intelligence, and while they are found on the judgment seat, so long and no longer will they retain the public confidence."

The member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) may believe that the dungeon and the jail of Fredericton, and the imprisonment in the jail of those who dare to criticise the judgments of the courts, will compel respect and obedience from the general public of Canada, but he will learn in a short time that the late Mr. Justice Morrison had a truer appreciation of what constitutes worth, intelligence and virtue, and what will best command the respect of the public. There was also an argument used as to what I said in regard to the hardship of Mr. Hawke's case, and the Minister of Justice said that, Mr. Hawke had his remedies. Well, what remedy has he? The Minister of Justice says he has the remedy of an application for a writ of *habeas corpus* to the Supreme Court of Canada. I am so perfectly satisfied with the reply of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) to that statement, that I will not even attempt to summarise it. He answered that proposition perfectly, but I will call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the case which he must well know, of Stockdale and Hansard. He will remember that the House of Commons caused the sheriffs

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

of London to be imprisoned for contempt of their honorable body, because they had, pursuant to the writ of the Court of King's Bench, seized the goods of the Reporter Hansard convicted of libel. The sheriffs were committed to the Tower for that contempt, and when they were brought up before the judges of the land, under a writ of *habeas corpus*, what did the judges say? They were acquainted with all the facts, they believed they were improperly imprisoned, but they said they could not go beyond the terms of the warrant. According to the terms of the warrant they were properly imprisoned, and the judges said they could not go behind the warrant. As it appeared that they had been imprisoned by the House of Commons for contempt, the judges stated that they could not on *habeas corpus* enquire into the facts which, in the opinion of the Commons, constituted contempt but were bound by the recitals in the warrant, and as the warrant was good on its face they could not release the prisoner. It would be the same thing if Mr. Hawke were to be so ill-advised as to sue out a writ of *habeas corpus* and to come here. He would find that the reason for his commitment is stated on the face of the warrant to be simply a contempt of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick. The judges would find that the jailer held him by virtue of a warrant from the Supreme Court of New Brunswick charging him with being guilty of contempt of court, and the Supreme Court of Canada would be powerless to release him, just as the Court of Queen's Bench was powerless to release the sheriffs of Middlesex when they were imprisoned for an alleged contempt of the House of Commons. It may be that this warrant has been altogether illegally issued, that the grounds could not be justified, but they cannot be enquired into, the judges are helpless, they are bound by the warrant, and they would have to remit Mr. Hawke to prison. If they had the power by *certiorari* to bring up all the proceedings under which that warrant issued, they might be able to enquire whether the warrant was legal or not, but they have no such power, and, unless the clemency of the Crown is exercised, there is no other power in this country by which Mr. Hawke can be released. The hon. gentleman asks if it will be argued that the Crown has power to interfere? I doubt very much the power of the Crown to interfere, but I remember the precedent which the hon. gentleman has set, and I know what a stickler he is for precedent and how carefully he must have enquired into all the authorities before he determined, as Minister of Justice, to exercise his power and release the prisoners who were imprisoned by the judges in Calgary. If he had the power in Calgary, I came to the conclusion that he must have the same power in New Brunswick. If Justice Travis imprisoned men improperly in Calgary, in the opinion of the Minister of Justice, and the Minister had power to review that decision, and did so, and released these men at Calgary, he must have the same power in New Brunswick, and I knew that the hon. gentleman could not be charged with exercising that power from political motives. At all events, I hoped not. I hoped that, in matters connected with the administration of justice, the hon. gentleman would carry out in the Department of Justice the traditions which he learned when he was on the bench of Nova Scotia, and I ventured to assume that, when he exercised the power vested in him in regard to these men in Calgary, he would exercise the same power in New Brunswick if he came to the conclusion that that man was improperly imprisoned. The only question, therefore, is whether he considers that he was improperly imprisoned, because, having taken the power in one case, I am sure that, if I have convinced him that this man is improperly imprisoned, he would exercise it in the other. Sir, I regret to say there is just a suspicion of party politics in this matter. I will not charge my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), nor will I charge some other hon.

gentlemen opposite with entertaining such strong party views as would prevent them from doing justice. I think I do not go beyond the truth when I say that in their secret hearts they are glad that Mr. Hawke is imprisoned, because he reflected upon a judge whose actions resulted in preventing the Westmoreland case from being tried. That I believe, whether right or wrong, and I gave my reasons for so believing it in the afternoon, and I have not seen any reasons yet for retracting one of them.

Mr. HESSON. It was party views that induced you to bring this matter up. If it had been a Conservative who had written these articles you would never have found fault.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is an old and homely maxim that a man generally measures his corn by his own bushel. The hon. gentleman makes that charge against me, but I would like to know from him whether he could gather from anything I said to-day that I was actuated by political motives. I refrained expressly from introducing politics in the matter. The hon. gentleman knows—and if he does not, those who sit to the right of him can tell him—that I could have imported politics into this question, and personal matters, and matters of an acrimonious character, reflecting severely upon many gentlemen who occupy high positions in New Brunswick. I refrained from doing so because I wanted the great principle which underlay this case to be fairly discussed by this House apart from party politics altogether. If the courts of this land have power arbitrarily and summarily to imprison without the interference of a judge, anybody who comments upon their conduct, if they have power to determine when those comments go beyond just criticism and when they do not, and if this House of Commons is prepared to endorse the action of those courts, I am anxious, as a Liberal, to know it. I will dissent, and as far as my humble voice goes, I shall continue to raise it in protest against that old Tory and accursed doctrine. I hope and believe better things of the House of Commons. I believe to-day that if there is a sentiment evoked on behalf of the exercise of this power by the judges of the court of New Brunswick, it has been because party politics have been brought in to back up that sentiment, and not because they believe in the doctrine itself. Sir, we do not hear the Premier or any other leading member of the Government, outside of the Minister of Justice—who made an argument from a purely legal standpoint endorsing the sentiments which some hon. members on the back benches are prepared to cheer, and which the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) enunciated here, sentiments which were invoked by the Tory members of the House of Commons a hundred years ago, but which it was thought their descendants are now ashamed of. I have only a word to say in reference to the authority by which the Minister of Justice attempted to justify the position he took, the case of Dwyer Gray. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman could not have cited an authority stronger in favor of the position I have taken. The position I took was this: that comments are improper which were calculated to interfere with the proper administration of justice. In the case of Dwyer Gray, he was the publisher of a newspaper in Dublin, and he published comments reflecting severely upon the verdict of a jury at a commission held by Mr. Justice Lawson. Mr. Justice Lawson held a court, under a special commission, to try a certain number of cases, and he had on his jury Catholics and Protestants. One case was tried, and a verdict was given convicting the prisoner. Mr. Dwyer Gray came out with an article in his paper condemning most strongly the action of the jury. His language, was held to be intimidation of the worst kind, and so severe that unless it was punished summarily, the administration of justice during the existence of that commission would be paralysed, and no other verdict possibly be obtained. The court

held that unless they were ready to consent to this paralysis in the administration of justice, they must step in, in vindication of their own rights, and assert the right of the court to punish the man who attempted to paralyse justice by the publication of articles intended to intimidate the jurors from giving a verdict. Sir, that case came within the very exception that I contended for in the proposition that I submitted to the House, namely, that comments which are calculated to impede or prevent the administration of justice in the courts of the land are comments which come within the rule of law by which the courts are enabled, by their own inherent powers, to inflict summary punishment. Those powers are inherent for one object alone, for the administration of justice, and to secure the administration of justice from being improperly obstructed. I think there never was a case cited in this House which could bear out more strongly the position I took, than the case of Dwyer Gray, and the reason which Mr. Justice Lawson gave for deciding it as he did. What does he say?

"I see perfectly well that the design of all these articles is one—it was to endeavor to destroy in the public mind the moral effect of this conviction; that was the object and nothing else, and to interfere with the trial of the subsequent cases, and to prevent juries from bringing to the discharge of their duties that free, that unfettered judgment, that judgment free from alarm and trepidation which every man should have when he comes to discharge this duty."

Mr. Dwyer Gray was guilty of that offence, he had been convicted, and although it was contended in the House of Commons that his arrest and imprisonment were a breach of the privileges of the House, nobody ever contended that the judge exceeded his duty, because everybody agreed that the articles were intended and calculated to intimidate the jury and prevent justice from being administered. But is there a man in this House who would dare to rise in his place and say that any one of the articles published by Mr. Hawke could possibly have the effect of impeding the administration of justice in New Brunswick? Sir, the election trial was closed, the Supreme Court of New Brunswick had adjourned, no other election trial was going on when these criticisms were passed, there was no similar case before the court, and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot argue that the criticism of which they complain was calculated to impair or impede the administration of justice in that Province. Not being so calculated it did not come within the summary power of the court to punish. I repeat now the proposition with which I started out in the early part of the evening, that in attempting to exercise that summary power, and punish a man without the interference of a jury, for having made a comment upon their judgment in that election case, after the election court had closed, after the Supreme Court itself had closed, and five months, mark you, after the proceedings were over, the judges were usurping a jurisdiction to justify which a precedent cannot be found, either in the laws of the old country of England, or in any of our colonies.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 11th May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PETITION AGAINST MR. CHOQUETTE, M.P.

Petition from Philippe Landry and others, praying that Philippe Auguste Choquette, Esq., member for the electoral

division of Montmagny, be declared an unfit and improper person to represent the said electoral division, and disqualified to sit in this House—being read,

Mr. LAURIER. I intend to object to the reception of that petition from Philippe Landry and others, but I do not see the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) in his seat.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The motion for the reception of the petition can stand over till another day.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 126) to amend chapter 124 of the Revised Statutes, respecting insurance. He said: This Bill is simply to put the insurance companies incorporated in any of the Provinces of the Dominion on the same footing as insurance companies incorporated in the United States; that is, they are allowed, by making a certain deposit with the Government of Canada, to do business in fire and life insurance. As the law at present stands, companies incorporated in the Province, after making the deposit required by the Government as security, have not the power to do business except in life insurance. This Bill is to extend their business to fire insurance, the same as is done by American companies.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is optional?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, of course. It simply enables the Government to receive their deposit, and give them power to do business.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DEPOSITS IN GOVERNMENT SAVINGS BANKS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 127) relating to the interest payable on deposits in the Post Office and Government Savings Banks. He said: The object of this Bill is to enable the Government to reduce the rate of interest we are now paying, under the statute, to depositors in the savings banks, if the Government think the condition of the country should require it; that is to say, it is to enable the Government to regulate the interest and to pay a lower rate than is paid at present, if they find that the terms upon which money can be obtained from abroad, do not warrant the payment of so high a rate as we pay at present.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Would it not be better to abolish that Act altogether, and allow the Government power, from time to time, to act?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is just what this Bill is. It is an enabling Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That on every Monday, for the rest of the Session, Government measures shall have precedence after Questions.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider resolutions (p. 1001) respecting a loan to be granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway. He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move these resolutions I am glad to know that the subject-matter is so familiar to every hon. member on both sides of this House as to render it unnecessary at this late period of the Session that I should detain the House long in referring specifically to what these resolutions contain. The House is aware that

MR. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

when this Government came into power in 1878 they found the Government of the country committed to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway as a Government work, and having taken such measures as they were enabled to do from time to time with the object of furthering that great work, they came to the conclusion that it would be very desirable if the proposal that had been made by their predecessors when they published advertisements asking for tenders for the construction of this great work, the proposal to transfer this great work to the hands of a private company, should be adopted; and in 1880 my right hon. friend the First Minister, the present Minister of Railways and Canals, (Mr. Pope) and myself were deputed by the Government to go to London for the purpose of ascertaining if it would be possible to obtain a company to take up the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The object of our mission, as the House knows, was no secret, it was publicly stated everywhere both in this country and in England that that was the object of our mission to London, and we spent a very considerable time in endeavoring to ascertain if we could obtain the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway through the agency of a company. We were in communication with a large number of capitalists, notably the president of the Grand Trunk Railway, upon this subject; we were in communication with other capitalists who had their attention attracted to the object of our mission, and we had an opportunity of discussing exhaustively with various capitalists the terms upon which it was possible to obtain the construction of that great work. I need not say that the result of those negotiations was to arrange with what was then known as the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate for the construction of the railway. The contract, which was subsequently adopted by this House, contained a clause which says that:

"For twenty years from the date hereof no line of railway"—

That is, from the date of the contract—

—"shall be authorised by the Dominion Parliament to be constructed south of the Canadian Pacific Railway from any point at or on the Canadian Pacific Railway, except such line as shall be run south-west or to the westward of south-west nearer than within fifteen miles of latitude 49; and in the establishment of any new province in the North-West Territory provision should be made for continuing such prohibition after such establishment until the expiration of the said period."

I have no hesitation in saying that without that condition we would have been obliged to return as we went, without being able to make any contract whatever with anybody for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was known that the country through which that line of railway, involving as it did an enormous expenditure for its construction, was to a great extent unsettled, and that, in fact, the country would require almost to be created as the line was constructed; and attaching the importance that we attach to the great object of securing the construction of that line of railway which would bind the various provinces of which Canada was composed together and render a real as well as a nominal union and confederation, we had no hesitation at all in binding ourselves to this clause, which under other and different circumstances would perhaps be regarded as very objectionable. The policy contained in that clause, I need not remind hon. gentlemen opposite, was the same policy that was pursued by our friends on the other side of the House when they were on the Treasury benches; that is to say, to endeavor to adopt such measures as would prevent the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway so constructed from being drawn out of the country instead of being made subservient to the development and progress of our own country. I need not detain the House by going through the long history of antagonism to the policy contained in this clause, the excitement that was raised in connection with it; and I do not intend to raise the question which has been raised and which has been pressed, that inasmuch as we declared that the

Dominion Parliament should not authorise the construction of the lines, the Government, clothed with the power of Parliament, assenting to the construction of lines in the established provinces, was open to question as to how far it was embraced in the terms of that clause. I do not propose to raise that question, because it is not necessary for the consideration of the subject. The House will remember, however, that a great deal of agitation having taken place in regard to the monopoly which is embodied in this clause, in 1884, when asking Parliament for a loan of \$30,000,000 additional to what had been granted by the contract made by Parliament with the Canadian Pacific Railway, I accompanied that application to Parliament by a statement that the Government hoped, and the Canadian Pacific Railway hoped, that by the time the line was completed north of Lake Superior, they would find themselves in a position to warrant abandoning the policy of disallowance which had prevented the construction of the proposed lines of railway tapping the Canadian Pacific Railway and running to the American frontier on the south. I made that statement to the House in all candor; I fully believed, I fully expected that it would be realised, and that neither in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway nor in the interests of the Government would it be necessary for the Government long to adhere to the policy originally proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, and which we had adopted as a sound, reasonable and justifiable policy. But, as I stated to the House a year ago when this was under discussion, and when the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) moved a resolution upon this subject, I drew the attention of the House to some very important circumstances that had occurred between the time when I made my statement to the House in 1884, and the condition in which we found ourselves in 1887. I do not intend to waste the time of this House by going into the question as to how far the Government is bound by the policy it announces at one time and under one set of circumstances, to adhere to that policy at another time, and under other circumstances. I hold that true statesmanship requires the Government of the country, to meet the circumstances in relation to every question of great public importance under and in connection with the existing state of things; and if a different policy is demanded, and a different course of action required by the changed state of things in the country, I say that a Government would be unworthy of their position, and would not discharge their duty to the country, which did not take into consideration the changed circumstances under which the same question of public policy had to be viewed and treated. I drew the attention of the House to the fact that we had been all disappointed, and especially had the Government and gentlemen on this side of the House been disappointed, in relation to the development of Manitoba and of the great North-West. I drew the attention of the House to the fact that we had had three, I am happy to say, abnormally bad seasons, and I believe there is no reason to doubt that the reassuring condition of things witnessed last season, will be found to be the normal condition of the seasons in the North-West. We had, unfortunately for Canada, for the Canadian Pacific Railway and everybody concerned, and especially unfortunate for the people who have gone into that country, we had those three abnormally bad seasons. In addition to that there had been no doubt a want of acquaintance, on the part of strangers going into the country, as to the best mode of meeting difficulties of that kind, and a want of experience which led no doubt to those bad seasons having a much more injurious effect than they would have had if parties starting in that country had known as much then as they know now, as to the best means of counteracting and avoiding those difficulties; an acquaintance which would have told them that early seeding was necessary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And good seed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, as my right hon. friend mentions, and good seed, too. In addition to those difficulties we had that which was unexpected. No person in 1884 had certainly the slightest possible reason to anticipate the outbreak which occurred—that disastrous, and unfortunate and lamentable outbreak, which occurred in the interim after 1884, when we had expressed the hopes as to the position we would find ourselves in on the completion of the line north of Lake Superior, and which outbreak had a most disastrous effect upon the settlement of the country, as every person can well understand. Under those circumstances we were obliged to reconsider the hopes we had expressed. We found ourselves in the position, that without sufficient traffic to maintain the Canadian Pacific Railway, without such a settlement and without such a return from the crop in the country as to furnish traffic for that road; we found ourselves in the position, that obliged us to hesitate, in the adoption of the abandonment of the policy that was intended to keep the traffic of our country upon our national line of railway. Under those circumstances we were compelled to ask the House to pause. We are compelled to ask the House not to oblige us to carry out what had been our confident expectation in 1884, but to allow that policy that had been continued up to that time, to be continued for a longer period and for the reasons I have stated. We asked this in what we believed to be the interests of the people of Canada as a whole, as well as the interests of that company who had undertaken and carried out so rapidly the completion of that great work. I may say, in passing, that those expectations which we held out to the House in 1884, have been given great importance to, because they were statements made in connection with an application to Parliament for a loan of \$30,000,000 additional assistance to the Canadian Pacific Railway, in order that they might carry rapidly to completion that great work. I may remind the House that hon. gentlemen opposite told me, that if I would call that a gift, instead of a loan, I would be treating the House much more ingenuously than I was, and that I perfectly understood, and that the Government of the country understood that so far as that loan was concerned, not a dollar would ever be returned; that it would pass into the same category as the loan made many years ago to the Grand Trunk Railway, and of which never a dollar had been realised or returned to the treasury of the country. I have no hesitation in saying that the rapid completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway—suppose that loan had been a gift, suppose we had never received a single dollar of that money—I have no hesitation in saying that upon that eventful occasion of the disastrous outbreak in the North-West, on account of the rapid manner in which that work had been pushed forward, and above anything the contract obliged them to do, the country received full value for every dollar of that \$30,000,000. Had it not been for the completion of that contract, not only would the disaster have been infinitely greater, but the additional cost to this country would have fully equalled the entire amount of that appropriation. I mention that, merely in passing, to remind the House of the position in which we stood. The House is aware that shortly after the Canadian Pacific Railway returned \$20,000,000 of that loan in cash to the Government, and that we were paid the other \$10,000,000 by taking land at \$1.50 per acre; which hon. gentlemen opposite estimated, and had very good ground for estimating, to be absolutely worth from \$3 to \$5 an acre. So that we see that claim was entirely extinguished. I am happy to say that we find ourselves able to reconsider our policy this year; just as we were obliged to reconsider our policy a year ago; just as we were obliged to reconsider the expectations we held out to Parliament and to the country as

to what we would be enabled to do in the abandonment of the policy of disallowance, and the permission of those railways that were so much desired to be constructed by the people of Manitoba. Just as a year ago we were obliged to reconsider our policy, and to a certain extent change it in the light of the changed circumstances that had occurred after that policy was propounded, I am happy to say we find ourselves to-day in a position again to reconsider our policy of last year, and for the same reason, but in a very different direction. Every hon. gentleman in this House knows now that instead of the Canadian Pacific Railway not having, by the want of settlement of that country and the growth of crops in that country, the means of being furnished with traffic; every person knows, and every person is delighted to know, no matter on what side of this House he may sit, that a return of the normal good seasons in that country have shown that its fertility has never been exaggerated, and that it certainly surpasses in its fertility of soil, and in its climate and its attributes as the great remaining granary of the world, all that which was claimed for it. That country to-day occupies a position that enables us to rest with the most unqualified confidence, upon its enormous resources, as the great remaining, and unoccupied grain field of the world. I may draw the attention of the House to this as it is a very important point, and as it has had the most vital bearing upon the position of the Government in relation to this question. The best and most reliable estimate I can obtain of the crop of 1887, showing the total crop and the number of bushels for export in the Provinces of Manitoba and Assiniboia, is as follows:—

	Total crop. Bushels.	For export. Bushels.
Wheat.....	12,860,000	10,613,000
Barley.....	2,263,000	1,130,000
Oats.....	3,780,000	2,890,000
Flax.....	180,000	150,000
Totals.....	19,083,000	14,783,000

The crop for export, independent of all requirements for the consumption of the country, amounted to no less than 14,783,000 bushels, which had to be forwarded by the railway. From the commencement of the movement of the crop of 1887, up to the 29th of April, 1888, there have been moved east from Winnipeg 6,887,000 bushels of wheat, and flour equivalent to 737,870 bushels more, or no less than 7,624,870 bushels of wheat or its equivalent carried east by the Canadian Pacific Railway from Manitoba and Assiniboia. Now, Sir, I need not tell the House that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, instead of being in a position to say that the country did not provide traffic enough for the line, stand in this position, that all their resources—and every person knows the extensiveness of their rolling stock—their elevators and other means of traffic have been entirely unable to deal with this immense traffic. Every member of the House can see that if the company had sufficient elevator capacity at Fort William or at Port Arthur, the trains could bring the crop forward and deposit it in those elevators and return; whereas if they were obliged, after the capacity of the elevators was exhausted, to go down a thousand miles further in order to reach means of storing the grain in elevators by the sea, the time expended in bringing the cars back would be such as to entirely disable them from handling the crop, as they would otherwise be able to do. But, Sir, as I said before, this fact has entirely changed the whole position of the question. I need not say that, from the first moment this was seen, our friends in this House—I will not say our friends only, but all the members from Manitoba and the North-West Territories, including the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), brought all the pressure possible upon the Government in connection with this question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

They declared, one and all, with one common voice from the first, that this great crop showed the inability of the Canadian Pacific Railway to handle the traffic, and brought forward that fact as an unanswerable evidence that the time had passed when it could be claimed that the country should be prevented from having other means of communication in order to handle the enormous crop that was already produced, and in order to provide for that which every person knows, in the nature of things, must in the future be demanded in that country. The fact that 16,000 farmers, all told, have been able to raise for export, over and above the entire consumption of the country last year, nearly 15,000,000 bushels of grain, principally of wheat, but also including barley which is known to be of the highest character, and oats which I believe will compare favorably with those of any other part of the world, shows the adaptability of the soil and climate for grain growing; and the moment that is known, everyone must see what a rapid development in that country must ensue, how capital and agricultural skill must be attracted, not only from the older Provinces, where the men best able to cope with the difficulties of a new country like the North-West come from, but from all parts of the world; and this must result in an enormously increased demand for the means of traffic. While on that subject, after having stated what last season has produced, I am sure the House will bear with me, if I give them the best evidence that can be obtained of the prospects of the crop for the present season. This is a telegram received three or four days ago from Winnipeg:

"Winnipeg, Man.:—The farmers throughout the Canadian North-West have no reason for sharing the feeling of despondency that prevails throughout Minnesota and Dakota owing to the unfavorable condition of the weather and backwardness of the season for seeding purposes, as following detailed reports will show:

"Carberry:—Seeding going on rapidly. Wheat about done and if present fine weather continues few days later all seeding will be completed.

"Battleford:—Weather very warm, thermometer 92 degrees in shade. Farming operations about completed. Wheat on many farms up. Every prospect for best harvest in years.

"Edmonton:—Seeding about finished and some field grain up. Farmers jubilant over prospects and sowing heavily. Weather very warm.

"Brandon, Man.:—Weather most favorable and farmers taking every advantage of it, thousands of acres being seeded each day. Wheat seeding nearly completed. A large quantity of wheat is above ground.

"Emerson:—Seeding operations in this vicinity progressing very favorably. Wheat is about all sown and up in some localities. Farmers report the land very dry, and warm rain would be beneficial just now. Prospects good.

"Glenboro', Man.:—Farmers are very busy seeding. The fine weather of the last few days has put them in excellent spirits. There will be about one-third more acreage under cultivation this year than last. Prospects, as far as can judge, seem very good. Wheat in many places already through ground. About two-thirds of seeding already finished.

"Moosomin, N.W.T.:—Seeding in this vicinity about completed. A few have some oats yet to sow but majority have finished, and general feeling is that there will be bountiful harvest. The seed bed has never been in better condition. Wheat fields are looking green, and all vegetation is rapid.

"Qu'Appelle, N.W.T.:—Farmers in this vicinity have finished sowing wheat and oats, and barley seeding under way. Roots will be put in about the 20th.

"Regina, N.W.T.—Seeding all done in Regina district. About twenty-five thousand acres seeding wheat, principally up, and looking well. Vegetation growing finely. Farmers are in good spirits, and looking forward to a bountiful harvest.

"Portage la Prairie, Man.:—Seeding progressing finely, and rapidly nearing completion. Wheat seeding finished, and farmers are now busily engaged in putting in their oats and barley. The present warm weather is favorable for vegetation, and many fields are already presenting quite a green appearance. The acreage will fully be one-third over that of last year.

"Morden, Man.:—Seeding is well advanced. Fully one-third area more under crop this year than last."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are these despatches all of the same date?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They all came three days ago from the different points. They are about the same date—I would not say to a day. I do not think it will be

necessary for me to say more as to the fact that when the Government pressed upon the House last year our reasons for hesitating to carry out our original hopes and expectations in regard to disallowance, we felt it was a question on which the advocates for the discontinuance of the disallowance policy had very powerful and irresistible standing ground; and, under these circumstances, we felt obliged to give immediate attention to the changed condition in which this question presented itself,—a position changed in every possible respect from the position of the country when we stood here a year ago, when we were obliged, as matters then stood, to hesitate in the adoption of the policy that was so earnestly demanded by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. Well, under these circumstances, we naturally opened up negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It may be said that we could have dealt with the Province of Manitoba, without regard to the wishes or feelings of that company. I have already said that I do not intend, for a single moment, to enter into a discussion of that question. It is a question upon which lawyers, and very eminent lawyers, hold different opinions; and because I have not the advantage of being a lawyer, I may be excused for saying that where lawyers differ on a question of that kind—and lawyers of high standing and character, as I happen to know, do differ on it—it is best if you possibly can, to avoid the contingency of these legal issues being raised and tried. Now, there was another point made, and that was that we were perfectly aware that at that moment we changed our attitude in regard to disallowance of the construction of railways in the Province of Manitoba, this would become a fair question in the great North-West, and that we would be charged with doing for Manitoba what we were denying to the settlers who, under still greater difficulties, were going out building up the North-West and making it productive. We were perfectly aware that that question would be raised in all its intensity, and that, in fact, it was of great importance to have at once a complete settlement and disposal of the whole of this agitation and of the whole of this question in connection with it, by obtaining, if we could, by an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the abandonment of that clause of the contract which the Government were compelled to make, giving them that twenty years monopoly, in order to get the road constructed at all. I need not tell the House that we were agreeably surprised when we came to negotiate that question with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to find that they were extremely anxious this question should be disposed of at once and forever, because it was of vital importance to them that Manitoba and the North-West Territories should be settled up as rapidly as possible, and no person had so deep an interest in the development of that country as the Canadian Pacific Railway has. They knew how the country suffered; they knew how settlement was retarded by the agitation and the hue-and-cry passed all over the world that there was a gigantic monopoly there which prevented the development of that country and imposed great difficulties in the way of its settlement. I need not tell the House how entirely I disagree as regards the exaggerated statements that have been made on that subject, and how greatly I think the difficulties connected with that question have been exaggerated. But we have to deal with things, not as they ought to be, but as they are; and the Canadian Pacific Railway find themselves precisely in the same position, that they have to look at the question as it stands, and not at the question in the attitude and position they would desire it should occupy. What they stated to us was this: Feeling the importance of this question being settled, we are prepared to have this monopoly disposed of at once and forever, and to meet any competition that can be brought into the country, and further to give abundant security, security so ample as to

remove the slightest possibility of doubt of the Government of Canada ever being called upon to contribute one dollar in relation to this question, if the Government of Canada will lend us their credit in such a way as to enable us to obtain upon our land grant the means of putting our road in a complete condition, the means of furnishing the necessary elevators and providing the necessary rolling stock to handle the crop. Now, the Government were very glad to find that they could settle this question upon terms that, I have no hesitation in saying, have been received by the people of this country, from one end to the other, with feelings of the most profound satisfaction. I have no hesitation in saying that we are indebted, no doubt very largely, to our friends opposite and to the newspapers representing their views, for that condition of things. These gentlemen and the newspapers opposed to the Government, held out to the people the assertion that we had fastened this gigantic monopoly upon the country, and that we would be compelled to buy it out by the actual payment of a very large sum of public money, and consequently—and I have no doubt that the opinion was honestly entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite and by the press opposed to the Government—they believed looking at the importance of that clause, looking at the fact that it had been a prime factor in obtaining the contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company not only felt that they held a very strong and powerful influence in order to induce the payment to them by the Government of a large sum of money, but felt that the abandonment of that monopoly was worth to the country a very large sum of money, and that consequently, as companies are not likely to part with anything they own without a *quid pro quo* they would compel us to pay a very large sum to at once sweep away and forever remove this monopoly which formed a part of this contract. After discussion, we found that, by giving a guarantee for fifty years for the payment of the interest on the Canadian Pacific Railway land grant bonds at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on \$15,000,000, we could obtain the consent of the company to take this clause out of the contract, and leave that country free and open to railway operations from any source whatever, and so entirely remove the whole difficulty connected with the question of monopoly. Then it came to be a question of what security they were prepared to give and how far their statement was well founded that not a particle of responsibility would rest upon the Government; that, while the credit of the Government for the interest on the bonds would enable them to go to the money market of the world and obtain this money upon infinitely more favorable terms than they otherwise could obtain it, the security being ample, it would furnish them, without imposing any responsibility on us whatever, with the means of putting their road and the entire system connected with their road in such a condition of efficiency as would enable them rapidly to develop that country and to compete with anybody in connection with this matter. The Government felt that Canada had a very vital interest in the expenditure of that money; that is to say, that the ground we have taken and the action we have taken has been inspired by the conviction that we owed it to Canada, after having expended such an enormous amount of public money to adopt means by which the traffic of that road would be brought down to the sea through our own country and would not be used to enrich the railway line and the ports of another country. We believe now that we have a vital interest, that the Government and the Parliament and the people of Canada have a vital interest in the Canadian Pacific Railway obtaining the means by which they will be able to hold Canadian traffic on Canadian lines and bring it down to the great ports in our own country, instead of its going down to the seaboard of the United

States of America. It is fair and legitimate competition, and we believe that we would be warranted in contributing towards an expenditure which would secure objects so important to the trade and to the development of an enormously large section of Canada. We have gone carefully into this question. The amount of interest which is involved is \$525,000 a year to pay 3½ per cent. interest for fifty years. What is the security upon which this is based? That security is on the land still owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I may remind the House that the question of the value of these lands is not a new question in this House, it has been discussed again and again. When we gave a grant of 25,000,000 acres of these lands to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, hon. gentlemen opposite, in showing what an enormous subsidy we were giving to that company, undertook to place an estimate on the actual value of those lands, and the House subsequently deliberately passed an Act authorising the company to issue bonds to the extent of \$2 an acre, and I remember the then leader of the Opposition referring to my modest estimate of \$2 an acre as the value of those lands, as that "miserable \$2 an acre." It was so utterly below and beneath the estimation of himself and of other hon. gentlemen opposite of what these lands were worth; and the hon. gentleman, I am bound to say, made a very powerful argument at that time in showing that that estimate of \$2 an acre was a most miserable estimate and was very much below the mark. He took the adjoining country; he took Dakota and Minnesota, which are similarly situated, which are lying alongside our North-West, where the lands, and the climate, and everything else give a comparison in our favor as against theirs, and he showed what those lands had brought, and that, at no distant date, our lands in the North-West would become very valuable, and therefore he considered \$2 an acre a most miserable estimate. Well, we had the good fortune to buy back 7,000,000 acres of lands at the still more miserable price of \$1.50 an acre, and thus we did two things—we reduced the monopoly which we all felt to be objectionable in regard to the 25,000,000 acres, and we brought the percentage of value very much down by purchasing, as we had the good fortune to do, 7,000,000 acres from the company at that reduced figure.

Mr. CHARLTON. Do you not think they would sell you the rest at the same price?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will get his answer in a few moments, when I show that the average price received by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for all the lands they have sold has been over \$3 an acre. The hon. gentlemen on that side had a good deal of reason to say that their estimate was not a very extravagant one on the information they had. The hon. member knows that the original land grant was 25,000,000 acres. Up to the 31st December last, there had been sold, of that 25,000,000 acres, 3,272,749 acres, at an average price, per acre, of \$3.12. The number of acres sold to the Government for \$10,000,000 was 6,793,014, so that the number of acres left is 14,934,237, which will be encumbered, that is including the fifteen millions about to be issued if these proposals receive the sanction of the House, deducting the \$1,200,000 unpaid purchase money on accomplished sales from the amount of the land grant bonds in the hands of the public, to the extent of \$17,271,000. So the average charge is not more than \$1.15 per acre.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What did the hon. gentleman say was the amount of the bonds involved in this?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As I have already stated, the House has already enabled the company to issue bonds to the extent of \$2 per acre upon the whole 25,000,000 acres, and the outstanding land grant bonds in the hands of the public amount to \$3,463,000. From that you must deduct the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

amount due on sales of land already made, \$1,200,000, leaving a charge of \$2,263,000 in addition to the \$15,000,000 which we hold, which makes our charge \$17,263,000, which is less than \$1.15 per acre on the lands still unsold. That is irrespective of the \$1,000,000 of land grant bonds held by the Government of Canada as security, upon which there is no interest. We do not take that into account, because there is no interest payable upon that, and it is the property of the company. In reference to the question of security, I may say that this Parliament has deliberately pledged itself to the monetary public as to the value of these lands at \$2 per acre, because, if these lands were not worth \$2 an acre it was a great wrong for Parliament to authorise the emission by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of \$50,000,000 of land grant bonds upon the 25,000,000 acres. In addition to that, we have the fact that the sales of between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000 of acres have averaged \$3.12 per acre. We have another important fact in connection with this, and everyone who knows anything of the construction of railways through these prairie countries is aware of it, that in almost all cases in the first instance the construction of railways upon land grant bonds has failed. Take for instance the most notable case, which is known to every member of this House, the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway. They undertook, with a very large grant, to construct a road there, and the result was that the Government free lands came into competition with the railway lands, and they could not sell their lands, and they broke down and utterly failed. I need not tell the House that Sir George Stephen, Sir Donald A. Smith, Mr. James Hill, the present president of that company, and a number of influential capitalists, went in and bought up the securities for a song of the railway that had failed, and made immense fortunes out of the sale of these very same lands. And why? Because the moment the Government lands were occupied as our Government lands are being occupied now, by free settlers, the moment these free lands were disposed of—every settler that was brought into the country went upon a free grant, and increased enormously the value of it for two reasons: first, they placed it out of the power of other people to come in along this line of railway and get land upon the same terms; and, secondly, because they created a settlement, and thereby gave a greatly enhanced value to the land. As I say, enormous fortunes were made by these gentlemen to whom I have referred, in connection with the enterprise, and that is the best possible illustration of the fact that you cannot construct railways by land grant bonds that are interspersed like these, for the House knows that every acre of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's lands, every square mile, was intersected by a Government section. What is the result? Why, Sir, they have been wise in their generation, and they found that it was impossible to compete with us and our free grants, and they have directed all their energy to advertising the free grant lands of the Government, and getting them taken up, in order to enhance the value of the lands which they hold. As these lands now are, to a great extent, occupied by free settlers, and are adjacent to the railway lands of the company upon which it is proposed to place a mortgage equal to \$1.15 per acre, they will be enormously enhanced in value, and the sales in future will be infinitely more rapid than in the past. I ask the House, under these circumstances, if there is a gentleman here, if there is an intelligent man in this country, that does not believe that, inasmuch as every dollar that is received for the sale of this 15,000,000 acres, in round numbers, of land, that still remains the property of the company, as every dollar of that money goes into the treasury of Canada, until the amount of \$15,000,000, which covers the mortgage, is provided—I ask if there is any intelligent man in this country who doubts that at no distant day they will be in

a position entirely to wipe out this mortgage and leave the money upon which we have guaranteed interest, in our hands, at, as I have said, at a cost to the country of the interest which we will then be called upon to pay at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.? No person can question that the basis of security is undoubted, that the amount with which these lands will be chargeable, \$17,000,000, with the land at \$1.15 per acre, will be ample security for the payment of the principal, and we are taking care that the bondholders, that the persons who invest their money, shall have security for the payment of their principal, by the fact that every dollar received for the land shall be deposited with the Government under the control of trustees, of whom a member of the Government will be one, for the purpose of extinguishing the claim; therefore, I think no person can doubt that the principal is perfectly safe. Now, what about the liability for interest? We now come to a question that, I think, will admit of being demonstrated with as much clearness and as much ease as anything else. The Canadian Pacific Railway has surpassed all expectation as to the net returns that it has received; the enormous volume of traffic that has been created. Everybody knows that a vast extent of that line passed, at the time that contract was made, through an unpeopled desert, everybody knows that there was no town on the Pacific coast of any magnitude. Almost the entire line passed through such a country that I remember well my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when dealing with our original proposition to construct that railway in ten years, after looking at it in the light of all the sagacity that he possessed, and after looking at it in the light of all information that he possessed as Minister of Public Works, the hon. gentleman declared, in his place here, that all the resources of the British Empire could not build that road in ten years. Sir, why did he make that statement? He made the statement because it commended itself to the judgment of the great body of the people in this country, and he made it on the ground of the absence of population, on the ground of the enormous engineering difficulties, and above all because of the inaccessibility of that country in dealing with the engineering difficulties, and also because the country was unpeopled. But at present, no person can look at the returns made from year to year, of the traffic which had to be created as this road was constructed, and which now run up to eleven or twelve millions of dollars per annum, without feeling that our most sanguine expectations as to the settlement and development of that great country, have been more than realised. Sir, if you look at the development of the country, at the recent crop in the North-West; if you consider the inability of this road, with all its rolling stock and all its appliances, which were very great, to handle that traffic last year, if you look at the prospect for a crop this year and at the normal condition of that country as it will rapidly people up, you can come to but one conclusion, and that is, that every acre of these lands lying contiguous of the line of this railway, will become greatly enhanced in value, that they will sell with much greater rapidity in the future than they have in the past, for the reason that the Government lands, in the neighborhood of the railway, having been, to a considerable extent, disposed of, as the country fills up the lands will not only be enhanced in value, but you will have a traffic that will tax all the resources of the Canadian Pacific Railway, after they have expended these \$15,000,000 of money, under this arrangement, in the betterment of the road, and in furnishing it with rolling stock and elevators so as to handle that traffic. I believe that when they have expended that money they will still find that their great difficulty will not be to obtain traffic, but to handle the traffic that the rapid development of that country will throw upon them. Under these circumstances, I do not think that any person can, for a moment,

doubt the sufficiency of the security. The surplus revenue of last year, over and above their fixed charges, was no less than \$253,884. It must not be forgotten that these figures are for the year 1886-87, which winter was one of extraordinary severity, the winter was one of unparalleled severity, and one which has not been experienced before or since. The cost of the operation of the line which was comparatively new, which was practically only opened, was under those circumstances very greatly enhanced, although the means adopted by the company for dealing with the avalanches of snow in the Rocky Mountains were found to be absolutely perfect, the snow-shedding, which is upon a scale that would astonish hon. gentlemen if they were to see in the solidity of construction, allowing these avalanches to come down from the Rocky Mountains and the Selkirks and elsewhere to pass over them without the slightest difficulty or without producing the slightest disturbance. But they did not possess the knowledge they have now as to how far these means of protecting the road would require to be carried, and, consequently, they had not been sufficiently extended. The traffic was blocked. The company was taxed with an enormous expenditure in the working of their line, which in future will be avoided, because they have supplemented their extensive works during the past season with such additions as will entirely remove any difficulty or obstacle from that cause. But the result is that for the first three months of this year the net profits have increased \$234,202 over the corresponding three months of last year. I am now speaking of the net revenue. The company had a surplus revenue last year of \$253,854, and for the first three months of this year a surplus, beyond all expenses, of \$234,202 over the same three months of last year, which indicate an increase of profits for the year of fully \$1,000,000; and that would afford, I think, sufficient margin to satisfy anybody. Not only from their inability to remove the crop produced in Manitoba last year, but from the short crop in Ontario the receipts of the company relatively for the portion of the line used in moving the Ontario crop, were affected very disastrously indeed, and I hope such an occurrence may not happen during coming years. But at this moment the company stand, taking a moderate calculation, in the position of having surplus earnings, this year, of at least a million. The House must not forget that this road is to-day in its infancy, that the initial difficulties which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), which we and every one who took an interest in this great work felt, namely as to what the road would do until the time came when the country was settled and developed, have just been surmounted; and every person will recognise that if this road when it has just got fairly under way is able to have surplus earnings to this extent, when it obtains fifteen millions additional capital which will place it in a thoroughly efficient and complete condition to handle whatever traffic may offer, we can scarcely fix bounds to the steady and solid basis of prosperity on which this enterprise will rest. The gross earnings for the first three months last year were \$1,873,994, and for the year \$11,606,412. The increase in profits for the first three months of the year were \$234,202, and the profits would be \$1,450,000 for the present year, assuming that that ratio of increase were maintained. I have not, however, based my calculation on that as it might be regarded as somewhat extravagant, but we may fairly rely upon having an increase of \$1,000,000 net profits in the present year. If we can have such a return at the commencement of the enterprise to what may we not look forward to as the position of this great national highway in years to come, as year by year the country becomes settled, as discoveries of minerals are made along the barren and onward district north of Lake Superior? I ventured to predict years ago when speaking of the construction of this road—and I based my estimates on a careful examination of

discoveries made in the past—that when this country was made accessible and the country could be investigated as it can be now done by railway, and I need not tell any one who has travelled on the Canadian Pacific Railway as to the comfort and luxurious character of their cars—when men of science and enterprise could travel through this desert, as it has hitherto been, for the purpose of making discoveries, surprising results would be obtained. Why, there is a copper discovery made in connection with the opening and construction of the line which has no parallel in the world. I took to the exhibition in London a barrel of the ore taken out of the mine as I saw it thrown up, for I went and examined the district, and I asked Professor Selwyn to place it in the hands of the most able analysts in London, in order to ascertain what it was worth, and the result was that they reported that the amount of metallic copper was no less than from 14 to 15 per cent. The ore of the Calumet and Hecla mine, the most valuable known in the world, the capital of which is so many millions, I am afraid to give the figures, but no doubt they are known to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), yields only from 4 to 5 per cent. of metallic copper. There is this, however, to be said that the copper is of a finer and more valuable description than that found in the Canadian mine. But we have this fact, that at this moment we are drawing capital out of the United States for the establishment of enormous works at Sudbury on this line of railway, which will build up at that point a town of many thousands at a very early day. Then we have a discovery of a silver mine within a distance of 15 or 20 miles of Port Arthur and Fort William in which a large capital is now invested, and which is said to rival and even transcend anything that Silver Islet has ever produced. Irrespective of the discoveries during the past year along that line of railway there has been discovered at a distance not remote from that point the finest iron ore for making Bessemer steel; and so in that district, which we all supposed was going to offer the great cardinal difficulty in connection with the construction and operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we have these mineral developments that surpass anything which the most sanguine had ventured to predict. The fertility of the soil and the character of the climate of the North-West have placed beyond question the fact that we have the great remaining granary of the world for development, and all that is necessary in order to make that country a mine of wealth to Canada and to build up there a great, powerful and prosperous population is that capital and people shall be brought into it. I do not intend to detain the House longer. I think, familiar as every hon. member is with the resolutions, which have been a long time on the paper; ventilated as they have been in the public press of the country, which has discussed the matter in all its bearings, I do not intend to detain the time of the House longer, than simply to draw attention to the fact, that in addition to the undertaking to expend this money, in the way in which we consider it would be most important in the interests of the country, we have provided in the schedule to this agreement, that \$5,498,000 shall be used to pay the floating debt of the company, which was expended as I have said in carrying out those great snow-shedding arrangements, and for the betterment of the road during the past year, also that of the remaining amount, \$5,250,000 shall be expended in obtaining the most ample provision of rolling stock on the road, and providing locomotives, box cars, passenger cars, freight cars, tool cars, snow ploughs, &c., so as to put the line in a position to do what has been the vital point with this Government and with the people of this country to do, from the inception of this contract, that is adopting every means that we can devise by which this great expenditure the country has put itself to, shall inure to the development of our own country primarily, and

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

to bringing the bountiful products of the North-West down through our own channels to the seaports of our own country, for shipment across the ocean. At this late period of the Session I will not detain the House longer, because I feel it would be unnecessary, and wearying them without any necessity in connection with this subject which I have placed as briefly as I could before the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is one question I would ask the hon. gentleman before he takes his seat. What significance is to be attached to the following passage in the memorandum of the Minister of Railways:—

“The company are willing that all postal subsidies and other moneys payable to them by the Government of Canada may be set off against any interest which the Government of Canada may be called on to pay, and these moneys will, at no remote period, be sufficient of themselves to cover the interest guaranteed.”

I have not noticed that the hon. gentleman said anything about security for the payment of interest.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I felt it would be unnecessary after demonstrating to the House, as I trust, the absolute impossibility of our being called upon ever to pay a dollar of this interest, until the entire \$15,000,000 were deposited with the Government as land sales. I felt that the impossibility was so great as not to require at all a reference to that. The hon. gentleman is aware that the Government of Canada requires the Canadian Pacific Railway to perform a very large amount of work for it. The hon. gentleman knows that at this moment we are paying an enormous sum to the Grand Trunk Railway for postal and other services for the Government, so in the same way our payments this year will very likely approximate to \$400,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that will always be an increasing amount.

Mr. CHARLTON. What security is there?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am coming to what my hon. friend says. He wants to know what security we have for the appropriation of that, in case we should be called upon to pay. As I said, I did not feel it necessary to refer to that subject, because the possibility of our being called upon, was as I thought so remote as to render it unnecessary to make the slightest reference to that. But the hon. gentleman will see that the original mortgage given to the bondholders by Parliament, provides that they shall have the tolls and revenues earned by the road, and the question has been raised as to how far that would interfere with the Government appropriating in case they were called upon for payment of any portion of this interest before the land grant bonds were extinguished, and before we had all the money. The hon. gentleman need not be told that the tolls and revenues will not be earned until we owe the Canadian Pacific Railway for the performance of the work, and that, as we can have the half-yearly settlement with the Canadian Pacific Railway dated beyond the periods at which any amount of default would become obvious and we would be called upon; the hon. gentleman will see at once, that the tolls and revenues never would be earned, and never would become the property of any person else, while the parties who had done the work owed us the money. I will put the case to the hon. gentleman himself. Suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway owed him \$100, and he got them to carry a certain amount of freight a certain distance for \$150; the hon. gentleman would discharge all his liability to the company and hand over all that could inure to the original bondholders, when he paid \$50 taking the \$100 they owed him. That is a matter of account, and is perfectly simple. Of course faith would be kept with everybody. No persons are more interested in the betterment of this road, and in its being put in a position to earn those revenues in a most prompt, efficient and economic manner, than the bondholders themselves. There

is no attempt to diminish in the least degree the security given to the original bondholders, nor is there the least possibility remaining, for the question being raised as to the Government of Canada being called upon to pay anything, in addition to that which at the time of settlement half yearly, from year to year, this Canadian Pacific Railway Company are shown to owe the Government for any service.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has endeavored to persuade the House that the liability which he has asked the House to undertake in favor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, is truly nominal, that it involves no responsibility whatever, and that the people of Canada will never be called upon to pay one single dollar of the millions which they are asked to guarantee in favor of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, Sir, whatever this House may believe, and whatever this House may do, I venture to say that the people of Canada at large will accept, only with a large share of discount, the sanguine expectations which are held out to them by the hon. the Finance Minister. The professions of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, have been so often falsified that there is legitimate cause on this occasion to apprehend that again, the result of the present transaction may be a heavy debt, to be paid by the people of Canada. With this expectation before us, there would be some measure of relief in the resolutions before the House, if it could be expected now that those new demands would be the last and final demands that would be made on the people of this country on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is finally final.

Mr. LAURIER. This is "finally final." That is not the first time we heard the statement from the same gentleman, and although it was "finally final," as was said, it never was final and that finality never was realised. There is reason to believe again on this occasion, that this will not close the account and that for us to expect even so little as that, is to expect too much. At no distant date we will have a repetition, and this "finally final" demand will have to be supplemented by some new favor on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Those resolutions are the pound of flesh exacted by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to relinquish the monopoly which they have exercised over the North-West portion of our country, and which if it has not ruined, has blighted the prospects of that country. It was felt from the first moment the contract with the syndicate was laid upon the Table of this House and communicated to the public, that of the many obnoxious clauses which the people of Canada were subjected to under this instrument, the most obnoxious of all was this monopoly clause. Indeed, public opinion recoiled against it; public opinion remonstrated against it; public opinion insisted at once that the monopoly would be an incubus upon the people of the North-West, which would crush their energies, and perhaps blight their prospects. Public opinion remonstrated in no uncertain tones, and many of those who were disposed to swallow the other terms of the contract, monstrous as they were, stopped at the monopoly clause. In fact, Sir, I am not exaggerating when I say that from the moment it existed, the contract was in danger. The Government understood that they had to speak on that subject to alleviate the anxiety of the people of the country; and then were uttered the famous words: "we cannot check Manitoba." The hon. gentleman tells us to-day that he will not discuss the question whether or not the obligation to disallow the railway charters granted by the Legislature of Manitoba was imposed on the Government by the monopoly clause. In so saying, he is eluding the very question involved to-day. What are the Government asking the House? They are asking the House to compensate the

Canadian Pacific Railway Company for relinquishing the monopoly which they claim over the Province of Manitoba. I will not say at present, taking the hon. gentleman's line of argument, whether or not their claim was not justified in their own view; but they have claimed that monopoly and successfully claimed it, and to-day the Government ask us to compensate the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for relinquishing it. I say, Sir, that at the time when the contract was adopted, the Government committed themselves to a policy; they declared that they had no power to check Manitoba; and since the hon. gentleman has taken the position that this question is not to be discussed to-day, it becomes my duty to reiterate the words that were spoken on that occasion by the Government in order to secure a ratification of this contract. The hon. gentleman who leads the Government, and who led the Government at that time, felt bound to alleviate the anxiety of the people on the subject of the monopoly, and he did it in these words:

"In order to give them a chance we have provided that the Dominion Parliament—mind you, the Dominion Parliament—we cannot check any other Parliament, we cannot check Ontario, we cannot check Manitoba—shall, for the first ten years after the construction of the road, give their own road, into which they are putting so much money and so much land, a fair chance of existence."

Sir, these words were explicit. But it seems they were not explicit enough, and an hon. gentleman whose recent loss we all mourn, Mr. White, who though not a member of the Government at that time, enjoyed the full confidence of his party, was detailed to emphasise the words spoken by the Prime Minister, and he did it as follows:—

"But we are told now that because of the fifteen miles there never can be any railway into this country. To what does that apply? Simply to the Territories over which the Dominion Parliament has control. There is nothing to prevent Manitoba now, if it thinks proper, granting a charter from Winnipeg to the boundary line. At this very moment there is a company in course of organisation to build a railroad from Winnipeg to West Lynn on the boundary, and after this agreement is ratified. This provision does not take away from Manitoba a single right it possesses. In fact this Parliament could not take away those rights. It has the same right as the other Provinces for the incorporation of railway companies within the boundary of the Province itself, and there is nothing to prevent the Province of Manitoba from chartering a railway from Winnipeg to the boundary to connect with any southern railway. The only guarantee which this company has under the contract, is that the traffic shall not be tapped far west on the prairie section, thus diverting the traffic away from their line to a foreign line. But there is nothing to prevent a railway being built in Manitoba, within the Province that would carry the traffic to any railway that may tap it from the American side. That is the position with respect to this matter."

Well, Sir, this language was very explicit; it could not be more explicit. It conveyed the idea as plainly as language could convey it, that the Dominion Parliament undertook not to charter any railways which might compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that the Government at the same time declared that they had no power over the Provinces, and that the Provinces were at liberty to charter as many railways as they thought proper for their own advantage; and, Sir, the compact was so understood by everybody. I cannot do better to show that it was so understood, than to quote a paragraph from a ministerial newspaper, the *Hamilton Spectator*, which commented on the language used by the Prime Minister and by Mr. White as follows:—

"Now observe it is the Dominion Government which is not to authorise any line to be built to the southward, except in the direction of south-west, or west of that, and not nearer to the border than 15 miles. But the territory from Winnipeg to the American border, for a good many miles east and west of Pembina, is Manitoba territory. Within that territory the Dominion Government have no jurisdiction in either the granting or withdrawal of railway charters, unless they pass into the territory of another Province, in which case the line becomes a Dominion one, and must have a Dominion charter. The right of granting railway charters within the territory of Manitoba and up to the boundary line of the Province is vested in the Legislature of Manitoba, and the Dominion Government have no power to interfere with that right either through a bargain with the Pacific Syndicate or in any other way. The Manitoba Legislature may grant charters for a thousand

railways from Winnipeg to the Canadian boundary if it please, so long as the lines are within Manitoba territory. That point was clearly explained by Sir John Macdonald in the railway debate, and was not for a moment questioned by an Opposition member."

No, Sir, it was not questioned by any Opposition member, because every Opposition member understood the language spoken by the Prime Minister exactly in the manner in which it was understood by the *Hamilton Spectator*, and to be incapable of any other interpretation. Well, even with this restriction, that the monopoly clause applied only to the Territories, it still remained an obnoxious clause. But a great deal of the objection to it had been removed; the public anxiety had been alleviated, because a great many understood, and rightly understood, from what took place afterwards, that the development of the Territories would not be so active during the time the monopoly was to be in operation as to be seriously hampered by the monopoly clause. But, as we are aware, the people of Canada, especially the people of Ontario, had invested millions and millions of dollars in the Province of Manitoba, in lands and every form of enterprise, and everybody realised that if the monopoly was to apply to the Province of Manitoba, those investments would become comparatively barren, and the progress of the Province would be checked; and when the Government stated that the monopoly would not apply to the Province of Manitoba, those people felt that the future of Manitoba was beyond question. And, Sir, I ask now, what was the reason those statements were made by the Government when the contract was under discussion? Why, Sir the reason was obvious—it was in order to get the contract ratified; it was to quiet an agitation which would have been dangerous to the existence of the contract; it was to prevent an opposition which was brewing even in the ministerial members and the ministerial community at large. But, Sir, what took place? The ink which recorded that assurance from the Government was scarcely dry before the sacred promises made, the solemn pledges taken, were deliberately violated and broken by the very men who had made them. The Province of Manitoba which in the language of the Prime Minister could not be checked, which in the language of Mr. White could not be deprived of a single one of its rights, but could charter as many railways as she chose to the boundary line—the Province of Manitoba largely availed itself of that power, and granted charters for the construction of railways to the boundary line; and every one of those charters, one after another, was disallowed by the very men who had said that the legislative authority of Manitoba could not be interfered with. Well, I ask, Sir, whether a more barefaced deceit was ever practiced on any people? Were solemn promises ever more absolutely violated by those who made them than those promises were violated? But, Sir, bad as this was, worse yet was to come. One day, not long after that, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company came to this House, knocking at the door and asking for assistance. The Government determined to grant the company a loan of \$30,000,000, and asked Parliament to authorise that loan. We remember the circumstance, well. They are still green, I believe, in every one's memory. We know there was strong opposition upon that occasion to that demand and to this new bounty being granted to the company. The Government understood the position, and decided they must speak at once strongly in order to prevent further opposition. The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, and who was then Minister of Railways, had charge of the resolution, and he openly declared, in presenting the resolution to the House, that by the year 1886, as soon as the line would be completed along the north shore of Lake Superior, the policy of disallowance would be abandoned. I do not quote the language of the hon. gentleman because it is fresh in the memory of every one of us.

Mr. LAURIER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish the hon. gentleman would quote it, because it is not quite so strong as he says it is.

Mr. LAURIER. If it can afford any pleasure to the hon. gentleman, I will be happy to give him the exact language he used. The hon. gentleman then said:

"I showed on a former occasion that the present Government had adopted the policy of their predecessors in regard to what is called the monopoly in the Province of Manitoba; that when the late Government undertook to carry on the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway as a Government work, they felt bound to protect the traffic of the road from being drawn off to lines to the south of us in the adjoining republic, and had consequently refused to issue a proclamation which would charter lines within the Province of Manitoba to connect with American lines to the south. I said that the present Government, when we came into power, adopted that policy; that we felt, as our predecessors did, that, grappling with as gigantic a work as the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we were bound to adopt every possible means of protecting our own line against having its traffic drawn to lines to the south—and, mark you, this was at a time when we did not contemplate, at an early day, carrying the Canadian Pacific Railway further than Port Arthur. I said, further, that when we made it obligatory upon the Canadian Pacific Railway to extend, at once, the line north of Lake Superior, giving us an all-rail route from Montreal to the Pacific Ocean, or from Callander to the Pacific Ocean, we felt obliged to give to that company, upon which we imposed such onerous obligations, all the security that we had considered necessary, and that our predecessors in the Government had considered necessary for the protection of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

"But I am glad to be able to state to the House, that, although true to that policy, the Government refused to give assent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba to connect with American railways to the south, such is the evidence presented by the operation of the line so far as it has gone, such is the conclusion arrived at by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself in regard to the ability of a through line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to take care of itself, and, by the inherent power of its own advantages, to maintain its position, notwithstanding any competition to which it may be subjected, we are now in a position to review and to reconsider the policy of the late Government and the policy of the present Government, as to the continued necessity for any long period of protecting the Canadian Pacific Railway against competition within the Province of Manitoba, and I am glad to be able to state to the House, that, such is the confidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the power of the Canadian Pacific Railway to protect itself, that, when the line is constructed north of Lake Superior, the Government feel it will not be incumbent upon them to preserve the position they have hitherto felt bound to preserve, that of refusing to consent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba connecting it with American railways to the south. I can give no better evidence to the House and the country of the advanced position which we consider this great enterprise of the Canadian Pacific Railway has attained, than when I say that I feel it is consistent with what we owe to the people of this country and to that great national work, that the Government should not deem it incumbent on themselves to pursue the restrictive policy within the Province of Manitoba, which we have hitherto been obliged to maintain."

That was, it seems to me, not even diplomatic language. It was as forcible language as the hon. gentleman could well deliver. He distinctly stated that the Government had come to the conviction that it would be no longer incumbent on them to pursue the policy of disallowance once the line was completed on the north of Lake Superior. Well, the date fixed by the hon. gentleman came to pass, and the line was constructed on the north shore of Lake Superior. The people of Manitoba, once more relying upon the promises which had just been reiterated by the hon. gentleman speaking on behalf of the Government, thought they would avail themselves of the fact that at last their rights were recognised, and they chartered new railways to the boundary line. But I am sorry to say, and I am ashamed for my country to say, that these very promises, which had just been made on a solemn occasion, were again broken by the very men who had made them and the two charters were disallowed. That was more than the people of Manitoba could endure, and, indeed the people of Manitoba would have been less than men had they longer submitted to seeing their legislation torn into pieces by a despotic Government and the fragments thrown into their faces in contempt. They commenced the policy of resistance to the authority of the central government. All party lines were obliterated upon that question. "No disallowance" became the one and the only political cry in Manitoba. Even ministerial

candidates for seats in this House had to adopt that policy or forego all hope of being elected, and even the Local Government, the Conservative Government of Manitoba, which had hitherto followed in the steps of the Dominion Government, were forced to change their course and to adopt the policy of disallowance. Up to that moment they had left the initiative of chartering competing lines to the Canadian Pacific Railway, to private enterprise, but they now determined to make this question a ministerial one. Not only did they make it a ministerial question, but they also made it a provincial question, and all party lines were obliterated in the Legislature of Manitoba. Mr. Norquay proposed the measure, which was carried unanimously, pledging the Government to undertake to construct a line from the city of Winnipeg, through the valley of the Red River, to the boundary line. That Act was disallowed, and the disallowance made it a dead letter. Still, in spite of the disallowance, the Government of Manitoba undertook to build the railway. In other words, they undertook to resist the Government. That was the third rebellion in the North-West. Not, I am happy to say, an armed rebellion, not a rebellion of poor half-breeds ignorant of their own rights, but a rebellion of civilised men; British subjects, who were determined that the spirit of enterprise should not be crushed out of their Province. What remained to be done by the Dominion Government? They had just disallowed an Act of the Legislature of Manitoba. The Government of Manitoba, backed by the whole people of Manitoba, undertook to set at defiance the authority of this Government, and there was nothing more for this Government to do, if they wanted to carry out the policy of disallowance to its legitimate conclusion, but to call out the volunteers and militia, and send them to Manitoba to tear up the railway works as fast as these were proceeded with. That was the legitimate conclusion of the policy of disallowance. There was another conclusion as well, which was open to this Government. That was for the Government to retrace their steps, to abandon their policy of disallowance, and to let the people of Manitoba build the railways which they deemed necessary for their own advantage. The Government did not care to take the first course; and, I am sorry to say, they had not the manliness to adopt the second course. They resorted to a third course. What was that? It was the course of granting more money, more advantages, and more privileges to the Canadian Pacific Railway; and hence, Sir, the resolutions which have been placed in your hands. Well, as far as these resolutions are concerned, they must be considered, first, as regards the abandonment of the monopoly in the Provinces, not only of Manitoba but of British Columbia, because British Columbia has also been subjected to this monopoly; and, secondly, they have to be considered so far as they contemplate the withdrawal of the monopoly of the Territories. So far as the Provinces are concerned, we, on this side of the House, protest against any compensation being given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for relinquishment of the monopoly in the Provinces, because we are certain that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company never had any legal right or legal claim to the exercise of any monopoly in the Provinces. It is true that, shortly after the contract had been ratified, in the month of October, 1881, the Pacific Railway Company presented a memorial to the Government complaining of certain charters which had been granted by the Legislature of Manitoba to lines which were to compete with them, and—

"Calling attention to the fact that one of the most essential of the conditions upon which the work was undertaken, and more particularly the eastern division of it, extending from the Thunder Bay Branch to Callander Station, was that no diversion of the traffic which the company might reasonably be expected to carry over that division would be permitted by the construction of railways tending to tap the traffic of Manitoba and the North-West."

Then there was but one answer to make to that pretension of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The only answer which it admitted of was, to say the least, that their claim came too late. They had heard the explanations given by the Ministers on the floor of Parliament; they had heard the interpretation which had been given to the contract by the Government when the contract was under discussion; they had heard the Ministers and influential members speaking for the Government, stating that the contract could not apply to the Province of Manitoba, that nothing could check Manitoba or interfere with her rights to charter railways to the boundary line, that Manitoba could not be deprived of the rights she enjoyed under the constitution; and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should have been told that, having heard those statements and never having protested against them when that discussion was received, it was nothing less than a piece of presumption on their part to ask the Government afterwards to do what the Government had said they would not do. But the Government ate their own words, and instead of saying what they had previously said to the company, they stated that they would do, and they did, the very thing they had said to the House they would not do. They disallowed the charter granted by the Legislature of Manitoba, a charter to compete with the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but the Government, it is due that I should say, felt the weakness, and the humiliation, and the shame of their position, because, in disallowing these charters, they did not pretend to say that they did it because they were bound by the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but they pretended that they were acting on behalf of the public interest, they said that the public interest demanded that the charters which had been granted by the Legislature of Manitoba should be disallowed, because, forsooth, if they were allowed to go into operation the result would be that the trade of the North-West would be diverted from Canadian to American channels. All I have to say upon this aspect of the question is that, if such were the views of the Government, if they were of opinion that it would not be conducive to the public interest to allow the charters to be granted by the Legislature of Manitoba to compete with the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, why did they not say so when that matter was under discussion? Why, instead of saying to Parliament, when the contract was under discussion, we cannot check Manitoba, cannot deprive Manitoba of any of her rights, did they not say we will check Manitoba, and will prevent her from granting charters to competing lines with the Canadian Pacific Railway, because it might injure the trade of the country? If they had spoken in that way when they were asking for the assent of Parliament to that contract, there would be nothing now to say. That would be perfectly legitimate, and the contract would have been ratified according to the views the Government now entertain, but what they did then was not what they did afterwards. When they said, we cannot check Manitoba, and we cannot deprive Manitoba of any of her rights, it was not open for them afterwards to prevent charters from being granted by the Legislature of Manitoba. However, I do not hesitate to say that these pretensions, which have been set forward by the Government at the fourteenth hour, that public policy and public interest demanded that these charters should be disallowed, are a mere sham, that the thing which they pretended to fear was never to be apprehended. What is it that they pretended to fear? They pretended to say that, if competing lines were built, in the valley of the Red River for instance, the trade would be diverted from Canadian to American lines—that is, from Manitoba to St. Paul and Minneapolis; but how many times did we not hear in this House—and the fact is true—that our geographical position is such that on the north side of

the St. Lawrence, we must have not only the trade of our own North-West, but of the American North-West; not only the trade of Manitoba and the Territories, but of Dakota, Minnesota, and all those States of the Union. I could not do better on this point than to quote the opinion which was expressed in the month of December last in the *Montreal Gazette*, speaking of the completion of the Sault Branch of the railway. I do not quote this because I attach any particular authority to the newspaper, because the facts are well known, but I do so because it is a paper representing the Government:

"The distance from Minneapolis to Liverpool, *via* Chicago and New-York, is about 4,425 miles, while from the same point to Liverpool, *via* Sault Ste. Marie, it is only 3,916 miles, a saving in distance of nearly 600 miles. This saving constitutes the advantage possessed by the new system, through which it is enabled to compete successfully with Chicago lines for the traffic of the North-West. Traffic from the Canadian North-West will enlarge by leaps and bounds in the next few years, and with that flowing from the American North-West over the new system, should double the trade of the port (of Montreal) in a very short time. The Harbor Commissioners cannot longer prudently delay devising means for increasing harbor facilities and accommodation, they ought at once to determine on a policy of extension and enlargement of wharfrage and apply it to upon the opening of navigation next spring."

These facts are not new. They are well known. They express what everyone knows, that our geographical position is such that, even after the trade has arrived in Minneapolis or St. Paul, it must come back to the Canadian territory, because all the geographical advantages are in favor of that route. So the pretence set up by the Government is evidently a mere sham. There was never anything to induce the Government to believe that the trade could be diverted from Canadian to American channels; but the Government shielded themselves behind public opinion. They did not dare to say that they were acting at the dictation and bidding of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that they were acting not upon their own views, because I believe that, if they had been acting upon their own views, they would have given them in time, but they were acting at the bidding and dictation of the company to which they had given life and which proved to be stronger than they were. The Government were fishing for reasons, and they took up that one. They took up another one, and that is alluded to by the hon. gentleman in his speech a moment ago, that eminent lawyers had contended that the Province of Manitoba had not the power to charter railways to the boundary line. These views were set forth in many State papers, and in the latest, in a Minute of Council which was adopted on the report of the late Mr. White and the Minister of Justice, which is in these terms:

"The Sub-Committee submit that the distinction between works purely local and those of general interest, embodied in the above clause, is a very obvious one, and may be made more clear by reference to the sub-clause of the 91st section of the British North America Act, which confers upon the Parliament of Canada exclusive jurisdiction in all matters affecting the regulation of trade and commerce. To say that a Provincial Legislature shall not have power to legislate in respect of railways extending into another Province or into a foreign country would be mere surplusage, for the reason that no powers can be conferred by any legislative body for the construction or working of railways beyond its own boundaries. It is clear, therefore, that the exceptions in sub clause 10, of the 92nd section of the British North America Act, were designed to restrict the powers of the Legislatures to works of purely local concern, leaving to the exclusive control of the Parliament of Canada railways which, although situated technically within the boundaries of a Province, are intended to become, and are created with the express object of connecting with other railways beyond its limits, would thus become great arteries of interprovincial and international commerce."

Well, Sir, I am not to discard the legal proposition which is here set forth. There is something to say on both sides. I am not prepared to say that the contention that we ought not to charter a railway through a foreign country, is not a sound one; but I repeat what I have already said in regard to the other branch of the question, that if such were the views of the Government it was their duty to have abandoned those views when the contract was under discussion,

Mr. LAURIER.

but having taken the position they did, having stated to Parliament that they would not check Manitoba, when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company came to this Parliament and asked us to interfere and exercise the power of disallowance, then the Government should have said: No, we cannot do it, because we have pledged our word that we would not do it; thus they should have left the company to seek a remedy before the tribunals of the country. But that was a mere fishing for reasons. They again refer to the policy of public interest, and this is the way in which they do it:

"It is most important on commercial, as well as national grounds, that the policy should be continued for some time longer. The Canadian Pacific Railway has already attracted a considerable trade between Canada, China and Japan, and the Atlantic markets of this continent. It has attracted attention as the most valuable highway, under British control, between the eastern possessions of the Empire. The Imperial authorities have become so impressed with its importance that they have agreed to grant a subsidy of £45,000 sterling per annum towards the establishment of a line of steamers on the Pacific Ocean to be run in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the struggle for the Pacific trade, the railway has already become a most important factor, being regarded as in some respect the most important of the transcontinental lines. Its chief competitor, the Northern Pacific Railway Company, of the United States, has been making great efforts to bear up against this new competition, and it is admitted that the efforts to strike the Canadian Pacific Railway in its centre, by an extension of the Northern Pacific Railway system from the international boundary line to Winnipeg, is not with the object of affording competitive rates to the people of Manitoba, but to secure a weapon by which to control the competition for transcontinental trade from the Pacific coast, now rapidly finding its way over the Canadian route, and thus retain it for United States Railways. It would be a most suicidal policy on the part of Canada to assist a foreign population in obtaining that weapon, to be used as it must be used, in hampering a trade from which the business men of the country have so much to anticipate."

Sir, these lines were written—when? No later than the 4th of January last. The Government then took the position that to allow these railway charters to go into operation would place in the hands of a foreign corporation a weapon to be used in hampering the trade and growth of the business of the country. Scarcely four months have elapsed and now the Government are forced to go back upon the policy which they then enunciated, upon the policy which they said at that time was still required in the best interest of the country. Sir, the Government to-day are giving the lie to the very arguments they used no longer than four months ago. We have proved out of the mouths of the Government themselves that they never had any justification for acting as they did, that their fears were purely chimerical. Sir, to say that no monopoly existed in Manitoba is to say something which cannot be admitted. A monopoly in Manitoba was an outrage, it was maintained against the constitution, it was maintained against the pledge of the Government, it was maintained against the best interests of the country, and now to ask Parliament to compensate the company for a monopoly which they never enjoyed, is a wanton sacrifice of the interests of the people of this country. But I frankly admit that the situation is altogether different with regard to the Territories. The monopoly legally exists in the Territories, Parliament granted the monopoly, Parliament enacted the clause which was cited a moment ago by the hon. gentleman, and Parliament did it in the plenitude of its power. But Parliament did this, in my opinion—indeed, the fact is now proved by the action of the Government—most unwisely, but still Parliament acted in the plenitude of its power; therefore, the contract is binding upon us, and like all contracts, must be dealt with in a just and fair manner. The contract has to be carried out unless it is cancelled by mutual consent, and upon a fair compensation to the party which renounces the advantages that it enjoys. So far as that goes, I would have nothing to say against the resolution. I admit that if the monopoly is to be wiped out as regards the Territories, Parliament should not do so except upon mutual agreement with the company, and I say without hesitation, except, also, upon compensation to the company for the advan

tages which they may have under the instrument. The hon. gentleman says that under the terms agreed upon, Parliament would not have a single dollar to pay the company. Well, Sir, I venture to say that the Parliament of Canada do not want any favors from any of their creditors, whether it be the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any one else. The people of Canada are prepared to discharge honestly all the liabilities which they may owe to any man, and if the company had come to Parliament and said they wanted compensation for the advantages derived from the monopoly, then coupled with the facts and data upon which we could base some action, I think we would have been placed in a position to discuss the terms proposed by the company. But we have nothing of the kind before us, we have no facts, we have no data to state the damage which may accrue to the company from the loss of the monopoly. It would have been more conducive to the public interest, it would have been more dignified in every way, that we should have had a plain demand from the company, and that the company should have been granted such a specific amount as would have been a fair compensation to the company for the loss of the monopoly. But this is not what has been done. We are asked to adopt as compensation to the company a proposition to assume an unlimited liability, a liability which is altogether contingent, under which we may not have to pay a single dollar, and under which we may have to pay \$525,000 every year for 50 years, or a total of \$26,000,000. Well, these are the terms which have been agreed upon by the Government, these are the terms which have been submitted to Parliament. The company proposes to effect a loan of \$15,000,000 in bonds redeemable in 50 years, bearing interest at 3½ per cent. This involves a charge upon the country for interest of 525,000 every year for 50 years. As further security to the bondholders, the company asks the Government to become responsible, not for the payment of the capital, I admit, but for the payment of the interest. The Government have undertaken a contingent liability, and they have adopted a security against their own security. They have not adopted all the security which was granted to them, but they have adopted other security. We see in the report of the Minister of Railways that the company were prepared to give very large securities to the Government. The report says:

"The company are willing that all postal subsidies and other moneys payable to them by the Government of Canada may be set off against any interest which the Government of Canada may be called upon to pay, and these moneys will, at no remote period, be sufficient of themselves to cover the interest guaranteed."

That was the offer of the company; but the Government did not deem it, for some reason of their own, advisable to avail themselves of the company's offer. I have not, however, to look at this point at the present moment. They adopted other securities, and these are recited in the instrument which contains the agreement signed by the Minister of Railways and the president of the company. Let the House remember that we become guarantors of the debt. It is always a safe rule in business for any man who becomes security for another to measure the liability which he undertakes. The liability which we undertake, as I said a moment ago, is the same as the liability which is undertaken by any individual; under it we may not be called on to pay a single dollar or we may be called on to pay the whole of it, that is, \$525,000 every year for 50 years. The Government have accepted other securities to recompense us for any expenditure which we may make under this agreement, and is contained in clause 5 of the contract, which reads as follows:—

"But if the company should at any time make default in the payment of any interest which may become due on any of the said bonds"—The Government have contemplated that this debtor like every other debtor might perhaps fail to carry out the agreement, and they very wisely foresee this event,—

—"then if required by the Government the company shall thereafter pay over to the Government all interest which it may collect, under uncompleted sales, upon the price of lands sold as well as the principal realised from the sales thereof, and the Government shall allow on the amount of such payments interest at the said rate, and shall apply all of such additional payments and the interest thereon as well as all interest accrued on the said principal fund towards satisfaction of the interest on the said bonds."

They say this security, accepted by the Government, is for any expenditure the country may have to make in the event of the default of the company. The company transfers certain moneys due to them upon lands sold but not yet paid for. It is remarkable how under this instrument we do not take the power to collect ourselves the money due to the defaulting party; but if the debtor is in default then we may go to the company and ask them to do for us what they do not do for others. I do not think these terms are very satisfactory. But it is well to look at what is the amount which is there set forth to be our guarantee. We find it stated in clause 8:—

"All land grant bonds which form part of the former issue by the company and now held by [amounting to \$1,000,000] shall be cancelled, and the said mortgage hereinbefore mentioned shall be subject to the payment of such of the said land grant bonds as are outstanding, [in the hands of the public, amounting to about \$3,463,000], but all sums due or to become due for unpaid purchase money to the company on account of lands heretofore sold, [amounting to about \$1,200,000.] shall be applied to the payment of the said land grant bonds according to the terms of the mortgage securing the same."

These terms are very remarkable. The security accepted by the Government for any expenditure which we may have to make under this agreement, is equal to how much? We undertake to pay possibly \$525,000 a year for 50 years, and the Government have accepted security of the value of \$1,250,000, or to put it in figures exactly as they are, \$1,252,857. This is all the amount which the Government have accepted for security in case we should have to make any expenditure on default of the company, if the company make default, we must pay \$525,000 a year for 50 years, or \$26,250,000, and we have placed in our hands security of the value of \$1,253,857, that is to say, not more than two years' interest. The security is a perfect mockery. It is still more a mockery, because the security given to us in case we should have to pay on behalf of the company, these very moneys set forth here are already mortgaged to other creditors of the company to the extent of \$343,000. If this proposal is not a mockery, I do not know what is. It would have been much better if the Government had accepted no security whatever but had trusted to the credit of the company, instead of accepting such a miserable, paltry sum as that named under such conditions, when even the security is a mere delusion and we have not, under the existing law, power to apply those moneys to claims which would arise in case the company made default. But the Government said, through the mouth of the hon. Minister of Finance, that it was perfectly useless to accept any guarantee from the company, that the terms were such that the lands would be perfect security and that there was no fear whatever but that the bondholders would be safe. I believe, and I must give my opinion candidly, that the bondholders under this agreement will be perfectly secure; I have no hesitation whatever in saying it; but the position of the Government is far different from the position of the bondholders. What will be the position of the bondholders? They have as a security 14,934,238 acres of land, which is the balance still remaining in the hands of the company out of the land grant. For how much would those lands sell to-day? The hon. gentleman says that the lands disposed of by the company have been sold at the rate of \$3 12 an acre. That may be; but how much has been sold? The total amount of land sold is only 3,270,743 acres. One fact is quite certain and quite plain: those lands to-

day would not sell for \$1 an acre. It is true that in southern Manitoba some lands are held today at a prohibitory price, \$5 or \$10 an acre; but the whole of these 14,000,000 acres, if put on the market, would not sell for \$1 an acre, in fact there is no price for them. This fact is proved by another fact, that the company have not selected the whole of the land to which they are entitled under the contract. If there was a demand for the lands they would have made their selection long ago, but there is no price for them at this moment; and this is the reason why the company, instead of selling them, have borrowed money upon them. I am bound to say I believe that in course of time, in course of the 50 years which the bonds are to run, the lands may perhaps be sold for \$1 an acre and more than sufficient realised at all events to pay the principal, \$15,000,000, issued on the security of those lands. So that the bondholders will be secured in this way; the agreement provides that the lands are to be placed in the hands of trustees, they will sell them from time to time, the money will be deposited in the hands of the Government and will constitute a fund exclusively for the benefit of the bondholders, and, as I said a moment ago, I believe in course of time the lands will be sold at a price sufficient to meet the principal. As to the interest, how is that to be met? This instrument provides that Government shall pay upon the moneys that are deposited in its hands interest yearly to the company, and it is to go towards paying the interest of the bondholders. It is quite evident; it is manifest indeed that for several years to come that the sales of land will be purely nominal; that there may not in fact be any sales of land, and, therefore, the interest shall have to be paid out of the other resources of the company. At all events it is of no concern to the bondholders, because if the interest is not paid by the company out of their other resources, then the interest will be paid by the Government, and so the bondholders are perfectly secured. But does the situation stand in the same manner with regard to the Government? Nothing of the kind. The Government will have to take their security out of these lands, and we must see what are the charges on these lands. First of all there will be \$15,000,000 of bonds issued on this agreement; there are outstanding claims, on the former bonds of \$3,463,000—I should say of \$4,463,000, because we have learned the fact and the Government holds \$1,000,000 of bonds in their hands, which are security for certain obligations contracted by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and therefore the amount is \$4,463,000. Further we must deduct, I admit, the balance still outstanding upon lands sold, but the deeds of which are not yet delivered, \$1,252,857; leaving a balance of \$3,210,143, so that the capital charges against the lands will be \$18,210,143. Now if we are to measure the liability which we have undertaken, we must see, as I said a moment ago, that we are liable to pay \$525,000 every year for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, suppose the company should fail to meet that amount. If we have to pay that amount it becomes at once a charge on the capital, which will lay upon the land. That would amount in the space of 50 years to \$26,250,000, or a total charge at the end of 50 years to \$44,460,143. Now will the land sell for that amount? I question it very much, and I have no hesitation in saying that the lands will not sell for that amount unless the policy of the Government with regard to the North-West is completely reversed. What has prevented the company so far from selling their lands? What is the reason, as the hon. gentleman stated a moment ago that all our hopes with regard to the North-West have been deceived? There are two reasons why our hopes have been deceived. First by the monopoly, and next by the tariff—the National Policy. Those are the two causes which have impeded and retarded the settlement of the North-West. I am glad to say the monopoly will disappear, and must disappear whether those

Mr. LAURIER.

resolutions carry or not, because the people will no longer submit to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, it will have to disappear. Does the right hon. gentleman pretend that the people of Manitoba will longer submit to the monopoly? Is it not a fact that all parties in Manitoba, even the friends of the hon. gentleman, have declared that the people of Manitoba will have competing railways, no matter at what cost they should have to obtain it. But, Sir, there is another blight on Manitoba and the North-West, and that is the tariff. There is no other section of this country which has suffered so much from the tariff as Manitoba and the North-West. If you want to sell those lands and to guarantee a rapid sale of them; if you want to settle the North-West with people, give us unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Not only will unrestricted reciprocity settle the North-West with inhabitants, but it will give value to your lands. There is no country which would profit so much from unrestricted reciprocity with the United States as the people of those Provinces. There are only a few thousand of them there, perfectly isolated from the east, but in direct communication with the large and teeming population to the south of them. If you only give them the power to trade with those people, then, Sir, all the expectations which we were confident of a few years ago; all the expectations which the hon. gentleman was forced to admit have not been realised, all these would be revived. You will see that prosperity which we hope for in the North-West revived, and that country become, what it ought to be, the garden of Canada. I have but one further remark to make before I close. It is with regard to the application of these moneys. The agreement stipulates, as the hon. gentleman has stated to-day, that the object of the money so to be raised by the Canadian Pacific Railway, is to perfect the line from Quebec to Vancouver. How is it, Mr. Speaker, that this line is not yet perfected? The line has cost us already, as was stated a few days ago by the hon. gentleman, over \$70,000,000. The people of Canada have given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, either in money or in the value of money, \$70,000,000, and still the line is not yet perfect. I say the line ought to be perfect by this time and if the company had not misapplied their resources in duplication of lines in certain portions of the country—in the Eastern Provinces—and gridironing certain sections of the country with railways, the line would be able to do whatever is expected from it, without those \$15,000,000 having to be applied for. If the company were raising their own money, they would be at perfect liberty to apply the money as they liked, but since they have asked the credit of Canada, since they ask the help of the people of Canada, the people have a right to expect that that money will be spent in a manner which will be most conducive to the interests of the country at large, and that should not be in perfecting a line which ought to be perfect by this time. But that the money ought to be applied in constructing branch lines in the North-West, and giving them to the country which has suffered so much for want of the expenditure on competing lines, for which they have been battling for so long a time. Those are the views which we on this side of the House entertain. In the first place we say that the House owes no compensation whatever to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for the relinquishment of the monopoly in British Columbia and Manitoba where the monopoly so existed. In the second place we say, that the terms are unsatisfactory, because they are vague and because they impose further liability on the country, and in the third place we say that the terms are unsatisfactory, because they do not provide, as they should provide, that the money should be applied in the manner I have just stated; that is to say, securing branch lines in Manitoba and the North-

West Territories. Therefore I beg to move the following amendments seconded by Mr. Davies (P.R.I.) :

That all the words after "That" to the end be left out and the following added instead thereof:

(1.) The exclusive privilege granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in virtue of article 15 in the agreement between Her Majesty and the company contained in the schedule to the Act 44 Victoria, chapter 1, do not apply and never were intended to apply to the Province of Manitoba as it existed at the time of the passing of the said Act, to the Province of British Columbia, or to any other Province but solely to the Territories over which the Parliament of Canada had exclusive and paramount legislative jurisdiction.

(2.) That the policy hitherto maintained by the Government of disallowing legislation by the Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia authorising the construction within the limits of each Province, of railways to the boundary line of the United States was one directly at variance with the statements of the leader of the Government when submitting the agreement for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Parliament, and has been productive of great loss and injury to the said Provinces and the North-West Territories and of well grounded discontent on the part of the people.

(3.) That this House, whilst ever ready to discharge honorably all the engagements legally assumed by the Government of Canada with the company, regrets that the terms entered into by the Government and the company for the relinquishment of the exclusive privilege which the company claims under the said Act, involve Canada in enormous contingent liabilities without providing adequate security for the indemnifying of the Government against the payment of the interest it guarantees and may be compelled to pay, and that this House further regrets that such terms do not provide for the expenditure of the principal moneys to be raised on such bonds in the construction of branch railways of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Manitoba, British Columbia, and the North-West Territories.

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

After Recess.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 128) for the relief of Eleonora Elizabeth Tudor (from the Senate), on a division.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 129) for the relief of Andrew Maxwell Irving (from the Senate), on a division.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 130) for the relief of Catherine Morrison (from the Senate), on a division.—(Mr. Small.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not ask to divide the House now on these two bills, but I give notice to the promoters of them that when they are moved for their second readings, I will ask for a division of the House upon them.

ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY.

Mr. RYKERT moved that amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 61) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Railways Company be now read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the nature of these amendments?

Mr. RYKERT. I understand that the Senate has struck out certain words which would have a retroactive effect, and have inserted a clause to provide that the Bill shall not affect any pending litigation, although it was shown to them that no litigation was pending.

Mr. EDGAR. Does that reverse the action of the Railway Committee of this House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, so far as those two clauses are concerned, and also so far as the third clause is concerned. There was a provision that certain sections of the Railway Act should apply to this Act, which has been struck out.

Mr. EDGAR. Do these amendments materially affect the decisions arrived at by the Railway Committee, because if they do, we ought not to rush them through without consideration?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think they do. The Senate amended a clause which they considered to have a retroactive effect, and I do not think anybody will complain of that. Then they thought proper to provide for pending litigation. There are other slight amendments.

Motion agreed to, amendments read the second time and concurred in.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. McMULLEN. When you left the chair, Sir, at six o'clock, we were dealing with the statement made to the House by the hon. the Minister of Finance with regard to our guarantee of the interest upon certain bonds of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. the Finance Minister represented to us in that statement the financial condition of the Canadian Pacific Railway as eminently satisfactory. I am sure it is a matter of great gratification to every true Canadian to learn from the lips of the Minister of Finance that the Canadian Pacific Railway is in a healthy condition. We rejoice to know that there are men amongst us who have had the ability and the courage to undertake the construction of that line, notwithstanding the fact that it has cost the country so much money; there is no Canadian who would desire to say a word derogatory to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or those connected with it. On the contrary we wish them every success. The country is largely interested in their success; and we shall be gratified year by year to see the financial prospects of the company improve. Still we cannot help remembering that the construction of this line has cost the country a good deal of money. When the hon. the Minister of Finance, some years ago, introduced his resolution with regard to the advance of \$30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway, he depicted in glowing terms the influx of population in the North-West, and the vast amount of progress which he anticipated would flow from that influx, and he gave us a very glowing account of what we might look for in a very few years in that country. We now begin to realise that his prophetic utterances on that occasion were not the words of true inspiration; we begin to doubt very seriously that the utterances of the hon. gentleman now and in the future may prove as wide of the fact as his utterances in the past. It is therefore fitting that we should closely and carefully criticise the statements he makes to us. He has of course painted the future of the Canadian Pacific Railway in glowing colors. I shall be rejoiced should his statements be fully realized. At the same time the country has expended a large amount of money, admitted on both sides to be \$71,000,000, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it is high time that, in dealing with the company, we should take care to guard against the country being called on to pay any more money. No doubt the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have honest intentions in this matter. I believe that company to be composed of high minded and honorable gentlemen. I have no doubt that if their lives are spared they will carry out honorably the contract they asked the country to enter into. But the day may come when the present directors of the company may have to abdicate their position; and if the affairs of the company should not be as carefully handled by their successors, we may be called on to pay this interest of \$625,000, the payment of which we are now asked to guarantee. We have no guarantee to protect us against this contingency. We have no security. The land in itself is absolutely devoted to the producing of funds for the purpose of meeting the principal sum of \$15,000,000. No portion of the money to be realised from sales of lands can possibly be devoted, under any circumstances, to the payment of the interest, until the proceeds of those sales reached the sum of \$15,000,000. Should they ever reach that sum, and I hope they will, the country will then become the borrowers of the \$15,000,000, and have to pay the interest

at 3½ per cent. for the balance of the fifty years. The hon. the Finance Minister, in addressing the House the other evening, said he was able to borrow on the credit of the country in England at 3½ per cent., and he anticipated a very decided reduction in the value of money in the old country. We hope his prediction may be verified and that the value may be still further reduced; but should that reduction continue, we will find ourselves placed in the unfortunate position, so far as this loan is concerned, of being committed to paying 3½ per cent. for the balance of the fifty years. We cannot possibly redeem the debentures before then, and the Government, should the land realise, in the course of 5, 10 or 15 years, the sum of \$15,000,000, the company will be entitled to a discharge of the mortgage on any of the balance of land that remains, and the Government will become the borrowers of \$15,000,000 at 3½ per cent. As far as the statement of the hon. the Minister of Finance is concerned, we hope that his predictions may be realised, but, in the event of the company not being able to meet their annual interest obligation of \$525,000, the country will be called on to meet it. The road of course in the meantime will have to be operated. We all admit that, under any circumstances, the road must continue to be operated. As I have said before, we have sunk already \$71,000,000 on the Canadian Pacific Railway, the interest on which is \$2,840,000. Now, the people are paying that annual interest. It may be said that every dollar of that \$71,000,000 was not directly borrowed in the English market, but that possibly some of it came out of the very large surpluses which the Government had in years past. The result is that we now have, and will continue to have, as long as those bonds continue in existence, to pay \$2,846,000. If the Government has to meet the interest of \$525,000 a year, that will increase the annual drain on the resources of the people so that it will amount to about \$3,400,000 a year. That is a large sum, and before we put ourselves in the position of adding \$525,000, we should seriously consider the whole question. It is highly desirable no doubt that the Pacific road should be placed in a proper position. Anyone who has passed over the line, as I have, must have seen that it is desirable that the trestle work should be replaced by solid embankments, and I am glad to learn that it is the intention to carry that out, because otherwise it would not be a complete road. There is a history of the transactions between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway which has yet to be explained, and some of the best statesmen of this country have declared that the connection between them has been very disastrous to the best interests of Canada. I believe that we cannot look forward with any reasonable expectation to the end of this until the country is placed in such a position that the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are separated, until they cease to be mixed up the one with the other. I have no fault to find with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for asking what they have demanded from the Government, for if they were permitted to retain the monopoly granted them, it would be worth more money annually than the interest on the loans, and I have no doubt, if it had not been that the people of Manitoba and the North-West became sensible that they were suffering from the monopoly which was granted, and threatened revolt, they would never have obtained the rights conceded them under this arrangement. The Government, in bringing in this proposition, have placed the Opposition in a very awkward position by the terms in which it is worded. They have prevented the Opposition from assenting to the proposition which they have introduced by the manner in which it is brought before the House. The Opposition have contended for years that Manitoba as well as British Columbia could not be prevented from granting charters to any local railways. Then, why should the Government expect that the Opposition

Mr. McMULLEN.

should agree to any such proposition as this? But, while the Opposition are willing to do anything reasonable to do away with that monopoly, they are not willing to admit that there ever was any right to this monopoly in Manitoba. We would be compelled, if we accepted this, to disregard the statements that we have made and the grounds that we have taken for years past, we, therefore, are compelled to vote in opposition to the propositions now submitted. No one on the Government side has attempted to show, by any logical argument, that there is any legal monopoly, so far as Manitoba is concerned, and the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite have gone largely to show that it is not in regard to any right in connection with the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway in Manitoba that disallowance has taken place, but it was owing to the friendly relationship which has existed between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that they have been disposed to protect them as long as they dare. Under these circumstances, we are in such a position that we will have to oppose the proposition which is made, in its entirety. They say that this is to be the last and I earnestly hope it is to be the last demand made on the country, but the same statement has been made before. The Finance Minister stated before that this was to be finally final. The Finance Minister stated that the earnings of the road from the Government would be a part of the arrangement, and that they would be a part of the security for the additional amount of \$525,000 which the Government would have to pay to the bondholders. I do not know, if the hon. gentlemen remain in power, whether they would retain that amount or not. We had a case where a quantity of freight from British Columbia was carried down to the Provinces, in regard to which there was a considerable amount of money owing to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that was much less than the amount of their indebtedness to the Government, but still that was paid in full and the indebtedness has been left standing against the company. The Finance Minister said something to us with regard to the financial condition of the line. Amongst other things he told us that there was a sum of five millions for floating debt. Well, I understand that the company have been making very large improvements in the city of Montreal, and I understand they are going to make very extensive improvements in the city of Toronto. With regard to those termini, in all probability they will cost considerable money, and my impression is that it would have been much better if improvements of that kind had been postponed for some years; and that the main line, with the necessary branches in the North-West that will have to be constructed, should have been built first, and after that, if they found their financial condition would enable them, out of their own resources, to make the necessary improvements, or what they consider to be necessary, in Toronto and Montreal, they might have done so. They might have adopted the American system of building roads. I have been through that country a good deal, and I have seen a road opened, running, and earning, without even stations, and in many instances without fences. They continued in that condition for several years, until such time as their earnings would enable them, after paying working expenses, and interest upon the bonds to complete the stations and do a certain amount of fence work. I think if a course of economy of that kind had been adopted by the Canadian Pacific Railway it would have been better. However, as the men at its head have had an extended experience, perhaps they have done what was best. Now, we are told that a land board is to be appointed, and that is to be a drain upon somebody. The Minister did not tell us whether the salaries of that land board are to be paid out of the receipts of the land, or whether the Canadian Pacific Railway will have to contribute towards paying them. If they are paid out of the lands, of course it will take some

time longer before a sufficient sum accumulates to enable the company to ask for a release of the mortgage; but that is a point the Finance Minister overlooked. Now, when we come to consider the history of this entire scheme, we have to express regret, in the interest of the country, that the Government should have entered into the bargain that they did. They were warned at the time that the monopolies they were creating, were going to be a serious injury to that country; they were also warned that in all probability a release from the monopoly would be pressed for by the people of that country before many years. Our prediction with regard to that matter is now being fulfilled. The Province of Manitoba is now pressing for a release, and it has been released. Well, Sir, it has been very unfortunate in the history of this country that so many blunders should have been made in the North-West. If that company was the only one that offered to build the road, it might not have been so bad; the Government might not stand charged before the country to the same extent that they are. But there was another company at that time who offered to undertake the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to do it without the monopoly clause at all. Now, owing to the Government being so closely committed to that company by that first offer, they are now compelled, owing to the bargain they entered into, to ask the country to run the risk of paying a further large amount of money to get rid of that monopoly. But it is no use to go on setting examples of the blunders that have taken place in that colony of ours. It has been one after another. The first unfortunate blunder was in connection with the government of that territory, when officials were sent up to govern it, virtually in opposition to the people's will. The second blunder brought on a war. The third blunder was committed in persisting to maintain a monopoly, year after year, that almost ended in a rebellion, and possibly might have caused a rebellion if the Government had not receded from their pretensions, and made up their minds that it would be too great a risk on their part to attempt to hinder these people any longer. But taking the entire history of that whole country, and the amount that it has cost the people of the Dominion, it has run up already to an enormous sum. When we consider the cost of the two rebellions and the cost of the Mounted Police, which is now about \$1,000,000 a year, we find that altogether we have virtually spent very close on \$20,000,000. We had spent \$71,000,000 in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway; we have paid for officials and surveys, within a short amount of \$15,000,000; and the guarantee we are now going to give the company is worth a little over \$13,000,000, making in all \$119,000,000. We have received something like \$6,000,000 in all for lands sold, leaving a total of \$113,000,000 that that country has virtually cost the Dominion. Now, with regard to the value of this guarantee, the leader of the Opposition stated this afternoon that it would cost the country some \$26,000,000. If you take an annuity of \$525,000 for fifty years, at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and the country was to go to the Bank of Montreal and ask them what amount of a deposit they would accept and release the country from this agreement, and meet the interest every year, the Bank of Montreal would tell you that they required an immediate deposit of \$13,870,541.61. If they were called upon to meet \$525,000 a year, allowing $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest on the money in their hands, it would take that amount to meet the sum of \$525,000 every year. Now, I am not at all finding fault with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have no doubt that under the contract they are entitled to what they are asking; but as I said before, I do not think they are entitled to anything so far as the Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia are concerned. Whatever amount we are called upon to give them, or whatever sum they ask us to guarantee, must be taken as a sum in lieu of the monopoly

that exists in the North-West—not including Manitoba or the Province of British Columbia, because, as I said before, we claim that in paying money for any supposed monopoly that exists in those Provinces, we are paying money for what does not exist at all, and the Government cannot make out that such a claim does exist. I do earnestly hope, in the interest of the country, that, as the Finance Minister has said, this is the last demand that will be made upon us, but from past experience I can scarcely expect that such will be the case. I am afraid that as long as the present Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway are hand in glove, as they evidently are, demands will be made year after year, and if the people of this country ever want to be released from the annual drain upon their resources in this connection with this line, my opinion is that they will have to ask the Government to take the opposite side of the House before the people will ever be able to get rid of the influence that will be exercised—not to say that the company is exercising an undue influence in this matter, because, as I said before, if they could retain their monopoly I daresay it would be worth more money to them. However, when they get this guarantee and complete the works that the Finance Minister says are so necessary, I hope they will not come back to this House again and ask us for any more money.

Mr. AMYOT. I think it my duty in a few words to explain the vote I am going to give on this question. I have always been in favor of the speedy construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think the company has been a great success. I have great admiration for the energy and boldness of the company, because they have succeeded in constructing a railway which is not surpassed in any part of the world. As for the directors personally, I cannot refrain from expressing my admiration for them. I believe in the second place that the resolutions which take away the monopoly are necessary to-day. When the monopoly was granted it was thought to be necessary to induce the company to build the road, and I believe it is proper that it should now be brought to a termination. The amendment declares that the monopoly of the company extended only to the North-West and not to Manitoba or British Columbia. I believe such to be the case; but admitting that it only extended to the North-West Territories I still believe that that is sufficient to warrant the abolition of monopoly and acceptance of the security we are consenting to accept from the company, at all events it removes all possible doubt, and it will release the country from a great embarrassment. The amendment further says that disallowance was productive of loss and injury. I know that to have been the case from the number of letters I have received from farmers in Manitoba, some of whom left there because they could not make a living on account of disallowance. But as the proposition of the Government is to do away with disallowance and bring it to an end, I will support it so far as disallowance is concerned. The amendment states further that the security offered by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is not sufficient. I have gone over the North-West pretty thoroughly, and I am of opinion that the security is sufficient. I believe in the value of the North-West lands, I believe that those lands are of immense value, and that the more they are settled the more productive and valuable they will become in the market. The amendment also states that the construction of branch lines should have been provided for. That might be so; but I know that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will be bound in their own interest to construct many branch railways in the North-West. I am sure that such will be the case, and when the interests of the company urge them in that direction they will promote those interests. Being in favor of the resolution of the Government, in favor of the

settlement of the question, being anxious to see the Canadian Pacific Railway advancing from success to success and doing well for themselves and also advancing the interests of the country, I shall take this opportunity to make a complaint, not perhaps against the directors themselves, but against the management of the road by their officials, and I do not think I could adopt a better method of informing the House as to the state of affairs than by reading an extract from a paper, *La Presse*, of Montreal, which takes a great deal of interest in railway matters. The article is contained in one of its late issue, and is under the heading "It does not pay." I read this translation in order that the Government may be informed of the position of affairs and may bring it before the directors of the company with a view to have it remedied. The article is as follows:—

"IT DOES NOT PAY.

"The reason given by the subordinate officials of the Canadian Pacific for the wretched service and accommodation afforded to the public on the north shores of the St. Lawrence and of the Ottawa, is that the line and its branches do not pay.

"In the first place, persons eminently competent to form an opinion on the subject assert that those officials do not speak the truth, but are simply seeking to mystify and browbeat parties who venture to complain, as one of these officials recently attempted to do with the agent of a short line having a connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. An employé of the latter, on being asked to alter the time for starting fifteen minutes, made answer: 'What! do you want us to upset the whole arrangement throughout the vast extent of the Canadian Pacific for the sake of your small little line?' This is mere humbug, but it is just the same with every complaint made, or to be made, by those who are dependent on the Canadian Pacific for railway service in this section. When the officials do not understand our complaints, they do not take the trouble to ask for explanation, and when they do understand what we want they give the matter no attention. This is the true state of the case as between the French-Canadian community and the Canadian Pacific.

"You say 'the line does not pay.' But surely the parsimonious manner in which the service is conducted is not exactly the best way to make it do so! Is the closing of branch lines for eighteen days at a time the way to make the line pay? Is it by neglecting to halloo a line ever since it fell into your hands, and running nothing better than a 15-miles-an-hour moccasin-train you are going to make it pay? You imported from Ogdensburg an individual named Bosworth, who could not speak a word of French and whose high breeding and culture were evidenced by tap-room oaths and tobacco chewing, to establish a set of stupid regulations for a new country where everything has yet to be created. At one blow he destroyed the splendid lumber traffic over the Canadian Pacific Railway from Hull to Montreal, which has now been diverted to the Ottawa; by the absurd rates he established he put a veto on the transport of cattle in large numbers from St. Thérèse, Joliette and Berthier; he established a special tariff for cordwood, calculated by the pound weight, instead of by the car load, and actually killed a branch of trade which was being extensively developed along the whole line of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

"But the sapient Bosworth has now vanished from the scene! What has become of him? What has become of the farmers who formerly shipped their produce on the company's trains? Many others also are missing, and will continue to be missed, so long as the company fail to place at the head of the eastern section of their railway, from Quebec to Ottawa, and branches, a competent man familiar with our language, knowing our people, their manner of living, working and trading, their way of travelling, and the periods when they like to travel whether for business or pleasure; a man with whom we can converse, and who can understand us, and with whom it would be a point of honor to treat us well and to create a profitable business for his own section of the road.

"The company are not justified in saying that the line does not pay, so long as they do not work it intelligently and under a system adapted to the French-Canadian population with whom they have to deal.

"You say the road does not pay! But how could it be otherwise when our people are daily subjected to treatment which no other class would patiently submit to, and which would not for one day be tolerated in France or in England!

"Let our legislators and the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway read what follows:

"The other day, a person from Ste. Thérèse, holding a 'commutation ticket,' took the 9 o'clock, a.m., train at Montreal, which, as the newspapers stated, was to stop at Ste. Thérèse. He was not allowed to stop at that place, but was compelled to go on to Lachute and return later at an additional cost of \$1.20. Two other passengers were treated in the same way. Is not this downright extortion? But the company, notwithstanding their absurd and annoying arrangements, cannot assert that the line does not pay as respects the carrying of passengers. Many of their leading officials have again and again said the reverse; and any one who has occasion to travel on the line now and then, will bear witness that the cars placed at the disposal of the public on certain of their branches are literally filled, and that the passengers, men and women alike, are frequently compelled to travel crowded together and standing, for several miles. But do your two Toronto lines pay so very

Mr. AMYOT.

well! Have we not seen a train laden with but two first-class passengers arrive from that capital?

"The answer: 'It does not pay,' is simply a ready-made reply to meet all cases which you do not want to deal; or an impudent attempt to impose on a population of 500,000 souls who have paid too much to stand any longer such a service as the company now afford."

This is a perfect picture of what is going on to-day, and I hope the Government will make representations to the directors of the company, in order that justice may be done to the trade and travelling public on that section of the line. I have another complaint to make. When we leave Quebec for Ottawa, we have to stop over at St. Martin for three or four hours, to obtain connection with Ottawa. This is perfectly absurd and unfair to that part of the country. It is no reason for the Canadian Pacific Railway to say that it does not pay. When the Canadian Pacific Railway wanted to have a terminus at Quebec, we hoped it would open a second road, and thus develop the country, but instead of doing so, they bought the North Shore line from the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Government came to the rescue of the Canadian Pacific Railway and gave to the company the \$1,000,000 which was going to be given to the Province of Quebec. By arrangement, if the Canadian Pacific Railway does not meet the interest of the money placed in that section, the Government is bound to indemnify them. The company has no excuse whatever to treat our section of the country in that way. I do not suppose that the directors know that this state of things exist, because I know they are well disposed towards the Province of Quebec generally speaking, and I think they want to give us fair play and justice. I hope that those few remarks may have the effect of causing a modification in their conduct, and that they will give us fair play and justice. I believe that the abolition of this monopoly will be a great benefit to the country and that it will be the cause of encouraging many branch lines in the North-West and Manitoba. We will, I believe, extend our commercial relations with the States, and we will make those relations so extensive and profitable, that the great cause of reciprocity will be enhanced by it, and finally we will have such trade relations through those railways that the great mass of the people will bring about the success of the reciprocity question. For all those reasons I will support the resolutions of the Government.

Mr. WATSON. I wish to address the House for a short time on this subject. My remarks will be brief, on account of the lateness of the Session, and the anxiety of the members of this House to conclude the business of this session. I must say that I have pleasure in supporting the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, because I believe that it is an amendment moved in the proper direction. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has stated that he believed the Canadian Pacific Railway will build branch lines fast enough in their own interest. Most people would suppose that the Canadian Pacific Railway would build branch lines in their own interest, but such is not the case. We have had experience in the past that it was not so, and we have found that portions of the country that were promised to be accommodated by branch lines years ago, are still without those lines. As I have stated in the House on a previous occasion, the company said they had no money to build branch lines in Manitoba. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact, that in the Local Legislature of the Province of Manitoba, they have passed resolutions asking that, as a condition of this settlement, the company should be required to extend branch lines. That resolution was moved by the Premier of the Province of Manitoba, and carried without a dissenting voice. When the Finance Minister introduced those resolutions to-day, I was a little surprised to hear his attempt to lead this House to believe that the Government of the day were overflowing with generosity and kindness towards the people of Manitoba, that they were now giving to that Pro-

vince all that was asked for, and that he believed it was true statesmanship for men to alter their position when they found it necessary. The people of Manitoba do not feel particularly grateful to the Government for making this change, but they do commend the wisdom of the Government in making the change. The Government of Canada have inflicted monopoly and disallowance on the Province of Manitoba just so long as that Province would submit to it. When they found that the Province was prepared to take the bit in its teeth, and construct a line of railway to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and break down the monopoly, then this Government yielded; and only then. I do not intend to go over the whole history of disallowance, because I have spoken about a portion of it on previous occasions, but this House must regret that the Government did not take advantage of opportunities which were presented to them on previous occasions to wipe out this monopoly clause, at a time when they could have wiped it out without the cost of risking one cent to the Dominion of Canada. In 1884 it will be remembered, when the Canadian Pacific Railway asked for a loan of \$30,000,000, I took advantage of that opportunity to move an amendment, which was supported by the Opposition in this House, to the effect that on condition of that loan being granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the right of monopoly should cease. That amendment was voted down by the Government and hon. gentlemen opposite. I have no doubt that at that time the Canadian Pacific Railway would have been only too glad to have given up clause 15 of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract on condition of receiving that grant. It was stated at that time that the road was not constructed, but it appeared to me then, and it appears to me now, that if the Government were prepared to vote \$30,000,000 at that time to the Canadian Pacific Railway as a loan, taking that railroad as security, that the company should feel perfectly safe, in trusting to the Government to protect their security. If they took the power of disallowance in their own hands, and if they saw fit to make it a part of the policy of the Government, they had a right to do so. The Minister of Finance stated that clause 15 was a similar clause to that which was contained in the offer made by the leader of the Mackenzie Administration for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is not so; it is entirely different. This clause was placed in the Canadian Pacific Railway contract giving those powers to a private corporation, while the Mackenzie Government had proposed to build that road as a Government work, and they made that provision in the contract, but they had it in their power, at any time, to relinquish the monopoly, and allow competition. In 1884, when the Finance Minister introduced the resolutions on the \$30,000,000, pledges were made by him, which I need not point out have been violated. He promised at that time that as soon as the road was constructed north of Lake Superior, the Government would see fit to revise the policy and allow competing lines of railway to the boundary line. It is unnecessary for me to state that that promise has not been carried out, and that the Government had gone on persistently disallowing the local Acts of the Province of Manitoba. The Minister of Finance has stated that the Government felt that they were now bound to revise their policy on account of the exceedingly large crop of last year. He went on to state that we had three very bad years in Manitoba, and while those three bad years existed, that the farmers who had very little grain to ship, according to his estimate, should have to pay a higher rate on that very small crop. I do not think that this House will accept the hon. gentleman's logic. He told us in 1884 that some 600,000,000 bushels of grain would be shipped out of Manitoba in 1890. If he expected 600,000,000 bushels of grain in 1890, why did he wait so long? Why did he not allow the construction of railroads? He has admitted that the Canadian Pacific Railway had not the capacity to export 14,000,

000 bushels of wheat out of that country last year, let alone 600,000,000. It appears to me this is not the particular reason for the change of policy, and in fact I feel satisfied that it is not. The hon. gentleman cannot speak too highly of the prospects of Manitoba for the present season. I believe that this year we will have at least a third more grain to export out of that Province than we had last year. I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman state that we had three bad years in Manitoba, for when some years ago I made reference, not to Manitoba but to a portion of the North-West that is not admitted to be as good as Manitoba, I was called to task by the hon. the Minister of Finance, who claimed that it was a very nice description for me to give of that country. That description has proved true, and so far as Manitoba is concerned the hon. gentleman cannot speak too highly of the prospects of this year. We have not had a crop during the past three or four seasons which has not been a better crop and has suffered less from natural causes than last season's spring crop in the Province of Ontario. The hon. Minister said that the question of disallowance in Manitoba was a legal question. I think that is not an argument which he can fairly bring up at this late day. The hon. Minister of Justice stated to the delegates who visited Ottawa last Session that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had no legal right of monopoly in the old Province of Manitoba, and if the hon. Minister of Finance had consulted the hon. Minister of Justice on that subject, he would have had no need to state to the House to-day that it was a legal question whether that power extended to the old Province or not. The hon. gentleman stated that the Government had been led to believe that disallowance should cease, and that the monopoly clause should be wiped out, in consequence of the large crop we had in Manitoba last year, and in consequence of the persistent endeavors of myself and other gentlemen from Manitoba and the North-West. Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems rather strange that such a statement should be made. I might ask those hon. gentlemen, why their sudden change on this matter? I remember that in the debate last Session on the resolution which I moved that monopoly should cease in Manitoba, the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) stated that with the exception of a few hot-headed politicians and ruined real estate men, there was nobody in Manitoba who wanted disallowance or monopoly to cease. I might also call the attention of the House to the views expressed by other hon. members, to whom I suppose the hon. gentleman refers as having urged the Government to do away with the monopoly. I find that W. D. Perley, M. P., at a meeting of the Conservative Association at Qu'Appelle, on the 30th of December last, is reported by the *Progress* to have stated his position as follows:—

"Mr. Perley spoke of the disallowance agitation as being a blow at Confederation, and said he refused to be party at striking the blow at the Dominion as a whole."

I wonder if the hon. gentleman expressed similar views to the hon. Minister of Finance and the Government at Ottawa during the Session. The *Regina Leader* of 24th May, 1887, gives the views of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) as follows:—

"Mr. Davin voluntarily declared his opinion in his address against disallowance."

That is what I stated last Session, that the hon. gentleman had declared in his address to the electors that he was opposed to disallowance. But that hon. gentleman did not vote in the House, but paired with the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) on that question:

"He is against it still, but the question was hardly before the constituencies and were he to vote in favor of his abstract opinion he would go against the practical interests of his constituents."

These were the views expressed by those hon. gentlemen only a short time ago, and when they voted against my

resolution in this House last Session, I supposed that they did not wish the Government to change their policy.

Mr. DAVIN. I merely rise to remark, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman attributes words to me that I did not use. That is a newspaper's comment on my opinion.

Mr. WATSON. The newspaper is the *Regina Leader*, which is supposed as a rule to express the views of the hon. gentleman. Of course, I give the extract for what it is worth. I thought the hon. member for East Assiniboia had more appreciation of the truthfulness of the *Regina Leader*. Now, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that under the arrangement proposed by the Government Manitoba receives nothing, unless some such changes are made in these resolutions as are proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition. Manitoba has now the right to build railroads, as has been maintained by the Opposition all along, and as was admitted by the hon. Minister of Justice to the Manitoba delegates last Session. It is not necessary for me to state to this House the views expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite during the session when the contract was adopted—for their speeches have often been quoted—to the effect that the monopoly clause did not apply to Manitoba. Therefore I maintain that Manitoba has no right to be charged with any portion of this guarantee, because Manitoba is receiving no benefit from it, and I say that the Government should be censured even at this late day for coming down here and dealing out justice to Manitoba which she should have received years ago. The people did rely on the statement made by the hon. Finance Minister three or four years ago that as soon as the railway was constructed north of Lake Superior the monopoly would cease, and they remained quietly waiting for the completion of that line before they raised a voice for competition. By the proposed arrangement the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in reality give up all claim to any lands in the North-West, and so they will not have the same interest in developing the country as they have had while holding the lands, because they find that there is enough land now under cultivation to tax the carrying powers of the railway. Therefore I believe that the money they realise from the guarantee will be used in binding the monopoly still tighter on Manitoba. I do not know whether or not it is on the strength of this proposed guarantee, but I see that they have purchased controlling interest in the Sault route, which the people of Manitoba expected would be held by an independent company which would be willing to give running powers to the Grand Trunk or any other company that would wish to come and relieve Manitoba from monopoly; and I fear that the moneys they will raise on the strength of this guarantee will be used for the purpose of maintaining their monopoly as strongly as they have done in the past. Now, I am not going to say that the Government are not taking sufficient security for the guarantee; I am not going to discuss that question; but I do say that in all reason the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will not encourage settlers to come into the country, which they find is already too large for their carrying capacity, and they are trying to get the Government to relieve them of some of the responsibility. Now, the policy pursued by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and this Government—for I charge this Government with having prevented the construction of competing lines—has caused great loss to the Province of Manitoba, and directly to the owners of last year's crop. It is estimated that if that crop had been carried out promptly and at as reasonable rates as the grain of Dakota was carried at, the people of Manitoba would have realised an advantage of at least \$1,500,000. And the Government did not simply leave the monopoly to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but they prevented a road that was built up to the boundary line from carrying any portion of that crop. The Northern Pacific Company built a line of railway to the boundary line and asked for bond-

Mr. WATSON.

ing privileges, whereby they might ship wheat out of Manitoba to Ontario, but the customs authorities refused to grant bonding privileges, and thus forced the whole crop to be carried over the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, I will simply call the attention of the House for a very few moments to the action of the House in preventing the construction of the Red River Valley road last year. That road was to have been built under a charter granted by the Local Legislature of Manitoba, a charter which was entirely within the power of that Province to grant, it was a charter for a road running directly over a route laid down by the hon. the late Minister of the Interior in his speech in 1881, when he said that Manitoba had a perfect right to build a line of railway from Winnipeg to the boundary, and there connect with the American roads. The Local Legislature passed an Act granting a charter for the building of such a road, but that Act was disallowed by the federal authority. Notwithstanding that disallowance, the Local Government, finding it impossible to get private parties to undertake such an enterprise on account of the hostile action of the Dominion authorities took power to build that road as a Government work. The Local Government then proceeded to build the road as a Government work, and the Federal Government again disallowed the Act and every other Act for that purpose, for there were several Acts which took power to build to the boundary. The Local Government still persisted in building the road; and what was the next move? The Canadian Pacific Railway purchased or got an agent to purchase a lot of land, which extended between the Red River and the Canadian Pacific Railway South-Western, which runs to Greta, extending the full length between the river and the Canadian Pacific track, except road allowance at the rear end of the lot. The Canadian Pacific Railway then obtained an injunction against the construction of the Red River Valley line across that lot. The Canadian Pacific Railway then went to work and built a spur line and a switch across this road allowance, to prevent the Red River Valley road being constructed on that road allowance. The Local Government persisting, however, in proceeding to construct the Red River Valley line across this lot, and then several injunctions were obtained against the construction of that work by a director of Canadian Pacific Railway, who has the honor of a seat in this House, I refer to the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald A. Smith). The injunction, however, apparently failed in that case; and then this generous Government went to work and obtained an injunction against the construction of the Red River Valley Line across the land that had been held and occupied by settlers for a number of years, on the ground that, as patents had not been issued for those lands, they belonged to the Government. The Premier of Manitoba then proceeded to try and raise money for the construction of that line, the estimated cost of which was \$750,000, in the money markets of the world, whither he was followed, according to his own statement, by an agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, who threw all the obstacles possible in his way, the result being that he was unable to float the bonds for the construction of that work. The people of Manitoba, who are the proper parties to be credited with this change in the policy of the Government felt justified—whether properly or not, it is not for me to say,—in believing that Mr. Norquay, the Premier of Manitoba, was not sincere in his endeavors to raise money for the construction of the work, and the result was he had to resign the leadership of the party. Then a gentleman came to the front who was supposed to be a better Conservative than Mr. Norquay—a man who had always been true and had never kicked—Dr. Harrison, and he proposed a compromise between the Dominion and Local Governments. He was premier but for a few hours when he had to go to the wall, as the people of Manitoba would accept no compromise, as they

would accept nothing less than the right to construct the railway to the boundary line. Mr. Greenway was called upon to form a Government, which he did, and he is backed up, not only by the Liberals but by almost the solid vote of the people of Manitoba on this question of disallowance. Mr. Greenway proceeded to Ottawa where he succeeded in obtaining a letter from the Government to the effect that the policy of disallowance would be discontinued. Now, I will just say this, that if the Dominion Government had ceased, during the past autumn, objecting to the construction of the Red River line, the House to-day would not have been called to guarantee this large amount of money to the Canadian Pacific Railway, because the construction of that work would have settled the difficulty, as far as Manitoba is concerned. The construction of that work would have shown the people of Manitoba and this House that Manitoba had the right to build that road, because she had built it and defied the authorities to impede her in the exercise of her just rights. Last Session I ventured to use some strong language in this House during the debate on this question of disallowance, and was called a traitor and several other harsh names, because I stated that, if the Government interfered with the construction of this line, there would be trouble in the west. The events have proved that I was right in making that statement and in warning the Government at that time as I did; and the Government have had to yield, not to the prayer or petition of Manitoba, but to the demand of Manitoba for the acknowledgment of the right to build that line without being interfered with by the federal authority. Why this change of front to-day on the part of the Government? The hon. the Finance Minister has given us his reasons for it. He has told us that it is due to the large crop of last year that the Government made up their minds to yield on this question. But what do we find stated in a report of the sub-committee of the Privy Council to the Imperial authorities, dated the 4th January, 1888? In that report, that sub-committee, composed of the Hon. Thomas White, Minister of the Interior, and the Hon. J. S. D. Thompson, Minister of Justice, recommended that the petition of Manitoba, which had been forwarded to the Imperial authorities, should not be listened to, and gave the reasons why. How is it, I would ask, that the eyes of the Minister of Finance and of his colleagues have been opened since the 4th January, 1888? Did he not know then that we had this large crop, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway were unable to carry it out of the country? Did they not know that cars could not be furnished by the Canadian Pacific Railway to carry away the crop? Did they not know that tens of thousands of bushels of wheat were piled along the line waiting transportation, which the Canadian Pacific Railway could not furnish? Now he comes down and tells us that this change of policy has been brought about because of the large crop, when only on the 4th of January, 1888, the sub-committee of the Privy Council recommended that the policy of disallowance should be continued and gave the reasons why. I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, that the reasons given consist in the quotation of extracts from speeches made by members of the late Government in the Province of Manitoba, but the people have risen in their might irrespective of party and have demanded of this Government the right to construct railways in that Province, of which they should have never been deprived. I will call the attention of the Government to another fact. They are taking this land as security, and I do not know whether it will be considered as Government land or Canadian Pacific Railway land. During 20 years from the letting of this contract, the Canadian Pacific Railway lands are to be exempt from taxation. It appears to me that the Government may practically hold those lands for another 12 years, a large portion of them may not be disposed of, and the Province of

Manitoba and the Territories may not be able to obtain any taxes from them just in the same way as if they remained in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The question of the taxation of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands is now becoming a burning question in Manitoba and the Territories. Under that clause of the contract, they had a right to the exemption of their lands from taxation for twenty years and of their rolling stock and matters of that kind forever. Well, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have a certain mode of disposing of their land. The Minister of Finance has told us that the average price at which they have disposed of their lands is \$3.15. Why is that the price? Because a large portion of those lands are exempt from taxation; they are exempt from taxation until an agreement is registered in the registry office of the municipality, so that the municipality may find out to whom the lands belong. The North-West Company bought a large amount of lands from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they were sold in such a way that I do not think there could be a cent of taxes collected. The Local Legislature of Manitoba, sympathising with the municipalities, have agreed to undertake the cost of testing a case between one municipality and the North-West Land Company. The amount of taxes which the municipalities lose in consequence of this exemption is enormous. I find that the amount of land in the Province of Manitoba which is exempt from taxation and is supposed to be held by the North-West Land Company is as follows:—

	Lands Exempt.	Annual Loss.
North Cypress	26,720	\$ 923 53
Odannah	10,080	401 00
Osprey	3,200	168 00
Miniota	11,680	473 73
Elton	3,520	284 59
Glendale	3,520	330 00
Woodworth	30,160	1,241 25
Cornwallis	3,860	359 95
Archie	19,360	608 77
Brenda	115,840	1,200 00
South Cypress	38,560	1,186 45
Whitewater	18,080	271 20
Oakland	8,960	305 53
Daly	2,240	118 00
Burnside	58,320	2,814 58

This does not include all the lands, because in some of the municipal returns, it is found impossible to separate the Canadian Pacific Railway lands and the lands of the Land Company, and so they cannot show what proportion of land should be taxed. I have no desire to decry the quality of the lands, but I must point out that, when the Minister of Finance stated that the average price was \$3.15, it should be remembered that these are selected lands, and must necessarily be the best lands in the country. I say that company made a good bargain in buying the land at that price, but the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are holding lands in Manitoba to-day at a price which no purchaser will pay. They are holding lands from \$4 to \$10 an acre. These lands are not subjected to taxation. They are in different municipalities, and they are a great loss to the municipality, because schools and churches and other public institutions have to be maintained, and it is a great drawback to have these lands locked up and paying no taxes. I do not feel disposed to occupy any more time. I will certainly support the amendment. It is unnecessary for me to repeat what I said in the House before as to the causes which led the people of Manitoba and the North-West to demand competition in railways, but, so far as the North-West is concerned, through their representatives, we have not heard any objection to monopoly. Last year, the representatives of the North-West voted in favor of monopoly, and against doing away with disallowance, and that because they can only expect to have their railway communication east and west through the Province of Manitoba. All their freight has to come through that Province, and it is simply a question for the

North-West whether they will tap the international boundary in the old Province of Manitoba or in the added territory. Before long, we expect to have a competing line by means of steamboats from Duluth. We feel that we will not be able to ship freight at the rates which the Canadian Pacific Railway will be compelled to charge for carrying our grain by all rail from the North-West to Montreal, so we expect to send it by water by way of Duluth or Port Arthur. I am satisfied that that will be the result and that they will connect with the all-rail route from eastern boundary of Manitoba. For the reasons I have given I intend to support the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, and I trust that the Government will see fit to make such changes in their proposed conditions of settlement, as will afford all sections of country in the Province of Manitoba the railway accommodation that the Canadian Pacific Railway have promised them for years, I know that the settlers in certain portions of Manitoba, particularly in south-western portion, represented by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) are greatly in need of railway accommodation. The member representing West Brandon moved in the Local Legislature the other day that it was of the utmost importance that branch lines should be extended from Brandon to the south-west in the very near future, and that it would be a considerable loss to that section of the country if railway accommodation is not provided. Settlers located in that district years ago when they were promised that they should have railway accommodation immediately. They have lived there for years, they have grown a large amount of grain, but they have not been able to dispose of it at remunerative prices. The gentleman who moved this resolution, Mr. Kirkcaldy, and who is a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite in politics, stated that unless the people were afforded such accommodation, it would be necessary for them to cease growing grain, and actually to abandon the homesteads which they have held for years. Mr. Speaker, I have made these remarks in order to set forth my position, and what I believe to be the views of a majority of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. DALY. Hon. members will no doubt recognise the fact that as a member from Manitoba, I have a particular interest in the question before the House. I am indeed surprised at the stand that has been taken by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) who has just sat down. That any man from the Province of Manitoba, that any gentleman representing a constituency, either in Manitoba or the North-West Territory, should stand upon the floor of this House and oppose such a resolution as the Minister of Finance has brought down to-night, I never supposed would come about in the history of the Parliament of Canada. What else has been the cry in the Province of Manitoba during the last five or six years, but "this crushing monopoly was grinding the life-blood out of our country?" And when at the last moment the Government has conceded that this monopoly should be done away with, when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been induced to enter into an arrangement with the Government to do away with the monopoly, and the Minister of Finance asks this Parliament to assent to that arrangement, an arrangement which it is conceded by the Reform press of Canada, throughout the length and breadth of it, to be a fair one, we find the hon. member for Marquette, supposed to stand here, as he has been called by the Reform press of Manitoba, the sole representative of that Province—that hon. gentleman stands up here and has the hardihood to say that he is going to vote for this amendment. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the sooner this rip, ranting, and roaring hypocrisy that we see upon the other side of the House, is done away with, the better. We beheld a spectacle in this House last Session that, I suppose, has never occurred before in Canada, when

Mr. WATSON.

my colleague from Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth), and myself, had to vote against the Government upon the question of disallowance, I who have been a supporter of the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, as far back as I can remember, and the hon. member for Winnipeg who has been a life-long supporter also of the right hon. gentleman. We carried out the pledges that we made to our constituents, echoing the voice of the whole people of Manitoba upon this question of disallowance, and we came down here and manfully withstood the reproach that we were voting against the party that we were elected to support, and voted against the Government upon the question of disallowance. We stood true to our colors then. But we find now that things have changed, we find that Richard is not himself? The hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who criticised my conduct upon that occasion, the press representing that gentleman in the Province of Manitoba who criticised my conduct, will find that, to-morrow, when that speech is read in Manitoba, that the man whom they looked upon as being their sole representative, has acted far otherwise to-day than they expected him to do. Now, Sir, we find that the great Liberal party of Canada were not able to pose in Manitoba as Reformers, but they endeavored to pose as Manitoba Liberals, they designated themselves as being Manitoba Liberals, they went to work and drew up a platform. A meeting of that association was held in Winnipeg on the 2nd March, 1886, and the fifth plank in their platform was the following:—

"PROVINCIAL RIGHTS PLATFORM.

"The absolute right to charter local lines of railway not extending beyond the boundaries of the Province, and it is asserted that whatever arrangements the Dominion Government may have made with the Canadian Pacific Railway curtailing the said Dominion Government is in duty bound to cause such arrangements to be set aside by purchase or otherwise, and thus restore to Manitoba her rights in this respect."

Now, Sir, that is a plank of the "Provincial Rights" platform in Manitoba. They laid it down as a plank that the Government should purchase the rights of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the monopoly. What is the Government seeking to do to-day? Are they not seeking to purchase the rights of the monopoly? Have they not come down with a resolution which says that this "grinding monopoly" is to be abolished? But we find, in face of that fact, that the hon. gentleman opposite, who is the sole representative from that Province, is opposing the resolutions that the Government have brought down. In addition to the resolutions that that were passed by the Liberal Association, we find that the *Winnipeg Free Press*, which supports that hon. gentleman, which has boomed that hon. gentleman, which has told the people of Manitoba and the people of Canada that he is the sole representative of Manitoba—the *Free Press*, on the 22nd July last, stated, in reference to the monopoly:

"The monopoly must be abolished everywhere, and if the Dominion Government have contracted to grant it to the Canadian Pacific Railway in the added territory and the North-West, that contract must be rescinded without being repudiated."

Again we find that the *Winnipeg Free Press* on the 7th December, 1887, stated:

"There can be no two opinions regarding the advisability of buying out the monopoly rights which are actually possessed by the Canadian Pacific Railway in the added territory of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Although the Dominion Parliament did not contract to give the railway a monopoly in old Manitoba, it did enter into an agreement to furnish it with a monopoly in the added territory and in the North-West."

Then again, the same newspaper, on the 21st December, 1887, says:

"In old Manitoba, to be sure, the Canadian Pacific Railway has no legal right to monopoly, but in the 'added territory,' which forms a very considerable part of the Province, it does possess such right just as fully as it possesses a similar right in the North-West Territories. As to the project of buying out the monopoly right we fail to see how any journal in this country or in the Dominion can oppose it."

The reason I have troubled the House with these statements is to show that the Reform or the Liberal party in Manitoba are bound to the plank laid down in their platform, and that is that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have certain rights in the added territory, as it is known, or the larger portion of Manitoba, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would not be likely to give up those rights without compensation. Yet, in the face of this fact, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), whose constituency is largely composed of counties lying within the added territory, as is my own constituency, rises and states that so far as Manitoba is concerned the Government have no right to compensate the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We heard the Minister of Finance state this afternoon that 7,000,000 bushels of wheat were sent from Manitoba this year, and I venture to say, without fear of contradiction, and the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) will bear me out, that of that quantity exported over 4,000,000 bushels were raised in the added territory; and that very added territory would have remained until the expiration of twenty years under the ban of monopoly unless this resolution had been brought down by the Government.

Mr. WATSON. Does the hon gentleman not suppose that the grain of the added territory will always be shipped through the old Province of Manitoba?

Mr. DALY. I do not know any other line of railway in Manitoba to-day by which it could be shipped. I am speaking of matters as I find them. I will come to a question later on which will possibly answer the hon. gentleman. I was about to point out to the House that I represent the largest constituency in Manitoba so far as population is concerned, there being 34,000 people there according to the last census, and 11,500 votes upon the voters' list. Of these 11,500 voters there is no question whatever that 8,000 live in the added territory, and therefore 8,000 of the voters who sent me to this House are men interested the same as is the hon. member who represents Eastern Assiniboia in the question of monopoly. I was surprised to see the leader of the Opposition expose his ignorance in regard to this matter; I did not suppose he would do so in discussing this question. I presume the hon. gentleman has never been in the country, either in Manitoba or the North-West, and that he has been inspired, as was the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when he made a statement during the earlier part of the Session that thousands of bushels of grain were rotting at the stations. The hon. gentleman made that assertion simply upon statements made to him by men interested in decrying the country. I would simply state that the largest portion of Manitoba is as much affected by clause 15 of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract as it any part of the Territories. The hon. gentleman's amendment is cunningly worded to catch myself and other hon. members who voted against disallowance last year; but they are not going to catch me. I have used every possible endeavor, and the leader of the Government and the Minister of Finance will say so; they will say that I and my colleagues, the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) and the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth) pressed, in season and out of season, the Government to carry out the view they now take. Although the question of disallowance was a moot question in Manitoba, yet at the same time only a certain portion of the Province would be affected and that was old Manitoba; the largest portion of my constituency would still remain under the ban of monopoly if disallowance were removed and it was conceded, as I have contended and will ever contend, that the Local Legislature had power to grant charters for lines running to the boundary, and if Mr. Greenway had obtained

the declaration of the Government previously that no more charters would be disallowed, the agitation would still have gone on. My people would not have yielded in that way; the mere fact of Mr. Greenway chartering lines to the boundary was not going to give compensation to the people I represent in the added territory. The people living in the added territory, among others in the constituency represented by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), would not be affected if disallowance was simply going to be done away with, and it would not have brought peace to Manitoba. I, and the hon. members I have mentioned, urged on the Government that the only thing that could possibly be done was to wipe out the monopoly clause, and by that means place the added Territory in the same position as the rest of Manitoba. I may say for the information of the House that it is my intention to move an amendment to the resolution in Committee of the Whole, to the effect that we regret exceedingly that the Government have not seen fit to provide for the building of the branch lines spoken of in the last clause of the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. The position taken appears a very singular one to me, representing as I do the very people who are most affected by the question of branch lines, knowing that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) must know, and through him the leader of the Opposition, that I have urged this question on the Government in season and out of season. I presented a petition to Sir Geo. Stephen not long ago signed by 229 ratepayers in nine townships, who stated they had marketed 532,000 bushels of wheat, that they had 32,000 acres of land ready for crop this year. That petition was taken into consideration by the directors of the company, and the reply I received from Mr. Van Horne was to the following effect.

"1st May, 1888.

"MY DEAR SIR,—The petition of the resident ratepayers of the municipalities of Glenwood, Whitewater, Oakland, and Brenda, concerning the construction of the Souris Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which comes to us through your hands, was considered by our board of directors at their recent meeting.

"The directors do not feel justified in deciding upon any policy as regards railway extension in Manitoba at present or until the policy of the Provincial Government in this particular is fully determined. While our directors fully appreciate the needs of the settlers in the Souris district in the way of additional railway facilities, they cannot find money to build railways in competition with the Government.

"It should be remembered that the Provincial Government is now engaged in the construction of a line between Winnipeg and the international boundary which will destroy the value of the two lines belonging to this company, together amounting to 135 miles of railway, and representing in value more than \$2,000,000, and the company has reason to believe that the Government contemplates extensions in other directions. The company's ability to provide additional railway facilities will be reduced at least to the extent of the destruction of its existing property by such action of the Local Government. With a view to preventing this loss, the company some time ago intimated its willingness to lease in perpetuity its existing line from Emerson to Winnipeg and has lately repeated this offer, indicating at the same time a disposition to go as far as possible towards meeting the views of the Government as to rental. No decisive answer has yet been received, and until we know the intention of Mr. Greenway's Government we will not be able to say what the policy of the company will be, but I fear that the pressure upon him from those in Winnipeg who want some money spent by the Government, whether it will serve a useful purpose or not, may be greater than he can withstand.

"Yours very truly,

"W. O. VAN HORNE."

"T. MAYNE DALY, Esq., M.P.,
"House of Commons,
"Ottawa."

It is apparent from the tone of that letter that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were prevented from taking into consideration the question of building those branch lines simply from the fact that Mr. Greenway and his Government had made up their minds that they were going into competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway in building branch lines in Southern Manitoba. Now, Sir, at a meeting which was held in my constituency about three weeks before I left home, men stated on the public platform that

they desired to have branch lines constructed, but that they wanted those lines to be built by the Canadian Pacific Railway and no other. They had lived in the Province of Ontario, and they lived on the line of the Midland Railway, and they knew what it was to be served by an independent railway which carried their grain to the Grand Trunk, necessitating the payment of double freight charges. They did not want the same treatment they received in Ontario, and they wanted this line to be built by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have shown that I have urged in every possible way that the Canadian Pacific Railway should build those branches, and I am going to show that I am in earnest in the matter, by moving this amendment in committee. It seems to me strange that the hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Watson) and the members of the Opposition, should be actuated by so great a desire to serve the constituents I represent in this House. They imagine, I suppose, that I never thought about such a thing as this. I tell the hon. gentlemen opposite, that the people of the Province of Manitoba will appreciate their anxiety in their behalf, when they see the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, and they will appreciate it further, when they read the speech that has been made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). The hon. member for Marquette referred to the question of the Red River Valley Railroad and he said, that was the burning question in Manitoba. It was a burning question. So burning was the question that I predicted at a banquet given me on my return from Parliament last year, that it would be a cold day for Mr. Norquay when he introduced the Red River Valley scheme, and it was a cold day for him, for he is now in the cold shades of Opposition. I predicted that, and I predict now again in this House, that the Red River Valley Railway will prove a cold day for Mr. Greenway also, and that this gentleman will fall by the scheme. The Red River Valley Railway means the building of a line from Fort Rouge to the boundary line. That would only accommodate the people of Winnipeg and the surrounding country, and it could not go to the people I represent. The reason I stood upon a platform in Manitoba as soon as I went back, and condemned this Red River Valley Railway was, because, I believed that on a question of that kind, I should represent the interests of my constituents. It is true I stood up and faced the whole public opinion of Manitoba on that question, but I did it for conscientious reasons, because I believed, and I believe now, that that railway could never, and will never, accommodate the people I represent. Our people wanted monopoly to be wiped out and that the 15th clause of the contract should be abrogated. I find now that the Canadian Pacific Railway are willing to abrogate the clause. The Reformers of the Province of Manitoba, and the Liberal press of the Province had made it a plank in their platform that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be compensated for this, yet at the earliest possible moment when those negotiations were brought down, when the resolutions were placed on the Table of this House, we find the great Liberal party of Canada and the only Liberal representative west of Lake Superior coming down here and opposing this very policy. Why, gentlemen, we are told in the Province of Manitoba to-day by the Liberal press, that this arrangement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government has been brought about by Mr. Greenway. We all know that Mr. Greenway and Mr. Martin were down here, and that they came as representing the Province of Manitoba. What did those gentlemen come here for? According to the memoranda published in the newspapers of the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Greenway said he came down here to try and discuss with Sir John Macdonald and the Government, the question of abolishing disallowance. He never referred to the question of monopoly, and monopoly is not referred to in any of the memo-

Mr. DALY.

randa he has made. At the same time that hon. gentleman was here endeavoring to do away with this disallowance, and to do away with it to an extent which would only affect one portion of the Province, we, the representatives from Manitoba on this side of the House, were busy day in and day out, negotiating with the right hon. the Premier to try and wipe out monopoly, and he in turn was negotiating with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The fact is, that when Mr. Greenway went back, he stated to reporters in Winnipeg and in Toronto, that he knew nothing whatever of the terms and negotiations that were going on between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway. We were conversant with those terms because the Government had taken us into their confidence and although I do not seek, nor do my colleagues seek any credit for the bringing about of these terms, I want to state here, as I will state in Manitoba, that from the first time I was elected, I have been trying and endeavoring to try and wipe out the monopoly. After all the efforts I and my colleagues on this side of the House have made, and after all the abuse we have been subject to by the hon. gentlemen on the other side, we find the efforts we have made have not been seconded by an hon. gentleman who represents a Manitoba constituency on the opposite side of the House.

An Hon. MEMBER. Misrepresents.

Mr. DALY. Yes, misrepresents. I was about to say "misrepresents" a Manitoba constituency. After the efforts we have made, he hurls back in our teeth, and tries to belittle the work we have brought about in the interests of the Province of Manitoba. In these memoranda that were published in the Winnipeg newspapers, Mr. Greenway sets out among other things, that he had several interviews with the right hon. the leader of the Government, that those interviews were not satisfactory, that they could never reach the leading question, and that leading question, mind you, was disallowance. When this was proceeding there was engaging the attention of the right hon. gentleman a question which it was not his business to inform the Premier of Manitoba about, and that is the question we are discussing here to-night; for the question of disallowance is included in the greater question of monopoly. The hon. the leader of the Opposition and the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) have stated that that is the Liberal platform, that so far as Manitoba was concerned all they required from the Canadian Pacific Railway was that monopoly should be discontinued in the old Province of Manitoba. I have shown by my action on public platforms in Manitoba, and by my vote in this House last year, that I was not in accord with the policy adopted by the Government on the question of disallowance. At the same I felt this: that although I represented a constituency that was not actually interested in the question of disallowance so far as their material interests were concerned, because if disallowance had been discontinued it would not affect the building of railways in my constituency, yet as an abstract question, as a question of principle, as a question of right, I felt that the Legislature of Manitoba should have the same right to charter lines of railway to the boundary, as any other Province in the Dominion had. What has Mr. Greenway secured at the hands of this Government to-day? He has admitted that he knew nothing about the negotiations between the Canadian Pacific Railway and Sir John A. Macdonald, he felt that he was not being taken into his confidence; he felt that he was being kept here longer than he thought he should have been kept; he did not like the idea of remaining here until Mr. Van Horne would return from the west, or until Sir George would be here; he felt aggrieved; he leaves here and he comes back. When he went back to the people of Manitoba all that he took with him was a letter from the right hon.

the Premier, and there is nothing in that letter except the concluding portion of it which is as follows:—

"The great and unexpected harvests of last year and the increased area proposed to be sown this year prove that additional facilities for the transport eastward of the agricultural products of the North-West will be required, and while I have reason to believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will make large expenditures to enable it to handle this increased traffic the Administration will not advise the disallowance of a Bill similar in principle to the Act for the construction of the Red River Valley Railway."

That is all that Mr. Greenway took back with him, a promise that the Administration will not advise the disallowance of a Bill similar in principle to the Act for the construction of the Red River Valley Railway. Does that say that the Government of the right hon. gentleman would discontinue the policy of disallowance throughout the whole of Manitoba? Does that say that those numerous lines that have been chartered by the Local Legislature are not subject to disallowance to-morrow? It simply says that a charter similar to that granted to the Red River Valley Railway Company will not be disallowed. But, on the other hand, while Mr. Greenway went back with that simple letter, myself and my colleagues, the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth), the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), were not content with doing away with disallowance merely. We wanted the doing away with the greater matter; we wanted to wipe out monopoly, and I can say this, as I have said before, that the doing away of disallowance would not affect my people, because they would not be able to secure any competing lines by the doing away with that. I contended on platforms in Manitoba, and I contend here, in accordance with the report of the two members of the Privy Council, that no Local Legislature, be it that of Manitoba, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Ontario, has a right to charter a line of railway running beyond the boundary of the Province. The leader of the Opposition said to-day that it was a question on which lawyers differ. My opinion as a lawyer has been all along that the British North America Act did not contemplate that any Local Legislature had the power to grant charters to lines of railway running beyond the boundaries of the Province. If it did, why did the Canada Southern Railway Company and the Great Western Railway Company, whose lines ran into the United States, come to the Parliament of Canada for their charters? Now, all that Mr. Greenway has got is a letter to the effect that a charter similar to that of the Red River Valley Railway Company shall not be disallowed. Does that mean that other charters shall not be disallowed. Does it give to Manitoba the constitutional right to charter lines beyond the boundary? Certainly not. So far as Manitoba is concerned, the question of disallowance to-day stands in the same position as it does with respect to other Provinces, and the measures passed by the Manitoba Legislature are still as much subject to disallowance as those passed by the Legislature of any other Province. I congratulate the Government, I congratulate the right hon. Premier Minister, I congratulate the people I represent, and I congratulate the whole Province of Manitoba, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have consented to negotiate with the Government on this matter, and that the Government in turn have consented to negotiate with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that a settlement has been brought about; and I trust sincerely that the people of Manitoba will, as I am sure they will, appreciate the efforts of myself and my colleagues on this side of the House in connection with this matter; and at the same time I am perfectly satisfied that they will deprecate the action of the hon. member for Marquette who preceded me. Now, there is one point that I do not want the House or the people of Manitoba to lose sight of; there is one point that I do not want the constituents of the hon. member for Marquette to

lose sight of, that is, that if the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition is carried, for which the hon. gentleman says he is going to vote, monopoly will continue, and everything we are fighting for will be lost, and the people he represents will remain under the bann of monopoly. Why, we have been told on platform after platform in the North-West by those righteous Liberals that monopoly has been grinding the life-blood out of the country; and two years ago, when we approached the Canadian Pacific Railway on the subject of abandoning the monopoly, they pooh poohed it; the sums they asked were too large; the Government would not agree to them; and now, when the Government bring down a measure to accomplish that very thing, the hon. leader of the Opposition moves an amendment which, if carried, will continue disallowance and monopoly during the whole period for which the contract provides; and the hon. member for Marquette intends to support that amendment. I can scarcely conceive of the hon. gentleman occupying so unfortunate a position. Now, a great deal has been said by the hon. leader of the Opposition in regard to the security that the Government will hold for this guarantee. The hon. Minister of Finance has shown clearly that the Government will have sufficient security in the lands which will be held by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and which, after all encumbrances are removed, will be worth \$1.15 an acre; and I think the policy the company are pursuing to-day is a wise one. They are endeavoring in every possible way they can to secure the settlement of the Government lands, the homestead and pre-emption lands throughout Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and they are not devoting the same effort to sell their own lands that they would do if the Government lands were all settled. It stands to reason that when a mangoes into a new country like the North-West, if he can get a homestead on payment of \$10 in a Dominion land office, he will prefer doing that to paying \$2.50 or \$3 an acre for Canadian Pacific Railway lands; and when that country is fully opened up and settled, there is not the slightest doubt, in my mind, that the value of those lands will greatly increase. It has been contended by the hon. member for Marquette that, as soon as the monopoly is done away with, the population of the country will increase, which would increase the value of the lands, and if the proposition of the Government is carried to-night, monopoly will be done away with; and, carrying out the reasoning of hon. gentlemen opposite, there is no doubt that population will increase largely, and that the value of the lands will also increase, and that the Government will have ample security. Now, I will not detain the House at any greater length, except to say a few words with regard to the amendment which I propose to move in committee, as I may not have another opportunity. The people living in south-western Manitoba are very much interested in the building of branch lines. Hon. members are aware that a Bill was passed in this House last Session extending the time for the building of the South-Western Colonisation Railway, which now runs to Deloraine. The Act provided that that railway, which is controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, should be built to the extent of 50 miles this year. In 1881 the Canadian Pacific Railway Company sent out surveyors south-west of Brandon, and they surveyed a line running south-west to the Souris coal regions. The line known as the Glenboro' Branch runs about 70 miles south-west from Winnipeg; and the people in the section which I represent wish it to be extended for 15 or 16 miles, and they wish the Souris Branch to be extended at least 50 or 60 miles to Melita, and the Deloraine Branch extended to the boundary of the Province. But I regret exceedingly that while the schedule and the agreement were signed by the hon. Minister of Railways and Sir George Stephen, the schedule did not provide for the construction of these branch lines. To give the members of this House and the people of the

country some idea of the quantity of grain raised last year in the country of which I speak, I will cite a few figures, showing the quantity of grain grown by some of the settlers, which will indicate how prosperous our farmers are in that neighborhood:

Settlers.	Bushels.
Gray Bros., tp. 7, r. 18.....	16,000
T. Nichol, tp. 7, r. 17.....	18,000
Jas. Elliott, tp. 7, r. 17.....	14,000
Jas. McFadden, tp. 8, r. 17.....	18,000
F. O. Fowler, tp. 7, r. 18.....	10,000
Jas. Brenner, tp. 7, r. 17.....	20,000
E. Donaldson, tp. 8, r. 18.....	8,000
B. Lines, tp. 7, r. 19.....	6,000
A. H. Carroll, tp. 7, r. 19.....	5,000
H. C. Graham, tp. 8, r. 19.....	7,500
Jas. Henderson, tp. 8, r. 19.....	7,000

Making an aggregate that those men living in those three townships marketed of 123,500 bushels of wheat. Everyone of these farmers had to team their wheat 18 miles into the city of Brandon, and all that is required to give them market facilities is to extend the South-Western Colonisation Branch some 15 miles, which will bring them within seven miles of a market. I ask, therefore, that the Government should urge upon the Canadian Pacific Railway to extend that branch these 15 miles. Then we come to another portion of my constituency, which lies south-west of the city of Brandon, which is 25 miles from the city of Brandon and 16 miles from Alexander, the nearest point on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, there are very large markets there. For instance, Mr. Wenman, last year, marketed from that district some 8,000 bushels, and another man, whose name I do not recollect, who took the prize in Manitoba for wheat some years ago, marketed 14,000 bushels, and Mr. Beckett marketed 12,000 bushels, and all these men are settled considerably further south-west. If this branch of the line from Brandon to the Souris coal fields was extended 25 miles, these men would be within two or three miles of a station. To give an idea of how the settlers in that portion of Manitoba have prospered this year, I may read an extract from a letter written by Mr. Norman, correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette* of London in connection with this very country, to which I desire the Canadian Pacific Railway should build their branch line:

"Wm. Wenman, from Kent, farmer, Plum Creek; came 1881; capital, about \$1,000; took up homestead and pre-emption for self and two sons, 960 acres in all; has over 8,000 bushels wheat this year; three teams of horses, worth \$1,200; eight colts, worth \$1,000; cattle, worth \$500; implements, &c., \$1,000. His real estate at present is worth at least \$8,000.

"H. Selby, from Leicester, office clerk, 23 years old, came 1882, took up homestead and pre-emption; capital nil; has this year 1,200 bushels wheat, some oats and barley; yoke cattle and implements worth \$400; real estate worth \$1,200. (This is a worker.)

"Michael Creedan, carpenter, from Cork, came 1882 with wife and six children, arrived at Plum Creek in debt £80; has now good plastered house and two lots in Souris town; 160 acres good land; four cows in calf, three heifers, pigs and fowls; no debts; real estate worth \$300; cattle worth \$300.

"Dan Connolly, plasterer, from Cork, came 1883; brought out wife and seven children; has now good plastered house in Souris town worth \$600; cash at least \$500; no debts.

"James Cowan, Irish, arrived in Manitoba 1882, without a dollar; hired out until he could earn enough to buy a yoke of oxen; owns now 320 acres, of which 200 are under cultivation; comfortable frame house, two teams of horses, eight cows, and everything necessary for carrying on a large farm; also a wife and two children; has 900 bushels of grain this year.

"Stephen Brown came out in 1882; was hired out till 1885; saved enough to buy a team of horses and make payments on land, broke land in 1885 and had his first crop in 1886; got his brother to come out, who also had a team and bought land alongside, so that they worked together; raised their second year 7,000 bushels of grain.

"Morgan and Thomas Powell, Welsh miners, came in 1882, £30 capital; last year brought out their wives and families, whom they had left behind; have each about 4,000 bushels this year.

"Patrick Buckley came out in 1882; has worked on a farm, hired ever since; has £300 in bank.

"Phillips Brant, a Guernsey carpenter, £200 capital; has 320 acres, 60 head cattle, and three grown up sons settled within four miles, all on

Mr. DALY

their own farms of 320 acres and rising large crops.

"Donald Sutherland and Thomas Stewart came from Scotland in 1882; bought each a yoke of oxen and went to work breaking their land, their wives meanwhile erecting sod houses, in which the families lived for two years. They are now independent; good frame houses, a quantity of stock and large crops."

I will detain the House a few moments longer because, owing to the Government having cut down the immigration expenditure from \$500,000 to \$50,000, it is necessary we should endeavor on every possible occasion to show to the world that we have a country fit to live in, and that those industrious people who have a hard struggle to make both ends meet in the old country can, by settling in Manitoba, look forward to securing, within a few years, a competency. I will read a few of the many letters received from actual settlers. Is there any known country where such similar results can be obtained?

"KEMNAY, 16th January, 1888.

"I take great pleasure in giving a correct statement of all the crop I had on my farm, which is situated on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, seven miles west of the city of Brandon.

"I had 145 acres of wheat, from which the total yield the past season was 6,840 bushels. One piece of 45 acres of summer fallow gave 2,340 bushels, being an average of 52 bushels per acre, and 100 acres averaged 45 bushels per acre. I had also 45 acres of oats, which yielded 3,150 bushels, an average of 70 bushels per acre. Off 6 acres of barley I had 387 bushels. I planted about $\frac{1}{2}$ of an acre potatoes and had 225 bushels good dry mealy potatoes. The yield of roots and garden vegetables was large and of good quality. In conclusion, I would say that previous to coming to Ontario, Canada, I farmed in one of the best agricultural districts of Germany, and after coming to Canada I farmed twelve years in the county of Waterloo, Ont. I removed to Manitoba in March, 1884; that summer I broke 190 acres, off which I reaped in 1885 a fine crop of wheat fully as good as this year. My two sons have farms joining mine and their crops yielded equally as large as mine.

"I must say that farming has paid me better in this Province than in Ontario or the fatherland.

(Signed) "CHRISTIAN SENEKELL."

"From J. R. NEFF, Moosomin District, N. W. T.

"Range 30 and 31, township 14, 4 miles from station. Came to country 1883, and settled in present location. Amount of capital \$12,000. Acreage now owned 4,000. Under crop in 1887, 600 acres, present capital \$40,000. Yield per acre 1887, 30 bushels average. Live stock, 14 horses.

"I am pleased to give my experience since I came to this country; my success has been far beyond my expectations. I am fully convinced for extensive farming, wholly grain, or mixed farming, it cannot be surpassed.

"I think Moosomin district is equalled by few and surpassed by no other point in Manitoba or the North-West Territories.

"Moosomin is a first-class grain market and is growing rapidly in importance."

"W. Govenlock—S. 27, T. 11, R. 23, near Griswold. Had 60 bushels of wheat per acre on 5 acres, and 37 bushels per acre on 250 acres.

"Samuel Hanna—S. 7, T. 10, R. 22, near Griswold. Had an average of 40 bushels of wheat per acre on 250 acres.

"John Young—S. 1, T. 10, R. 23. Had 75 bushels of wheat from one acre.

"Alex. Johnson—Near Elkhorn. Had an average of 41 bushels wheat per acre on 14 acres.

"Geo. Freeman—Near Elkhorn. Had an average of 37 $\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of wheat per acre on 50 acres.

"Thos. Wood—10 miles north of Virden. Had an average of 63 bushels of wheat on 5 acres. (315 bushels of wheat from 5 acres.)

"Rich. Tapp—South of Virden. Had an average of 51 bushels of wheat per acre on 20 acres.

"Thos. Bobier—Half mile north of Moosomin. Had forty acres of wheat, averaging 38 bushels to an acre.

"J. R. Neff—Three miles north of Moosomin. Had 115 acres of wheat, averaging 37 bushels per acre.

"G. T. Chesley—Four miles north-east from Alexander. Had an average of 45 bushels per acre on 100 acres of wheat.

"A. Nichol—Four miles north-east of Alexander. Had 100 acres wheat, averaging 40 bushels per acre.

"H. Touchborne—Four miles north-west of Alexander. Had an average of 40 bushels per acre on 100 acres of wheat.

"W. Watt—South-west of Alexander. Had 80 acres wheat, with an average of 40 bushels per acre.

"Robt. Rogers—Near Elkhorn. Had 10 acres of wheat averaging 45 bushels per acre."

I have taken up the time of the House to show that in the constituency I represent, the people are more affected by this question of monopoly than the people residing in the eastern portion of Manitoba, and that unless the Government had brought down these resolutions, these people

would not be relieved from the ban of monopoly which now rests upon them. No credit is due for this relief to the gentlemen who have prated so much about monopoly in the eastern portion of Manitoba. So far as that portion is concerned, which is affected by the Red River Valley Road, it has not sent out 500,000 bushels of wheat, while the city of Brandon has marketed 1,300,000 bushels of wheat this last year. The last statistics I have got from the city of Winnipeg show that all they marketed was 30,000 bushels. Yet, forsooth, because the city of Winnipeg, which has been nurtured and built up by the Government, and were it not for the shops of the Canadian Pacific Railway would fall to the bottom, agitated for this Red River Valley Road, which they wanted to be built at the expense of the whole Province of Manitoba, they claim the credit for the discontinuance of monopoly. Last year, the Provincial Government said they would expend \$1,000,000 on the Red River Valley Railway, and they asked that that amount should be borne by the whole Province of Manitoba. I have shown that the part of the Province from which I come would not receive a dollar's worth from the money expended in that way, and yet, forsooth, in order that these men should get competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, they were going to run us into debt in order to get a second outlet from the city of Winnipeg. They knew very well that that railway could not be built by a charter from the Local Government. If they thought it could, why did they come down here and ask for authority, as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has done by his bills to build two bridges across the Assiniboine River. I pointed out, in a speech I made in Brandon, that the Assiniboine River would have to be bridged, and that it would be necessary to ask the Government for authority to bridge it, and the best proof that I was right is that the Provincial Government have asked, through Mr. Watson, for legislation at the hands of this House. But, still further to carry out the idea that I expressed that ratification from this Parliament is necessary for the construction of competing lines, I may quote an article from the *Brandon Sun* of 17th March, 1887—and everyone who knows anything about Manitoba knows that the *Brandon Sun* is grit of the gritty:

"What is desired and what must be obtained is a local charter that will be immediately ratified by the Dominion Government, and unless we can secure this we might as well at once give up all hopes of ever being able to obtain the relief that is to free this country from the monopoly that is now crushing it."

Now, in view of that utterance from a Grit paper, when the Government have decided to wipe out the monopoly, and we find the Reformers of all the Provinces coming here and proposing an amendment, I say that, in the annals of this Parliament, no such rank piece of hypocrisy has ever been exhibited as that which is now exhibited by these hon. gentlemen. They held me up to scorn last year, and said I was pledged to my constituents to vote against disallowance and that I was bound to carry out my pledge. I did pledge myself to my constituents, because I believed that the Government policy was wrong, and I told my constituents that, as far as they were concerned, this matter did not affect them at all, because, unless monopoly was wiped out in the added territory, they would not receive any relief, but, as desiring the prosperity of the whole Province, I said we would pitch in with the men from the old Province and so they might receive the same relief, as a matter of right and justice, which the old Provinces of Confederation possessed. All I have done and all my constituents have done, would be thrown to the wind if the amendment should carry. Representing my constituents in that added portion of the Province, as the hon. gentleman misrepresents his constituents, I thank the Government for bringing down this measure to-night. We have not had that measure of prosperity which we expected, and why have we not? Because

we have had an agitation there which would drive immigrants from any country in the world. I have shown what a land of promise that is, and all I ask is that my friends shall stand at the back of the leader of the Government and show to those hypocrites on the other side that they cannot seduce his friends from this side on any such question as this. Although the Reformers are in power in Manitoba to-day, I prophesy that within two years the people will discover the hypocrisy of that party. We find that Mr. Greenway has gone back to Manitoba with the idea that he has brought about this settlement. What will he think when he finds that his friend Mr. Watson is voting against a proposition for the abolition of monopoly? The Grit press of Manitoba, from one end to the other, has been advocating the abrogation of clause 15 of the Act, and yet, the moment the Government proposes to agree to that, the hon. gentleman is found to vote against it. Flushed with victory in Manitoba, the present Premier is now acting in the manner the Reform party would act when they got into power, as the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) suggested the other night, when he said: "God help you people when we get into power; we will wipe your friends out of office." We find that an Act has been passed in Manitoba wiping out every Dominion officer from the voters' list except those in the Indian Department. There are two officers in the Indian Department, Mr. McColl and Mr. Leveque, both of whom were appointed by the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). The postmasters in Manitoba are also wiped out, except in cities or towns. In the country districts there are some Grits, but in the cities and towns they are nearly all of the other stripe. The Government there have carried out the threat which was held out before the election and have practically dismissed every officer who was appointed by Mr. Norquay. So it goes on, and so it will go on until the people of Manitoba dismiss the men who are now acting in that hypocritical manner.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. DALY. Yes, you may say "hear, hear," but the people of Manitoba will say "hear, hear" before long and don't you forget it. I may have the opportunity of meeting the hon. gentleman on the platform in Manitoba, and he will find that my constituents will consider that I have carried out the pledge which I made when I was elected, when I stated that I would vote against disallowance. I did vote against it, and I will vote against it to-night, particularly as this proposition not only wipes it out in the old Province of Manitoba but in the added part of the Province and in the Territories as well, and gives to the people I represent and to the people of British Columbia that measure of right for which we have so long contended that we, in the same way as the other members of Confederation, had to charter lines of railway within any part of our Province.

Mr. DAWSON. When anything connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway comes up, Manitoba always takes a prominent place, and very properly so. I am very happy to think that the people of Manitoba will now be satisfied and will be able to build railways wherever they like within their boundaries, and go wherever they please; but there is another section of the country through which the Canadian Pacific Railway passes to which the hon. Minister of Finance alluded. He alluded to the great quantity of minerals which were to be found to the north of Lakes Huron and Superior. There is no doubt that a great development has taken place there, and that it has been principally caused by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. At Sudbury, there are mines of copper which I believe to be inexhaustible, and at Thessalon to the north of Lake Huron there have been recent discoveries of gold. Sections have been discovered there where formerly gold was only found in the quartz, but now alluvial gold has been reported, and the existence of

alluvial gold above all other things, draws people into a country. At Sault Ste. Marie and vicinity, they are now opening up mines of galena, and also copper mines, and quarries of the most magnificent marble, which latter is now being exported to Chicago. If you go further west, you will find valuable minerals in great abundance. Within a short distance of Port Arthur there are silver mines which are now attracting a good deal of attention, miners are going in, and we expect a considerable influx of population during the coming summer. But it is not in silver alone that that district is rich, but also in iron. There are immense deposits of iron ore towards the height of land in the country through which the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway will run, for that railway touches on the great belt of iron ore extending through to the State of Minnesota. To give the House some idea of the importance of that great band of ore, I may state that from a section of it just beyond the line in the State of Minnesota, there were exported no less than 400,000 tons of iron ore last year, which is a quantity sufficient to load 800 vessels with 500 tons each. Then at the Lake of the Woods, which is also in the district I have the honor to represent, they have discovered gold, which is giving rise to an important industry. Mines are to be opened next summer, and I believe that the great district of Algoma will be found to be very rich in minerals. But that district is not only rich in valuable minerals, but also in agricultural lands. Along the shores of Lake Huron towards Sault Ste. Marie and in that direction generally, there are large tracts of the very best agricultural lands, which are now being opened up. We have heard a good deal in this House, within the last few weeks, of a great exodus of Canadians going to a foreign land. But that is not the case in the regions I speak of, where a large influx of population is now occupying the fertile lands along the coast of Lake Huron. On the Islands of Lake Huron, more especially on the Manitoulin Island, and on St Joseph Island, there is now a very large population. It has more than doubled since the last census. I believe that in Eastern Algoma alone we have now a population of 35,000. On the Island of Manitoulin there are no less than 12,000; on the Island of St Joseph, 4,000, and on the other islands, corresponding numbers, so that on these islands, fronting the north shores of Lake Huron, we have now a population of 18,000, chiefly brought in from the prospect, in the first place, of the opening up of the Algoma Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Here, Sir, we have no exodus, here we have a country growing up. Those who have been speaking of an exodus might have pointed to Algoma, where at least 40,000 people could be accounted for within the last eight years. But it is not alone on the shores of the lakes that people are settling, but they are going in along the great Rivers, such as the Mississagua and Thessalon, and spreading backwards into the interior. Now that this railway is opening up the country, there is no doubt that the north coast of Lake Huron will become one of the finest sections in Canada, rivalling even Manitoba in its agricultural resources. More than that, there is now growing up in Algoma an immense lumber trade, occasioned by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Saw mills are being built, and a water power canal at Sault Ste. Marie, is among the enterprises in contemplation. The people of Minneapolis are speaking of building mills there to grind the wheat of the North-Western States, because the water power at Minneapolis is insufficient to run the mills that are required. This fact is in a great measure owing to the Canadian Pacific Railway. When this Algoma Branch, which has been so long in contemplation, is fully completed, I believe that the amount of traffic thereon will even exceed that of the main line. The traffic already going over it, although it is not quite completed, from the direction of Minnesota, is immense. I believe that in the future large quantities of wheat will come down Lake Superior from

Mr. DAWSON.

those great regions north-west of Duluth, and north-west of St. Paul, then it will find its way to Sault Ste. Marie, and a great portion of it come over the Canadian Pacific Railway to Montreal, where it can be shipped to foreign ports. I need not go on speaking of the resources of that region, but since Manitoba has occupied so much of the attention of this House, and as Algoma is more than treble the size of Manitoba, and contains a very much greater length of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I think it is just as important as Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and it is only proper that the attention of the House should be called to it. Sir, no one is more impressed than I am with the energy and financial ability with which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have pressed forward their work. Only eight years have elapsed since the contract was given out, which gave them ten years to carry the railway across the continent. A great part of it has been already four years in operation, and numerous branches, developing the country in all directions, are now being carried out. I say that the energy, the enterprise, and the pertinacity with which that company have carried through their operations, is something extraordinary, and the country at large is greatly indebted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the bright prospect before it. I think the present arrangement is one that must receive the approbation of every person who has given attention to the subject. It will put the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in a position to complete their line from ocean to ocean, and to improve it along the north coast of Lakes Superior and Huron and there can be no doubt that they will now put their line from one end to the other in the best possible order. Then we shall have population flow in in all directions. With the great crop of last year, and with the prospect of a favorable crop the coming year, there is no doubt that we will have a large immigration to the great regions of the North-West. I can only say, without going into details, that I approve in the strongest manner of the arrangement which has been entered into by the Government with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as it will enable them to put the line into good order, and will be of immense advantage to the country at large.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), who closed his speech a few moments ago, made some statements with reference to the richness and development of Manitoba which I was very glad to hear, and which I do not propose to criticise. I hope he has not over-estimated the wealth and value of Manitoba lands, and I hope he has not drawn a brighter picture than the circumstances justify of the future of Manitoba. Nor am I concerned with a large part of the criticism which he devoted to the claims of Winnipeg. He seemed to think that one part of the Province had been unduly favored at the expense of another; that is a local matter on which I have neither the knowledge fitting me to discuss it here nor have I the desire. But the hon. gentleman made some general observations with regard to the course he intended to take to-night and with reference to the policy of the Reform party upon the question of disallowance, which I cannot allow to go unchallenged and upon which I desire to take issue and to take issue promptly. The hon. gentleman talked at some length about my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson), whom he designated as a rank hypocrite and as one who he said, unfairly misrepresented the people of Manitoba. Well, I have had the honor of sitting with that hon. gentleman some five or six Sessions, and I know I am but voicing the opinion not only of his political associates but the opinion of the manlier part of his political opponents when I say that a better, nobler, more self-sacrificing patriot does not sit in this House. That hon. gentleman time and again has fearlessly and ably advocated the interests of the whole

Province of Manitoba, and especially of the district he represents, in a manner which commanded and won for him the expressed admiration of some of the leading members on the other side of the House. At the time when the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) was skulking in his seat, afraid to open his mouth, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) was raising his voice loudly in defence of the rights and privileges of the people he represents, which he said were being trampled upon by the policy of the Government. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) took great credit to himself that he worked his enthusiasm up sufficiently once, after he had got the permission of his leader to vote against that disallowance. If it came to a question between the people he represents and allegiance to his party the people would have been sacrificed to that allegiance. I would advise him to imitate not only the modesty of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), but the industry which prompts him to master subjects before he addresses the House, and then he will receive from the House at large that kind attention which generally greets my hon. friend behind me. But the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) says to-day that the Reform party are opposed to the abolition of the monopoly. I interrupted him because I thought the hon. gentleman was delivering himself of some very flippant remarks without reading or understanding the resolution of my hon. friend before me (Mr. Laurier). The policy of monopoly has received the bitter opposition of the Reform party from the time it was first proposed and carried by hon. gentlemen. When the monopoly clauses of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract were first introduced in this House, from what quarter came the unswerving and relentless opposition with which they were met? Was it not from the united phalanx of those who composed the Reform party, and from that day to this I challenge the hon. gentleman or any of his friends to point to any occasion when the voice of the Reform party has not been raised strongly in denunciation of those monopoly clauses, which to-night he says, he is proud are going to be removed. The hon. gentleman is confusing monopoly and disallowance. My hon. friend for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has contended, acting in unison with the Reform party, that the monopoly clauses of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract never extended and never were intended to extend to the Province of Manitoba proper. He contended, and we all united in the contention with him, that when the Government by their policy of disallowance thought to give an extension to the monopoly clauses of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, they were acting in defiance of the expressed wishes of the people and in opposition to the interests of the people of Manitoba. We were opposed to monopoly from the first, we denounced it from the first; but the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) became the subservient and obedient follower of the father of the monopoly clauses. We opposed the disallowance policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and when my hon. friend for Marquette (Mr. Watson), not once but time and again, brought the matter before the House and moved resolutions, how was he met? It is true he received at one time a reluctant assent—I will not say that, but I say he forced the hon. gentleman to acquiesce in the resolution he proposed, and when he gave that acquiescence he said he was sorry he was voting against his leader. But to-night what does the hon. gentleman do? He says my hon. friend is taking a course condemned by the people of Manitoba. What do I find? I find in the *Manitoba Free Press* of 24th April a report of the proceedings of the Manitoba Legislature, and that the leader of the Government, who I think it will be admitted represents the feelings, wishes, desires and hopes of the better class of the Manitoba farmers as well as any other man and better than most other men, moved a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the Legislature. What was that resolution? It was a resolution affirming the very prin-

ciple which the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) supports in the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. That resolution declared that a humble address should be presented to the Government, praying that in the proposed settlement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, it should be made a condition that the branch lines of the Manitoba South-Western and the Canadian Pacific South-Western should each be extended a distance of 50 miles during the present year. The mover went on to support that proposition. He received the unanimous endorsement of the representatives of Manitoba, and to-day in supporting the resolution in the House declaring that the money received from the Government should be applied to the construction of branch lines in Manitoba and the North-West, my hon. friend is carrying out a proposition identical in principle with one that received the unanimous assent of the Manitoba Legislature. So I do not think he need fear when he goes back to his people and points out that the resolution he supported here had been in advance supported and endorsed by the representatives of the Manitoba people. But the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) intimated that he was going to screw his courage up sufficiently high to move a resolution. The way was open to him now. He said he was going to move something in relation to branch lines. Why did he not do it now? I will tell the House the reason. Because he had not the courage to move a resolution when he would have to divide the House, and when the votes would appear on the record. He prefers to act in committee when there is no record of the vote taken, when the people of Manitoba will not know how any one votes. I prefer the manly course of the Opposition, supported by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), to the rank hypocrisy which dictates the course of a man who says: I will not move when my vote can be recorded, but I will move at a time when I will escape having my vote recorded. Did the hon. member read the propositions embraced in the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. What are those propositions? The first proposition is, that the exclusive monopoly clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway contract does not apply to Manitoba proper. Does that proposition receive the consent of the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), or of the member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), or of the other members from Manitoba? Are they prepared to vote against that proposition? Are they prepared to go back to Manitoba, and declare that they believe that these monopoly clauses do extend to Manitoba proper? I do not think they will do that. I remember last year that the member for Selkirk, and I think another member from Manitoba, if I mistake not, the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Searth), voted for a proposition involving the same statement that is contained in the first clause of the amendment before you, a proposition to the effect that the exclusive privilege does not apply, and never did apply, and never was intended to apply to the old Province of Manitoba. If that proposition is correct, why is the House now asked to assent to the proposition to buy from the Canadian Pacific Railway the monopoly which they do not possess and never did possess? We are asked to assent to a proposition which involves indirectly the paying to them of money for a privilege which they never received from Parliament, and which they do not possess at this day. The next proposition of the amendment is, that the policy of disallowance which has been practiced for the past five or six years by the Government of the day, is at variance with the declaration and statements made by the leader of the Government when he was submitting the Canadian Pacific Railway contract for ratification to this Parliament. I need not elaborate upon that point. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has to-night shown the language made use of by the leader of the Government when he introduced that contract. At that time the contract was opposed by

the entire Reform party, and they opposed it on the grounds that you were not only giving the Canadian Pacific Railway a monopoly in that country by your contract, but you were extending to them a monopoly over the Province of Manitoba, one of the existing Provinces of the Dominion. An agitation arose not only in this House but out of it, which gained strength day by day, and the leader of the Government saw it was necessary to allay that agitation. What did he do? He rose in his place and he said that that agitation was based on a wrong impression. He said: It is not the intention by this contract, to extend this monopoly to the Province of Manitoba. We cannot check Manitoba, to use his famous historical phrase. "We cannot check Ontario." We cannot check Manitoba, and the House believed this, and the country believed that the leader of the Government was honest in his declaration when he said, that the contract then before this House could not check Manitoba. They believed that he was honest in that statement that he would not introduce legislation to the House, or in his capacity as Premier of the Government and head of the Executive, do any act which would check Manitoba in her constitutional actions in the building of railways. Sir, the hon. gentleman then carried his contract and he has broken his word. He did check Manitoba. He checked her persistently and consistently, and I do not know of any policy of the Government in which they have been consistent, excepting in this consistent disallowance of every railway Bill which the people of Manitoba passed, with the object of obtaining access to the boundary. That is the second proposition to the amendment of the hon. gentleman; that this policy of disallowance which has prevailed in the Government from that day to this is a policy at variance with the statements of the leader of the Government when he introduced and carried his contract, is a policy antagonistic to the best interests of the people of this country, and is a policy which should be abolished. There is another proposition in the amendment which says that the terms of that contract, was an enormous addition to our liabilities without adequate security. That proposition I will discuss in a little while, but not at any great length as I do not wish to detain the House. I will pass over it in the meantime. The last proposition in the amendment is that the terms do not provide for the expenditure of this money on branch lines in Manitoba and the North-West. Which of these propositions is it that receives the hatred and opposition of the hon. member from Selkirk (Mr. Daly)? Which one is he going to ask the Manitobans to condemn the Reform party for introducing? Why, Sir, the proposition to construct branch lines in the Province of Manitoba, if I have read rightly, has been the policy of the Reform party for many years back. I remember years ago, when that branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway was about being constructed, reading a very remarkable speech made by the then leader of the Opposition in this House. In that speech he pointed out that the only way we could help to develop the resources of that country was by building a main line with reasonable speed, and as we went on, and as settlers came into the country, building branch lines to develop the land to the north and south of the main line. That policy then seemed to me to be a manly and statesmanlike policy, and to-day, Sir, in this resolution we are only asking that the money which will be received on the sale of the \$15,000,000 of bonds, shall be appropriated in the construction of branch lines in that country, which will go to develop and render more valuable the lands they gave us in security. From that standpoint, from the standpoint of a Manitoban especially, that proposition of the leader of the Opposition should receive a very hearty assent. From the general standpoint, from the standpoint of even a Maritime Province man, it should receive assent too, because it is calculated by developing

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

the country there, to increase largely in value the lands which are given to us as our only security. If those branch lines are built and the country developed those 15,000,000 acres may become valuable. If they are not built, and if the country remains with a single main line, then the lands will remain, most probably at about the average price in value that they have been bringing for some time past. I cannot see—and the hon. gentleman who spoke so vigorously and with such apparent heat and warmth failed to show—one single proposition contained in the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, which ought to receive disapproval from any Manitoba or North-West representative. Before I sit down, let me call your attention for a moment to the proposition contained in the main resolution. That proposition has been said to be one, having for its principal object, the abolition of monopoly in the North-West. I have already referred to the fact, that when that contract was passing, one of the strongest arguments against it was this very monopoly clause. I have referred to the language made use of by the Premier, in which he led the House and the country to believe that that monopoly should not extend to the old Province of Manitoba. I have shown how he has broken his pledged word to this House from that day to this, and that he has disallowed every Bill which has been passed by the Province of Manitoba, with the object, as I have said, of obtaining access to the United States. In 1884 we had the hon. the Finance Minister coming down to this House and asking the House to assist, with a large grant of money, the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate. We had that hon. gentleman then declaring that he was speaking not only for the Government, but for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and declaring that if the agreement the Government were then submitting to Parliament should be assented to, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would abandon the monopoly they had claimed, and the Government would abandon the policy of disallowance, and there would be prosperity in the North-West from that time on. I am not going to repeat the hon. gentleman's language, but I will say that he used language at that time with the object of inducing Parliament to assent to a contract which I doubt they would have assented to unless he had pledged the Government of which he was a member that if the \$30,000,000 were voted, the Government would not continue further to exercise the policy of disallowance, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would not claim the further continuance of their monopoly. The implied contract the hon. gentleman then made with the people and the Parliament of this country was no sooner made than it was broken, and as soon as the company got the money the Government resumed their policy of disallowing every railway Bill the Manitoba Legislature passed. Sir, the hon. gentleman has been charged to-day with a breach of faith, one of the grossest in the political history of this country, and I repeat the charge. Then, in 1887, came the resolution of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) reciting all the facts of the case, and asking that the pledge which had been given by the hon. gentleman should be carried out; and what was said at that time? I am not going to quote the earlier speeches; but when the hon. Finance Minister was confronted with the solemn pledge which he had given two years before, what did he do? Why, Sir, we had the hon. gentleman rising in his place the other day and reading a lecture to this side of the House upon the desirability of a great political party having some fixed principles to go upon, and he told us that unless we had those fixed principles we never could hope to succeed to place and power. This hon. gentleman talks about fixed principles, and yet his whole career during this Session has been a chameleon record of changes. One morning he held to one policy, and by the time the afternoon shone upon it, it disappeared and a new one was set up in its place; one day he was in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, and another

day opposed to it; his pen was hardly dry in writing the proposition which he himself had made to the Secretary of the United States in favor of such a policy before he stood up in this House and declared that such a proposition would be an act of insane folly. But to come back to the point, when my hon. friend moved his resolution in 1887, and called upon the hon. gentleman to carry out his pledge, he said:

"I never made a more candid statement to the House, I never made a statement with greater pleasure than when with the authority of the company and the consent of my colleagues, I found myself in a position consistent with the policy we had pursued, and the policy we had adopted of preventing competition, while at the same time we encouraged Canadian interests, to be able to state that the time was near at hand when we would be enabled to be relieved of that obligation and not feel it necessary in the interest of Canada longer to continue that policy."

Then, the hon. gentleman, after showing that the Government and he himself had frequently changed their opinions, went on to say that it was not a provincial matter merely, but a great national matter, and he deprecated, he said, looking at it from a narrow provincial standpoint. It was not a question for Manitoba, but it was a question for the great Canadian people, and he said, I appeal to the gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces, the independent opinion of the Opposition, and I ask them whether they ever could consent to a policy which is calculated to act so detrimentally to their interests as this one. He said:

"It is a question between the Northern Pacific Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the men to the south of us, the men who think that, regardless of everything else, setting patriotism aside, setting the development of their own country aside, it is to the best interests of Canada to build up a great rival line to the Canadian Pacific Railway, must expect to have their views put before an intelligent people, not in a small Province, not before a comparatively small population of this Dominion, but broadcast over the whole of this country. It must be understood, and it may as well be understood at once, that this is not a question between two great Canadian companies, but it is a question between a great transcontinental highway, binding all these Provinces together and giving us easy and rapid communication with each other, and a rival line of railway that has spared no effort and is prepared to spend any amount of money in order to undermine that serious competitor for the traffic of the east that the Canadian Pacific Railway has already shown itself to be. Under these circumstances, I feel that this House will not hesitate. Gratified as every man here, on either side of the House, would be to meet the views, even the erroneous views, and to satisfy the prejudices of the rising city of Winnipeg and the important Province of Manitoba; anxious as this Government has shown itself to be by every act by which a Government could evidence its anxiety to develop and promote the interests of the Province of Manitoba and the great North-West, notwithstanding all that, the time has come when we must choose between what I believe to be the prejudices of a section of the community and the interests of the whole of Canada."

The hon. gentleman contended that the interests of the whole Dominion were bound up in the carrying on persistently and continuously of this policy of disallowance for preventing the people of Manitoba from obtaining any access to the markets of the world excepting over the Canadian Pacific Railway; and he denounced those who looked at the matter from a provincial standpoint, telling them that they were speaking from their prejudices, and that the interests of the whole country must be looked to. Now, I want to read another extract, in order to call the attention of the House to the manner in which the hon. gentleman spoke. There was no hesitation; there could be no doubt; there was not a man with a head on his shoulders who could hold any view but that which the hon. gentleman was at the moment propounding. It mattered not how much it might be at variance with the pledges or the statements or the arguments which he had used before. The hon. gentleman is always so thoroughly satisfied with his arguments that he invariably says there is not a man in the country with a head on his shoulders who will hold any view different from the one he is at this moment propounding. What did he say on that occasion:

"I say there is not a man in this House, I care not on which side he sits or what his political proclivities are, who will not say that as we stand to-day in the presence of a threatened danger, the danger of hav-

ing our own lines of communication on which we have expended so large an amount of public money, embarrassed and paralysed—there is not a man to whom I cannot confidently appeal on such an occasion as this, to stand by the whole country."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman says "hear hear"; and yet he is asking us to-night with a calm, unblushing countenance to reverse that policy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The circumstances are changed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has changed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry it is so late in the Session for I would like to reply to the hon. gentleman, but I shall be glad to hear him continue quoting from my very interesting speech and read the whole of it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not going to read the whole of it, but I will just finish this quotation, because it is interesting reading. Mind you, the hon. gentleman called upon us then to stand by the whole country and not to form an opinion on the subject which might be in the interest solely of some one or more of the Provinces; and he appealed to the representatives of the older Provinces, which had expended the \$71,000,000 in building up this highway in the hopes that they might reap from it some of the advantages of the great traffic which was to flow from the great North-West, to support the policy he then proposed. We cannot allow this line, he said, to be tapped by railways on the other side. Such a policy would be suicidal, and therefore he called on the Opposition to lay aside party feeling and to vote for the country. To-night the hon. gentleman, with equal impressiveness, asks us to vote for the opposite policy. But I will conclude the quotation:

"It is a painful position for me and my colleagues to occupy, after all we have done for the Province of Manitoba and the city of Winnipeg and the great North-West, after the support they have unanimously given us at the recent elections, it is an embarrassing position to stand for a single moment in conflict with the hopes and sentiments or even the prejudices of any considerable portion of our friends; but we owe something more to Canada than to any personal consideration for ourselves, and that debt can only be discharged by independently, at any cost—aye, at the cost even of alienating the political support of these gentlemen which we have had the good fortune to obtain, and which we value so highly—even at that cost, we owe it to ourselves and to our country, straightforwardly and unflinchingly to pursue the course that, not our expectations of a couple of years ago, but the present exigencies of the country demand it at our hands."

The hon. gentleman to-night asks us to pursue a course directly opposite. He is the general of fixed principles who represents the party of fixed principles, and we have the evidence of it in his speeches. Did he ever shrink, when asking Parliament to accept a proposition, from declaring that it involved all that was great and good, and that everybody with a head on his shoulders and who was not a fool, ought to accept the proposition at once? But a proposition exactly the reverse may be presented the next night, and everybody is equally a fool who fails to see its justice and strength. Some of us may be pardoned if we cannot change our views so suddenly and completely. But the hon. gentleman says, the times have changed, the circumstances are different, and he used these words: "The duty of a Government is to change their policy with changing circumstances." That is perfectly true, as a general proposition, and I never saw a Government that could change quicker than this one. They are changing from day to day. But let us see how long it is since the last change. The hon. gentleman has tried to make us believe it was because the crop was a large one last year and the Canadian Pacific Railway could not carry it, that the Government abandoned their policy of disallowance. But the hon. gentleman knows that is not the reason. He knows that the circumstances show that it is not the true reason. He knows that his record proves it is not the reason. He knows that in January of this year, he assented to a Minute of Council, which declared that the unyielding policy which he recommended last year must con-

tinue to be the policy of the future. He knows that he declared the Government had a mandate from the people to carry out that policy, that that policy was necessary to develop the best interests of this country, and that any other policy would be suicidal in the extreme. He knows that he put those views on record only a few months ago in a Minute of Council, signed by the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Justice and dated on the 4th January last, and which the hon. gentleman ratified. That Minute of Council reads as follows:—

"It is impossible that the policy which has produced these results can be properly stated as calculated to deter immigrants from settling in the Province, or to prevent the investment of capital therein."

He was then urging that the policy of disallowance had not worked detrimentally to the North-West.—

"On the contrary, while the policy of the Government has been to afford the fullest development to the resources and industries of the Province, it has had in view to prevent the diversion of a large part of the traffic of the Province to a foreign country, by which the forces that have been most effective in building up the different industries of the Province, and bringing settlers to it, would be seriously impaired."

Then the Minute in Council continues as follows, and this is the important part of it:—

"The sub-committee, therefore, are unable to recommend that there should be an abandonment for the present of the policy of Canada, pursued by both political parties in the past, of preventing the trade of Manitoba and the great North-West from being diverted for the advantage of foreign railway corporations and foreign commerce, and of protecting the great national interoceanic highway for a reasonable time to permit permanent direction to be given to the traffic of the country. Canada has made great sacrifices to secure the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Upwards of \$71,000,000 and over 18,000,000 acres of land have been voted by Parliament for that purpose. These generous subsidies have been voted under the conviction that the older Provinces of the Dominion would be greatly benefited by the increased trade which would flow down upon them as the result of the development of those portions of the Dominion lying west of Lake Superior; and the unwillingness to forego these advantages by permitting this great western trade to be diverted to United States railways for the advantage of the commerce of a foreign country, found its expression at the last Session of Parliament in the emphatic vote of the House of Commons, in which every Province is represented, and which had just come from a general election at which the question formed one of the leading subjects of discussion. That vote, the sub-committee submit, must be regarded not only as an endorsement of the policy of the Canadian Government in the past, but as a mandate to the Government to continue that policy in the future."

That official record of the hon. gentleman's opinion of a few months ago was forwarded to Her Majesty the Queen, and Her Majesty the Queen was told that this Government could not depart from that policy, the object of which was to retain to Canada the benefit of the great trade of the North-West, and to prevent that trade from being diverted to the country to the south, to enrich, as the hon. gentleman sometimes tells us, foreign corporations. And mind you, this is not the unstudied language which the hon. gentleman sometimes uses to catch a vote in the House of Commons. This is his deliberately recorded conviction, which he placed upon the councils of the country and forwarded to Her Majesty the Queen. Yet the document has hardly crossed the Atlantic, it has hardly reached Her Majesty, before Her Majesty will learn by telegraph that the hon. gentleman has changed his mind, and that nobody with any sense can fail to see that the change is altogether in the interests of the country. We hear of nothing now about diverting our trade to the foreign country, but we have a glowing picture given us of the development of the country under this new policy, which, but four months ago, would be ruinous to every Canadian interest. Now, however, we are all going to be rich. Such is the marvellous richness of our western country that when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company get these \$15,000,000 and when the harvest of last year, which he told us was not an abnormal one, has been duplicated for a few years, the riches of the North-West are going to flow all over the Dominion. A year ago, if the Canadian Pacific Railway were tapped by a line leading to the States,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

that would be ruin, not to the interests of Manitoba alone, but to the interests of all the Provinces. All the Provinces had invested \$71,000,000 in this road, and had a right to get some return for that expenditure out of the trade, which, if it were tapped by a line leading to the boundary, must be diverted to the States. The hon. gentleman has turned his back on the cities by the sea and he has reversed all his policy, and he asks us to follow him in his wonderful vagaries and windings. We are asked to give our quota for the payment of interest on bonds to the extent of \$15,000,000. The country will naturally ask, as we have a right to ask, what guarantee have we for the payment of this? As far as the principal is concerned, I do not think any difficulty arises, but there is no such relief in regard to interest which, for fifty years, amounts to no less than \$26,250,000. We have been voting one, two, three, four or five millions to this and that corporation, and that is not considered to amount to very much, but, when you vote \$26,000,000 to one corporation, it appears to be a serious matter, and the first question which will be asked in any constituency will be, what security have you got? I have no hesitation in saying that you have not got a scrap of security. The Minister of Railways, in his original report to council, stated that we were to have the security of the freight and the postal subsidies. That report stated:

"The Company are willing that all postal subsidies and other moneys payable to them by the Government of Canada may be set off against any interest which the Government of Canada may be called on to pay, and these moneys will at no remote period be sufficient of themselves to carry the interest guaranteed."

That might be true or it might be debateable. I am not going to enter into it; I do not know what the postal subsidies amount to. I find that, although the Minister of Railways states that they are willing to give this as a security, the Government have not taken that security, but they have gone further and entered into a binding contract which this Parliament is free to accept as a whole or to reject, and in that contract there is no security given for the payment of this interest. The hon. gentleman told us that we ought to be satisfied because this rich corporation had a surplus last year of \$250,000 over and above its fixed charges, and, in his usual way of dealing with those matters in a grandiloquent style, he said that this quarter of a million would amount next year to a million dollars. But this country has had such promises from the hon. gentleman long enough, I do not think they will accept his statement as a guarantee. He has stated nothing except the good name of the company as any security whatever. What is that worth? Supposing the company were to fail in paying the interest, and that we, under our guarantee, are called upon to make good their default, and we must look upon it in that light, what is the total amount which we would have to pay at the end of the fifty years? At 3 per cent. interest on the amount of \$26,250,000, it will tot up to the sum of \$45,543,750, and at 3½ per cent. it would come to \$48,975,000. We must remember that this agreement which the Government had entered into and which has been signed by the Minister of Railways, is not an agreement which they submit to us for amendment, but is already entered into and concluded, and that Parliament has simply to go through a form and take it as it stands. In that agreement, it is carefully provided that the lands shall be security for the principal, but not for the interest. Section 4 of the agreement is as follows:—

"4 It shall be a condition of the said mortgage that the net proceeds of the sales of said lands shall, from time to time, be paid over to the Government, and the company may at its option also pay over other moneys to the Government, the whole to constitute a fund to be set apart and held by the Government exclusively for the purpose of satisfying the principal of the said bonds."

We are, therefore, trustees for the bondholders, and we are bound to appropriate whatever is received for the sale of

the lands to meet the payment on the principal. We have no authority, and it would be a breach of our duty to divert one dollar of that amount to the liquidation of the interest. There are many other clauses in this contract which I cannot reconcile with each other, and which show that there has been a most culpable negligence in the preparation of this contract. There is clause 5, which leads to the belief that, if default is made in the payment of the interest, the Government may receive the amount from uncompleted sales. It says:

"But if the company should at any time make default in the payment of any interest which may become due on any of the said bonds, then if required by the Government the company shall thereafter pay over to the Government all interest which it may collect, under uncompleted sales, upon the price of lands sold as well as the principal realised from the sales thereof, and the Government shall allow on the amount of such payments interest at the said rate, and shall apply all of such additional payments and the interest thereon as well as all interest accrued on the said principal fund towards satisfaction of the interest on the said bonds."

Any ordinary reader, any lawyer or any critical reader would understand from that that we had the security; that, in case there was default in the payment of interest on the bonds and we had to pay the interest, we could fall back on the moneys derived from the uncompleted sales of land by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the unpaid purchase money on the uncompleted sales, and that we would receive from that source sufficient to indemnify us for the money paid out. But it is not so, because every dollar to be derived from those uncompleted sales has been already pledged for the payment of the bonds, and the 8th section makes that clear. It says:

"The sums due or to become due to the company for unpaid purchase money of lands heretofore sold, amounting to about (\$1,200,000) one million two hundred thousand dollars, shall be applied towards the payment of the said land grant bonds now outstanding according to the provisions of the mortgage securing the same."

Section 5 says that the \$1,200,000 is given to us as security for any interest we may have to pay, but, by section 8, it is declared that that amount shall be applied to the liquidation of the land grant bonds. Therefore, we have no collateral security whatever from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, we have nothing but their own name for the amount of interest which we guarantee. That, as I said before, is \$26,250,000, and if we are obliged to pay all that we guarantee in the end, it will amount, with interest, to nearly 50 million dollars. Hon. gentlemen may think, as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) seemed to think, that it does not matter what the country has got to pay, so long as there is a statement on the face of the proposition that disallowance is to be done away with, and that we ought willingly to vote whatever the Government ask. Sir, we have a right to be prudent in this matter, we have a right to see what engagement we are committing the country to before we give our assent to this arrangement. Now, how do we stand? We are getting 14,400,000 acres of land, the hon. gentleman says. But that land is not clear, it is mortgaged. All that land stands mortgaged to-day for \$4,463,000. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that before that \$4,463,000 is paid, many a year will roll by. We have got to judge of the future to some extent by what has taken place in the past. They have never yet taken \$4,000,000 out of the lands of the North-West, and I predict it will be many a year before they will do it. The hon. gentleman said it was \$3,463,000, but he left out a million of land grant bonds which we hold as security for the company performing its obligation west of the Rockies, and this \$4,463,000, forms a first charge upon these lands which are now handed over to us, so that after the land has paid nearly \$5,000,000, then we get the balance towards the principal of the bonds we are now going to guarantee. As for the \$26,000,000, or with interest, \$49,000,000, according as you take the simple sum or the sum with interest added from

year to year, you have no security whatever. Sir, I do not think that proposition should be allowed to go through Parliament without an amendment. The company have, it is true, pledged the tolls which they at first offered to the Government as security to the bondholders of the road, for the interest due these bondholders; but there is nothing to prevent that company giving us a security upon the road itself and upon its tolls, and upon the revenues and franchises, so that we might take precedence and preference to the stockholders. As it stands now, we have no security upon the road whatever. The stockholders own the road, and the stockholders can make away with it, notwithstanding our guarantee which we give them. We have no hold upon them, and the least that the people of Canada have a right to expect from its parliamentary representatives is that they see that all the franchises, and plant, and railway property that the Canadian Pacific Railway possesses, shall, at any rate, be pledged to secure the Government against any loss that may occur from this indemnity. It is true that it will only be a second security, but it will come in ahead of the stockholders, and it will be something. I see, myself, how it is going to be. I see that the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) and many others like him, will go through the perfunctory work of moving some amendment in committee which they are afraid to move before going into committee. I see this agreement will be adopted as it has been entered into by the Government. But, Sir, we can warn the hon. gentleman now as we did in times gone by, that his fancy predictions will fail, as they have failed heretofore. We warn him now that he is submitting to Parliament an agreement duly signed, sealed and delivered, he is taking Parliament by the throat and saying: Agree to that, or nothing. He is binding this country to an enormous contingent liability, running up nearly to 50,000,000, and he has not asked from the Canadian Pacific Railway, for whom we are assuming this liability, any security whatever. He can get security for the asking, but he does not ask it. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company intend to indemnify us, to pay us back, they can have no objection to giving us a second mortgage upon the railway, and its plant and franchises. The liability we are assuming to-night is a very large one, the obligations we are taking upon ourselves for the people are enormous, and I trust that every hon. gentleman, I care not on what side he sits, will calmly reflect upon the enormous extent of these obligations, and will endeavor, by his voice and his vote, as far as he can, to secure to us, at the very best, all the security the Canadian Pacific Railway can give, even if it is only a second mortgage upon its plant and franchises.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not intend at this time of night to trespass long upon the attention of this House, but I may be permitted to say a few words with reference to the speech of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), and briefly speak of the question as it affects the North-West. I confess, Sir, in listening to the speech of my hon. friend, that I had to make an effort to recall what the amendment was that he was supporting, because it was very difficult for me to realise that so stormy a speech was required to support an amendment which is merely a regret, for it concludes by expressing a regret that the Government has not decided to take guarantees that the Canadian Pacific Railway would build branch lines; and if we divide on this, we shall divide upon the question as to whether we should express regret or not. Now, Sir, when my hon. friend from Queen's accuses my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) of not having the courage of his conviction in coming forward with an amendment, before going into committee, so that the names may appear on the division list, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition with such distinction has himself been some-

what timid in affirming the amendment he has placed before this House. Sir, it is quite clear that the real truth in this, that the Opposition agree that the policy of the Government, as their press throughout the country has declared, is in this respect a very good one. In other words they agree with the policy of the Government—

Mr. DAVIES. Not the disallowance policy.

Mr. DAVIN. Is it not abandoned? Certainly, most of the hon. gentleman's speech might have been made if the Government were persisting in disallowance, and persisting in supporting the monopoly. He thundered against the hon. Finance Minister. Why? Not for what the hon. gentleman is doing now, but for something the hon. gentleman said under a different set of circumstances, and a few years ago. Really, Sir, it was a pity to see so much nervous force wasted, and so much eloquence thrown away. It is to be regretted—because I like my hon. friend for Queen's. I have indeed an affection for him; he is an old acquaintance of mine; and for that reason I should always like that he might be as strong in argument as he is invariably in tone. If he ever becomes as strong in argument as he is always in tone, he will be one of the most cogent debaters that ever appeared in Parliament. Now, the position of the members from Manitoba and the North-West has been somewhat canvassed here to-night, particularly by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). Now, I am not the person to deny my hon. friend from Marquette any credit that he properly deserves, for having fought, to the best of his lights, for his views in this House and out of it. My hon. friend from Marquette quoted a passage from an article in a paper published in the North-West Territories, and he attributed the sentiments to me. That article appeared, I believe, in the *Leader* newspaper. It was not written by me.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Which *Leader*?

Mr. DAVIN. The paper that is published in Regina. The hopeless ignorance on North-West matters exhibited by some hon. gentlemen is positively discouraging. However, they will learn by-and-bye.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have heard of it in the Public Accounts.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is in the Public Accounts, and if any hon. gentleman who takes an interest in its appearing in the Public Accounts—so I am informed by the manager of that paper—will look into the reason for it, they will see that it gives very good value for any sum that may appear to its debit in the Public Accounts—at least, so I am told. I may say here in passing that I do not write the leaders of that paper and for the sentiments expressed I am not responsible; but I will say this, that the view taken is a view I would defend and enforce, namely, when I came down here, never having heard from a single constituent of mine that he took the least interest in this question, having come down as a supporter of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Conservative party and the Government, and having many things to carry and effect for my constituents, I say that although I voluntarily put my opinion in regard to disallowance in my address, I would have been recreant to my duty and my constituents, if, when I came here, not knowing that they took the least interest in disallowance, a question that did not affect the Territories, because the members for Manitoba who were urging their views never said one word about the general question of monopoly—I say if I had at that time not taken the course I did I would have been a traitor to my constituents, because I did not know that the right hon. gentleman had the strong backing he had, and I thought it was of far greater importance, and I think so now, than any question of disallowance that the right hon. gentleman and his able colleagues should be able to carry out their general

Mr. DAVIN.

policy for the Dominion of Canada than that hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, if any little disaster occurred, should take a hand at mixing and muddling public affairs as they had done in other years. Afterwards, when I saw the Government had a good majority, what did I do? I did not vote. I did not pair. I saw it stated in the papers—it was stated in the *Leader* that I paired. Immediately my attention was called to it, I wrote up and said I did not pair. I abstained from voting, because I thought then that was the only course for me to pursue. We had had conferences together and decided on a certain course for those members to pursue who came from the North-West. That personal attitude is a small matter, but it has this phase to it to which I will call the attention of the House. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) very properly dwelt on the efforts made by him and his colleagues from Manitoba to change the Government's policy in this respect, because the attitude of the Government in this matter from beginning to end, is, as I will show, one of policy. No one who is fit to pronounce an opinion on the subject doubts that technically the Government were within their rights in the course they took, and the only question which can be discussed is whether their policy was right or wrong. We took the view, I took the view, that their policy was not the best policy to pursue. What did I do then? I stood by my party. If I may recall to the mind of the leader of the Opposition, who I know is a student of the best and greatest minds in politics, the powerful utterances of Edmund Burke in regard to political connections, he will know very well that that great man, one of the purest minds that ever applied itself to politics, points out the advantages to the community of the binding force of those connections on every honorable man, and nothing but the very greatest questions, questions affecting the interests of the country at large, can justify any man in breaking the bonds of an honorable connection of that sort.

Mr. LAURIER. You did it.

Mr. DAVIN. No; I did not. I will now call the attention of the House for a moment to what we did. The Minister of Finance, who is always such a power in this House, I had the honor of meeting in London, where he treated me with the greatest kindness, and I believe it is in his honor to say that he always treats all Canadians with equal kindness, whatever may be the party to which they belong. I told him my views on this question, I pressed my views on the hon. gentleman; I pressed my view on other members of the Cabinet. I will now ask what then was the position of the Government? The members of the Government were not living out in those Territories. It was a question which might occur to any man coming from the Territories or Manitoba to ask: I am looking at this question, but probably I am looking at it in a half light, from the point of view of the Territories or Manitoba; if so I actually may not be taking a just view. But the Government were bound to look at the question of disallowance and monopoly from the point of view of the Dominion at large. What did they tell us? They have told us in this House that looking at it from the point of view of the Dominion at large, they considered that the policy of disallowing the railway charters of Manitoba was the true policy. Taking that view, what course had they to pursue but the course they took? What other course could they take? We are bound to believe what they tell us, that one of the most cogent arguments that could possibly be used had its effect—the argument of the abounding harvest we had last year, which showed the Government and showed the world at large that one railway could never serve that great territory. I consider that was really the clinching argument that decided the minds of the Government. I will ask the attention of the House for a few moments to the merits of the question,

because it is really not a question that we are actually in battle about, because the conscience of the Reform party throughout the country has gone with the arrangement that the Government is making in this matter. They have got rid, not of the disallowance for which the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) was struggling, and for which I in my way was struggling—for I never concealed my opinion, but in fact stated in a very plain way to the head of the Government what my view on this subject was, that while my friends in Manitoba were contending for disallowance we in the North-West were not deeply interested in disallowance unless we had also monopoly got rid of; but the Government decided to get rid of monopoly and disallowance at the same time. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition dwelt in his argument on the fact that in the older part of the Province of Manitoba, and in the Province of British Columbia, the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot have a monopoly. I must frankly say at once, that I entirely agree with him there. The Canadian Pacific Railway can have no right of monopoly at all under its charter, or in any construction that can be put upon any bargain that has been made with it, over the portions of Canada I have referred to. That at least is my view, whatever it is worth; but what about the monopoly for the North-West Territories? Will any man tell me that the guarantee that has been given by the Government for the relinquishing of that monopoly to the Canadian Pacific Railway, is not a good bargain for Canada and for the Territories? Remember that the Territories have given last year 14,000,000 bushels of grain, and that from year to year they will go on expanding at a ratio far greater than the most sanguine member of this House anticipates and far greater than could dawn from the sanguine mood the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) attributes to the Minister of Finance. Under these circumstances that monopoly would be a far greater advantage to the Canadian Pacific Railway, than any equivalent that is given them under this arrangement. I think there is an inability in the minds of some hon. members to realise the magnitude and importance of the North-West to Canada. The hon. the Finance Minister has spoken at other times on the advance in our credit. He has spoken of the fact that at present we can borrow at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Why is that? Partly it may be due to the fact that certain changes have taken place in the money markets of the world, but undoubtedly one of the reasons is this that since the time we had to go to the money markets of Europe and pay 5 and 6 per cent., we have got possession of the North-West, and with the accession of the North-West, and with the growth of that country our credit has every year improved. Therefore I ask the attention of this House to a view that must be pressed upon them, if they will do their duty to the Dominion of Canada and to the North-West Territories, and the view is this; that our North-West is a place where a statesman has to make the greatest and most fruitful blow for Canada. The Canadian Pacific Railway must have had great expectations from that monopoly in the North-West Territories, and I say that the abandonment of that monopoly might fairly be set against any advantage that under this arrangement the company gets. I do not speak with any official authority, but I am not surprised if I am rightly informed, that the Canadian Pacific Railway hesitated long, and required a good deal of pressure before they would agree to that arrangement. I will deal with the reference to one part of what might be called the attack of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) on the Minister of Finance. It is a thing worth referring to, because if his view of the case were correct it would involve the honor of one of the most prominent men in the Conservative party, and in the Dominion of Canada. He argued that that utterance of the Minister of Finance was tantamount to a decisive promise that henceforward the policy of disallow-

ance would not be adopted. What did the Minister of Finance say: He said:

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

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear." Will any honest man, reading those lines say, that they mean a promise on the part of the Finance Minister that that policy will be discontinued?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. No, a thousand times no. The only fair construction that can be put upon those words, is that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues at that time felt that after the line was completed north of Lake Superior it would be in a position to hold its own, it would be in a position to face competition, and with safety to the country, safety to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and safety to the interests involved that the policy of disallowance might be discontinued. There is no position that a statesman can take more truly statesmanlike and more truly great than the position taken by the Finance Minister. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) comes with that sort of rhetoric which is sometimes very successful before a jury and that with untrained minds has a certain cogency. But, Sir, the statesman that would bind himself to go on, under changing conditions always in the same way, would be the greatest curse that ever oppressed a country. The hon. gentleman, if he found that the conditions of the country were not as he anticipated them to be, if he found that they would not justify the course that he intended to take, it was a bold and courageous and statesmanlike policy to say: We must defer taking this course. Though I differed from the Government on their policy of disallowance, yet in regard to the principle on which they acted I have not any hesitation in saying that taking the view of the situation that they did, and the view of the interests of Canada that they took, they took a broad and statesmanlike course. I shall not trespass on the House further. I wanted merely to correct a few misapprehensions and reply to one or two things that had been stated. I will say that since disallowance and monopoly have been done away with, that a new life has struck the North-West. Although I am only in this House for two years still I have had considerable experience of parliamentary proceedings, having sat so many years in the gallery of the English House of Commons, and I have seen amendments like that constructed, which are simply fishing amendments, which have no meaning. What policy does it propound? Does it say you will not consent to anything unless a certain course is taken? No; we are asked to divide solemnly on a regret. It is like organising Her Majesty's fleet to waft a sigh. You are going to divide this House of Commons in order to declare solemnly that you do not agree with the hon. gentlemen's regret. He says he regrets that the Government has not adopted a certain course. Why, Sir, the Government could not probably have got that course adopted unless they gave a still bigger guarantee. Suppose the Government came down here ask-

ing that the House should guarantee the interest on \$25,000,000 instead of \$15,000,000, and were to say that next year—and I would like it to be done—a branch line should be built here and a branch line there, the size of the sum would be attacked by the Opposition. As a North-West man I heard with some surprise—I forget whether from a North-West member or not—a complaint that some of this money would be spent in Toronto and some in Montreal. Now, Sir, I will show you how large-minded and how liberal our broad prairies and our free western air make us. It is to us a matter of no regret that any money of that sort shall be spent in Montreal or Toronto. We do not care where the money is spent provided the Dominion of Canada at large is advantaged by it; we regard ourselves as part of the Dominion of Canada. Sir, I never heard words of which I was more proud than words which fell from farmers at meetings held in the North-West some months ago in answer to some one who said that we are paying heavily on our lumber, on our coal, and what not; and those farmers got up and said: We are also getting great advantages from our connection with eastern Canada, and we are determined to feel that we are part and parcel of the Dominion of Canada, and ready to bear whatever burdens may properly fall on us. That, Sir, is the true course. I hate the sectional sentiment that makes any man think his own little place or his own little Province the centre of the universe. For God's sake, let us escape from the miserable thralldom of this sectionalism. Let us act on the view that we are all Canadians, and are bound to make this Canada of ours a noble land full of a great national life. Let me say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that branch lines are being built, and they will be built all the more now that the monopoly clause is gone. That young country will go on under the sympathetic care of the Government; but whether under this Government or another it will go on by its own inherent energy which will not be kept down; and I can assure you that the day is not distant when the North-West will repay Canada fifty-fold for any expenditures such as those the hon. member for North Wollington (Mr. McMullen) referred to. It is greatly to be regretted that these narrow calculations should be made. Any man, come from what part of Canada he may, who will calculate what the North-West has already done in the way of recouping Canada, what has been given for Dominion lands, what has been paid in customs duties—and that cannot be exactly got at because our customs duties are paid at Montreal and Quebec—and what we shall pay by-and-bye when we shall have five or six million people in that country, will find that Canada will be amply repaid. Why, Sir, at the present moment a vast trade is done between the North-West and Montreal; and do not let any man from Ontario or Quebec imagine that we for one second will listen with any patience to the proposition that the North-West is in any way indebted to the rest of Canada. The fact is this: it is the rest of Canada that is indebted to the North-West. We have given you a backbone. We have put you in a position to go before the world with the certainty of a great future, and hence it is that your credit stands so well. I say that seriously; it is a proposition that will bear the utmost scrutiny. Now, Sir, I cannot vote for the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition, because part of it contains propositions that the Government have endorsed, and it closes with a simple regret that the Government have not done so and so. Why, Sir, whatever course the Government took—if they were to propose branch lines, do we not know that the hon. leader of the Opposition would go into his room and prepare another amendment, saying that it was a pity the Government had not gone in for little canals in the North-West? And if they went in for some small canals, some other idea would occur to the hon. member to express his regret about. But the fact is, Sir, I am a material creature. I am not airy

Mr. DAVIN.

enough, I am not volatile enough to be able to divide on a regret or go into battle about a sigh. I consider that this is altogether too fine and spiritual an issue for a material and practical person like me to be able to divide upon with the leader of the Opposition. I have so much admiration for him and for his silvery eloquence that I sometimes almost wish that I could divide with him; but I must say he will have to bring forward amendments of a more practical nature before he can find my voice on his side.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I hope hon. gentlemen will give me just a few minutes. I beg to announce myself as a fourth party in this House, for this time at all events. The first party are allowed to say as much as they choose; so are the second party; the third party says what he likes, and I claim as much for the fourth party. I have been very much amused with the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who has proved, at least, by his readiness to support any new position which the Government may take, that he is a practical politician. While he was speaking, he brought to my mind a historical parallel, the only one that strikes me very forcibly as applicable to himself, and that is Black Sam in Mrs. Stowe's celebrated novel. You are aware that when twitted with inconsistency for having taken two different courses within 12 hours, Black Sam says: "Oh, I thought Missus wanted to catch Eliza, and so I determined she should be cotched. That ere was conscience; but when I found that she wanted Eliza not to be cotched, I determined she should'n't be cotched, and that ere was doubly conscience, because the fellow that gets the most is always standing on her side of fence." The hon. member for Selkirk was hardly consistent in his strictures on the hon. member for Marquette, for he should have remembered that when about twelve months ago the hon. member for Marquette moved a resolution in this House declaring that the policy of disallowance should now be abandoned, he asked the hon. member for Selkirk across the floor to second his resolution, and that hon. gentleman refused to do so, so that your humble servant from a distant Province had to second the resolution in order to get it before the House. Now, I am one of those who have always held that if the monopoly given to the Canadian Pacific Railway were abolished, that company was certainly entitled to a fair consideration for giving it up, and that whatever the monopoly was worth to them they were entitled to be paid, and I hold the same views still. But in the resolution before the House, I believe that they are getting too much. Let us look at their claim. The hon. the Finance Minister gave away the whole case this afternoon, when he said that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were utterly incapable of carrying the traffic out of the country. Now surely, the contract is not all on one side. When the Government gave the company a monopoly for 20 years, it was certainly the distinct understanding that they would do the necessary work of the country. That must have been the implied obligation on their part; and when the hon. the Minister of Finance tells us to-day that the company are utterly unable to their work, it is certainly his place to ask them to allow another road to be built, which will do the work that they are unable to do. Their inability to do the work of the country certainly goes a long way to deprive them of any claim to compensation for taking away the monopoly. Then again the sum allowed the company is altogether too much compared to the security given. We are asked to assume, for practically it amounts to that, an obligation of \$29,500,000. The hon. the Minister of Finance has stated correctly that the interest, which we are asked to guarantee, amounts to \$26,250,000, and we have only a second mortgage on the property, for there is a first mortgage amounting to

\$3,263,000, which brings up the whole amount to \$29,500,000, which we are asked to guarantee. Now, the hon. the Minister of Finance has proved to his own satisfaction, at least, that all that money can be got from the land, and that we are perfectly safe in giving a guarantee because every dollar will be recouped. I have great admiration for the Finance Minister, and there are few things I admire more than his prophetic utterances. He has made a great many since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, and he always makes them with full confidence. True, not one of them has ever been fulfilled, but that makes no difference, and he comes up smiling and makes his next prophesy with the same confidence as he did the others, and his followers applaud and hope he will have better luck next time. The hon. gentleman's prophesies we may be excused for taking with a little grain of salt. We remember the prophecy the First Minister made some years ago, that by a certain time there would be \$60,000,000 derived from the sale of lands in the North-West. Most of that time has passed, and the prophecy is as far from fulfilment as ever. The hon. the Finance Minister remembers that some years ago he prophesied that between certain days he named, there would be \$58,000,000 in the public treasury, as the result of the sale of lands in the North-West. Well, the time has very nearly gone by, and if we deduct the expenses of survey and management in the North-West, we will find that we have not one dollar to-day in the treasury to show for the land. Now, what right have we to suppose that those lands in the North-West, which we are asked to take for security, will yield anything like that amount guaranteed. As has been shown this afternoon, the guarantee is too large, and the consideration far too much when we consider what the monopoly really amounts to. It has been shown most conclusively that the monopoly never was intended to apply except in the North-West. It was not to apply to Manitoba or to any of the older Provinces, so that in considering the compensation to be given we have simply to deal with the North-West, and I submit that the sum asked is entirely too much. This appears much stronger when we consider the change that has been made in the route of the railway. I need not tell this House that the line was intended to be run on the old route surveyed by Mr. Sandford Fleming. The route, as originally surveyed, was to run from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains, through the fertile parts of Manitoba and the North-West. For nearly 1,200 miles the land was all first-class to fair farming land; if we can credit the evidence of travellers and the evidence which is being given before the committee in the Senate. The road was to have been built over this route, and if the country was to be considered at all, it was by that route the road should run. It is in the memory of the House that, in 1882, an innocent looking little Bill was brought in, after the contract had been let, to allow the Governor in Council, if the Government saw fit, to change the route of the road. It was then said by the hon. the Minister of Finance that he did not expect the line would ever be changed; however, the Government took power to change it, just as they did the other day to borrow an enormous sum of money, as they saw fit. They changed it, and where does it run? Any one conversant with the geography of the country, knows that the great American desert dips down into it, and that now instead of running over a fertile tract of country it runs straight through the desert. What was the reason for this change? The Canadian Pacific Railway simply desired to get a shorter road to the Pacific. They abandoned the idea of building the road to develop the North-West and of getting traffic from the North-West, and thought only of the traffic from Asia. I submit that when that change was made the railway was no longer constructed in the interest of the country. I do not blame the company for making that change. It

was a matter in which they were the best judges as to what would pay them the best, but I think the Government, in the interests of the country, were very much to blame in sacrificing the interests of the country by agreeing to that change. See how the matter stands now. From Winnipeg to Qu'Appello, and a short distance beyond, it is good fertile land for a distance something within 400 miles. Of course the land is of a variable character. Sometimes you find land on which good crops could be raised, and sometimes you cannot. But after that you get into this arid waste, and I say it would be simply cruel, and I say it without fear of contradiction, to advise any man to settle in that part of the country. I assert that from Moose Jaw to the Rocky Mountains there is not a spot where any man could settle and make a living by farming. The distance is over 500 miles. It is true that near the mountains, where the moisture does fall, in what is known as the ranching country, where I have been informed by friends who have been in the business, there is everything in the soil and the climate which is required for raising good crops, but unfortunately, being in such a high altitude, the summer frosts are so frequent that agriculture is not successful there. It is a strange thing that 400 or 500 miles further north, it is perfectly safe to farm, and I can only account for that by the fact that the mountains are lower there, and the warm breezes from the Pacific ameliorate the climate and prevent summer frosts. This railway only accommodates about 400 miles of that great North-West. The Government have allowed the company, at their own request, to change the route and simply to give accommodation to that section instead of to 1,200 miles of country where the territory will have to be settled, and where a road must be built. In fact, we will have to pay for that now. The Manitoba and North-Western is being built on a land grant, and this Session I see that we have been asked to allow them to reduce to over one-half what they were compelled to do, that is, to build 20 miles instead of 50 miles each year. As the Finance Minister has stated to-day, no company can build a road simply on a land grant, and the result will be that the country will have to pay for building a road which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company agreed to build, and was paid for building, and was expected to build. For all these reasons, I say that this resolution asks too much. The company are entitled to something, no doubt, and I am in favor of their having every dollar which they should have, but I think they are asking too much, and, therefore, I cannot vote for the resolution. As to the amendment, so far as I recollect it, it asserts that too much is given to the company, but it goes on to demand that the money shall be expended in Manitoba in building branch lines.

Mr. DAVIN. Not to demand—it only expresses a regret.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well, I do not regret that it has not been done. I say that the company is either entitled to consideration or it is not. If it is not, then the amendment should have said so, and have done with it. If it is entitled to consideration, it should have the right itself to say how the money should be spent. I shall, therefore, vote against both the motion and the amendment.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). My usual modesty has prevented me from addressing the House before, but I find that it is a duty that I owe to myself and my constituents that I should, even at this late hour, trespass upon the indulgence of the House in order to explain my position in regard to the vote I gave last year and the vote I intend to give to-night, and to bring an important matter before the notice of this House. Last year, at the time of the election, my constituents did not pledge me as to what course I would take upon the question of disallowance. They had confidence in me that I would fairly represent them, and that, as I stated in my address, I would stand by them first, if necessary, against the Government. Last year I did what

I thought right in this matter, and, if I thought the interest of the Government was against the interest of the North-West, I would vote against the Government now. But, when I found last Session that the question of disallowance was to be brought before Parliament, I took some trouble to make myself acquainted with all the details connected with the matter. I was not a merchant and had never had any connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in regard to paying for freight over their line. But, when the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) put his motion on the paper, I made myself acquainted with the question, in order that I might be able to defend my vote before my constituents, which I trust I have done. Before the disallowance resolution was brought up in the House, the members from the North-West and from Manitoba and from British Columbia organised themselves into a committee to consider how they best would represent the interests of their constituencies. We had invited Mr. Van Horne to appear before us and to bring to us the tariff of the rates charged by his road, and to produce also, if he could, the rates charged on other roads. Mr. Van Horne did not arrive here before the time came for bringing up the resolutions of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). I asked that hon. gentleman to allow those resolutions to stand over until we could meet Mr. Van Horne and see what conclusion could be arrived at. The hon. gentleman kindly consented to that, on condition that we should see the First Minister and arrange that the motion might be allowed to remain on the Order Paper. We met Mr. Van Horne, and also the General Manager of the road, and we discussed the question of freights with them, because I understood it was the question of the rates for freight on the Canadian Pacific Railway which was complained of. We discussed the question most thoroughly, with Mr. Van Horne and the manager, and they showed us that the charge on the Canadian Pacific Railway was not excessive as compared with other roads, and that, after the first hundred miles, freight was carried at a lower rate than by any other road. Not being a railroad man, I was not able to contradict them, but at that time you will remember that a delegation from Winnipeg came down here to represent the views of Manitoba and of Winnipeg in reference to disallowance. We had the pleasure of meeting those gentlemen. There were five or six of them. There was Mr. Ashdown, a very large and wealthy merchant in that country, Mr. Brock, a clever business man, Mr. Robinson, and the present Provincial Treasurer, and some one or two others, all able men, well able to present their case. I heard those gentlemen present their case, I listened with a great deal of attention, because I was bound to get all the information I could from them so that I might give a proper decision in that matter. Well, Sir, I did make a proposition to Mr. Van Horne when he was meeting with us, because he knew more about rates than I did. I was not able to compete with him in argument, and I did suggest to him that we would meet him in company with these Winnipeg men, but he said it was no use that whenever a Winnipeg man came down to a conference he was usually on the other side of the question. I also proposed to them to meet Mr. Van Horne, and we would meet the two rival competitors, and hear the arguments on both sides and come to a conclusion. I may say that Mr. Ashdown refused the interview as well. Well, Sir, we met on two or three occasions, and I may add that I always considered myself an intruder upon this Winnipeg delegation, because they never invited me to assist them in what they desired to accomplish. I was present at several meetings with them, but it was upon invitation of the members for Manitoba. Well, when we met these gentlemen and discussed the matter with them, I found that their whole object and game was to advance the interests of Winnipeg more particularly than any other part. I found that when we did happen to

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia).

meet a day or two afterwards with Mr. Van Horne, and when Mr. Ashdown and Mr. Van Horne undertook to discuss the question of rates, Mr. Ashdown claimed that the railway should carry freight from Montreal to Winnipeg, and then unload it and reship it to western points at the same rate that he was carrying direct from Montreal to western points. He was endeavoring to get a concession for Winnipeg that was against the interest of my constituents at least, and after listening to the arguments of those men I concluded that what Winnipeg wanted was a monopoly of the trade of the whole north-western country, which Mr. Van Horne, in my presence, absolutely refused to give. He said he would not give a concession to Winnipeg as against any other western point. I listened to these men carefully, and our last meeting as will be remembered by some of the western members here, took place in the tower room in this building. We had a meeting which these gentlemen addressed, and after they were done speaking I was puzzled to know what they really wanted, because in some of our conversations Mr. Ashdown put forth the idea that Manitoba had suffered during the hard times from a trade depression caused by bad crops, frost, and one thing and another, which had caused a depression of money circulating in that country. He said that if they could get another railway,—and the Grand Trunk was the road he referred to,—if they could get that road to come into Winnipeg, it would cause a large circulation of money, a million and a quarter dollars, he said, by which the Province could tide over the depression until such times as the road was built, and that the immigrants coming in on that railway to Winnipeg and bringing certain sums of money with them, would help to carry the Province over until a good harvest came on. Well, after listening to that argument, I asked the question of these gentlemen in the tower room, as the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was going to get up to reply, I rose to ask a question on the matter of rates. I said to those gentlemen: "I wish to ask you one question, is it a matter of rates that you complain of, or is it a matter of getting a railway to Winnipeg?" Mr. Robinson—he was the man, I may name him—said it was not a matter of rates at all, it was a matter of getting another railway to Winnipeg. Well, I said, then and there, that I was justified in voting against the resolution of the hon. member for Marquette, because my constituents were interested in that question, and these men were asking that the standing of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be affected by that vote. They knew very well that the Canadian Pacific Railway had been to a large extent backed up by the Government in building that road through that great country. There was no section in the whole North-West that was receiving a greater benefit from it than the city of Winnipeg. They wanted to get their end accomplished, no matter how other people were served. I was expecting the Canadian Pacific Railway to build an extension of railway through a portion of the country that I represent, and after thinking the matter over carefully, I considered it was in the interest of my constituents for me to interfere with any project that was not injuring the credit of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from whom we were expecting to get railway extension, and whose officers we met every day, and with whom we were receiving no competition in the resolutions then before the House. I may say further that up to that time, there had not been grain enough raised in the country to half employ the Canadian Pacific Railway. I contend that they built the railway two or three years in advance of the time specified, and I maintain that to undertake to bring in competition and interfere with the contract would have been a violation of the terms of agreement, and would have interfered with the credit of the company in the mother country where they expected to get money. I therefore considered that it was not in the interest of my constituents to support the resolution of the hon. member

for Marquette. Now, I would refer to a remark made by the hon. member for Marquette to-night. It is true—and I want this to be distinctly understood—that at the meeting of the Conservative Association last fall, as was stated by my hon. friend, I did make a remark that I would object to being a party to striking a blow at Confederation, and I repeat that here to-night. The circumstances did not justify those gentlemen in the agitation they were carrying on. Sir, since 1884, I have had continued application from agitators in Manitoba to take part in an agitation in the North-West, and I never listened to them. I say this, I care not if there was a Reform Government in power in this country, if I were a member of this House, and if any section of the people undertook by any other means than constitutional means, to carry out their views in defiance of the Federal Government I should vote against that Act. That was the spirit which animated me last year, and I reiterate it here to-night. I do not think it is proper for any faction of men in Canada to get up and defy the federal power. I do not think it is good policy, and as long as I have the honor to occupy a seat here I will not sustain any party in doing it, even against the Government that I am opposed to. Now, after considering well all the circumstances in connection with this matter last year, I voted as I did in support of the Government on the disallowance question. I voted for that because it was not bringing any grist to my mill; I voted for that because I considered it was not in the interest of my constituents, and I am proud to think that every action of mine from that day until this evening has been in keeping with, and in pursuance of the policy of bringing about the very result of doing away with this monopoly as these resolutions propose to do to-night. I must express my deep gratitude to hon. gentlemen, on the Government side of the House, for the course they pursued in not forcing the Government to grant disallowance to old Manitoba alone. If such had been done, what would have been the result? Monopoly would still have prevailed in my constituency in the North-West; but by proceeding in the course that has been followed and by standing by the Government, the present result has been brought about, because circumstances did not demand increased railway facilities until last harvest. Before I left Ottawa for home last Session, I heard glowing accounts of the prospects of a bountiful harvest; these accounts were given in every letter I received from the people there, and on the morning when the train reached Winnipeg and I pulled up the blinds in the car I beheld splendid fields of growing wheat. From that early hour in the morning until twilight I saw nothing but field after field of the most promising harvest. It astonished me; I had never seen anything like it in my life. The reports sent by every man were of the most glowing and hopeful character. Seeing the prospect ahead I arranged with the agricultural societies of my district to hold a series of shows in the autumn in the several districts commencing at Moosomin and proceeding west, holding nine shows in all. When I had arrived at that conclusion I wrote to the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Agriculture, asking them for free passes for newspaper men from the eastern Provinces. I also wrote to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and by return mail I received information that free passes would be given to responsible newspaper men who might be induced to visit the shows. I called a meeting of the people, not of my own town but of different parts, and organised a committee, and we invited a number of pressmen from each of the Provinces, irrespective of their political leanings, whether Reform or Conservative, to visit our shows. I told them in my communication that I could provide free passes going and coming, and the condition was that they should give a true and correct account of the country, nothing more or less. Thirteen different editors sent reporters of their journals, three from New Brunswick,

three from Nova Scotia, two from Prince Edward Island, and the balance from Quebec and Ontario. We had reporters there from the Halifax *Chronicle* and Halifax *Herald*, and from very many different journals. We met them at Moosomin. My object was to bring these journalists to see the country. I saw we were going to have a splendid crop, and that on account of Manitoba being an old settled Province, the section of country that I represented was not likely to be brought so prominently before the world as it should be. They saw the splendid field referred to by my hon. friend—4,000 bushels of grain in September in Mr. Niff's granary. They saw hundreds of acres of barley, they saw most magnificent crops, of which I had no conception before the harvest. They saw the cattle. They visited the butcher stalls the previous evening, and when they were shown the beef of prairie fed cattle they thought the statements were falsehoods; but when they saw the cattle on the grounds, every one first class, they were convinced. Mr. Trewman, of New Brunswick, a reliable man and a first-class farmer, wrote home that common prairie grass fed cattle were equal to the best stall fed cattle of the eastern Provinces. We visited all the shows; it was difficult to tell which was the best, some excelling in one particular and others in another. At Whitewood we had working oxen which were 8 feet 1 inch in girth. There were sun-flowers that were 14 inches wide and that would feed a flock of chickens a week. There were turnips weighing each 25 pounds, raised on the stubble without manure. One exhibitor showed potatoes, 23 of which filled a bushel, and another man near Wolsely said that he had a field of potatoes each weighing on an average half a pound. I felt, after visiting these shows, that the time had come when the wheels of progress of our country should not be clogged. I sat down—because I was astonished at the greatness and grandeur of the country, and the exhibits made—and wrote the First Minister, and told him of the greatness of the North-West, and what a magnificent harvest we had. I sent him the reports from the newspapers, for they were written by impartial judges. These reports, which were written by picked men whose opinions carried weight, had a strong influence in assisting in monopoly being wiped out. When the shows were over I wrote to the First Minister a letter of eight pages. I told him that if there were a dozen competing railways into Winnipeg the stock of each of those railways would be worth more in the money market of England than was the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with half enough to do, as had been the case in the past. I said the time had come when monopolies should be wiped out, not only in old Manitoba but throughout the country. I have never boasted of what I have done to bring about that result; I do not claim to have any influence more than other members. There is another matter which I want to refer to and I am going to be brief, as I do not want to detain the House at this late period.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I intend to speak as long as I want to, and you need not say "hear, hear" or "no, no." I have as good a right to speak as anybody else. A member of the Government pledged a portion of my constituents that he would use every effort in his power to secure the construction to completion of the Canadian Pacific South-Western Railway, and if there is any pledge that I am morally bound to stand by, that is my pledge to the people of South-Eastern Assiniboia. Last Session I presented a petition for a railway from 500 settlers in the south-eastern portion of the district, asking for a railway. They went there among the first settlers in 1882 and 1883, believing that there would be an extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway beyond Deloraine. This is a very important matter, and I want to call the attention of the House to it, because where a human being is suffering an injustice

he should not be allowed to suffer it any longer than can be helped. When the country was first occupied there were railway tracks dotted out on the maps all over, and those men went there in good faith under the promise of having a railway. I went to the Dominion lands office in 1882 and asked for maps and plans of the country, and I was advised to go to southern Manitoba or southern Assiniboia. I said: I would not go there because there happened to be a few dots on the map indicating where a railway might be built. I have been within the sound of a railway whistle all my life and I will remain there; and so I stuck along the line of railway. Some of the men had an ambition to be good farmers, and they went into that country because it is good, and got their land under the promise that a railway would go there in the near future. They have lived and worked hard there for five years, but still there is no railway accommodation for those men. They live in a country where it costs a man \$10, over and above the price obtained for his load, to market it with a team of oxen, and so it is impossible for them to raise wheat in that country. I promised the people that I would try and get them the railway. I may say that the late lamented Hon. Thomas White wrote a strong letter to those settlers, in which he told them that the Government would use every influence they possibly could to get this line built. I may say here that every letter I have received from my constituents since the death of that hon. gentleman, has expressed the deepest regret for his sudden and lamentable death. What is the good of our producing grain in that country, the fertility of which has been pointed out by the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), if they cannot get it to market? It is true they may be poor men, but a poor man has feelings. Those men are there with their wives and families, and if there is a heart-rending scene it is to see them toiling there, after five years of hard labor, and toil with patience and endurance, without their hopes being realised. I do maintain that, in all fairness, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should spend a portion of this money in extending that line. I do not care, what road is built so long as they will extend the line that will run 50 miles below where it runs to now. Last year, when the time of the charter had elapsed for completing that railroad, the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) and myself, in the Railway Committee protested against renewing the charter, unless they told us they would go on with the railroad. Mr. Abbott, too, I understand, is a director of the company, and who is the leader in the Senate, came before that Committee and pledged his honor as a man, that the company would build 50 miles in time for the harvest this year, and that they would build the balance next year. Inasmuch as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made that promise by one of their directors, who is also one of the cleverest and ablest men in the country, and that the people had faith and went on with their ploughing the land in the hope of what might be realised, I say that they are honorably bound to see that that promise is carried out. It is not only the bounden duty of the company to build the road, but of the Government to see that they do it. I intend to vote with the Government in the expectation that they will see that this road is built. The amendment of the Opposition asked that all this money, without distinction, should be expended on branch lines. I think this is unfair. I do not want that. I want to see the road thoroughly equipped and enabled to carry the product of that country, but I say that the expenditure will be of no very great use to my constituents unless they give a portion of that money to the extension of railways in South-Eastern Assiniboia. I claim that my premises are correct, and my vote last year sustaining the Government, has been the means of keeping disallowance in abeyance until the magnificent harvests of this year. I do not pretend to say that it is because of my influence, or

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia).

any other member's influence, but that the magnificent harvest has been a very important factor in doing away with monopoly in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. I believe that the course I have pursued will be approved of by my constituents in bringing about the result that has been brought about. In committee I shall support the amendment of the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly.)

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Call in the members.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have something to say on this subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have a very important proposition and I think I should be heard. I have not taken up the time of the House very much to-day in reference to this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will obey the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. The members are called in. I am very sorry, but the hon. gentleman has an opportunity to speak again.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know that, but you gave no time when the other gentleman sat down, to allow an hon. member to get up and speak.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is the second time I have been snubbed in a very peculiar manner by the Speaker.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),	Flynn,	McMillan (Huron),
Barron,	Gauthier,	McMullen,
Béchar, d,	Geoffrion,	Meigs,
Bourassa,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bowman,	Godbout,	Perry,
Brien,	Guay,	Platt,
Burdett,	Hale,	Rinfret,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Holton,	Robertson,
Cassey,	Innes,	Rowand,
Casgrain,	Jones (Halifax),	Ste. Marie,
Choquette,	Kirk,	Scriver,
Couture,	Landerkin,	Semple,
Davies,	Lang,	Somerville,
De St. Georges,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Sutherland,
Dessaint,	Laurier,	Trow,
Doyon,	Lavergne,	Turcot,
Edgar,	Lister,	Watson,
Eisenhauer,	Livingston,	Weldon (St. John),
Ellis,	Lovitt,	Welsh,
Fiset,	Macdonald (Huron),	Wilson (Elgin),
Fisher,	McIntyre,	Yeo.—63.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Freeman,	Montague,
Audet,	Gigault,	O'Brien,
Bain (Soulanges),	Girouard,	Patterson (Essex),
Baker,	Gordon,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Bell,	Grandbois,	Perley (Ottawa),
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Porter,
Bergin,	Guillot,	Prior,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Putnam,
Boyle,	Hall,	Reid,
Brown,	Hesson,	Riopel,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Burns,	Hudspeth,	Roome,
Cameron,	Jamieson,	Ross,
Cargill,	Joncas,	Royal,
Carling,	Jones (Digby),	Rykert,
Carpenter,	Kenny,	Shanly,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Labelle,	Skinner,
Chisholm,	Landry,	Small,
Cimon,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Smith (Ontario),
Cochrane,	Laurie,	Sproule,
Coolby,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Stevenson,

Corby,	Maddowall,	Taylor,
Costigan,	McCulla,	Thérien,
Coughlin,	McDougald (Picton),	Thompson,
Coulombe,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Daly,	McGreery,	Tupper (Picton),
Daoust,	McKay,	Tyrwhitt,
Davin,	McKeen,	Wallace,
Davis,	McLelan,	Ward,
Dawson,	McNeill,	Weldon (Albert),
Desaulniers,	Madill,	White,
Desjardins,	Mara,	Wilmot,
Dickinson,	Masson,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dupont,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wilson (Lennox),
Ferguson (Leeds & G.),	Mitchell,	Wood (Brookville),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Moffat,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Foster,	Moncreiff,	Wright.—111.

Amendment negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am informed that the hon. member for East Middlesex, (Mr. Marshall) and the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Brien) paired, and the latter has voted.

Mr. TROW. We made a change for Mr. Armstrong.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Armstrong stated in the House that he was against the amendment.

Mr. TROW. I do not think the pair on the opposite side is entered in the book. The parties have not spoken to me about it.

Mr. SMALL. I think the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) and myself made the arrangement that the pair should be Mr. Marshall and Mr. Brien.

Mr. TROW. The hon. gentleman must be mistaken; he did not mention the matter to me. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) mentioned it to me, and I said I would do my best to find a pair, and I thought of Mr. Armstrong.

On main motion,

Mr. MITCHELL. I suppose I am now in order in speaking to this motion, and in doing so, I shall occupy but a very few moments. I dissent from the proposition made by the Government in relation to this matter, inasmuch as it does not go far enough. I dissent from the views expressed by the majority of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, because they object to what, in my opinion, is a measure in the interest of the country. The view I entertain about this matter is this: I think the corporation now under the consideration of the House have shown an energy, and ability, and a determination, such as few men or groups of men could have possibly shown in the same circumstances, and they have done a work for this country which will rebound to the advancement and to the increasing of the population of this country. They have performed a work for Canada such as few men would have undertaken, and fewer still would have carried to so successful a result. They have been aided by the Parliament of this country on former occasions, on one occasion to the extent of \$30,000,000; and a great many people in Canada and in the neighboring republic, and some of the members of this House doubted very much whether that money would ever be repaid. But it was promptly paid when the company realised on their securities; and now, when they are asked to give up a valuable privilege for the sake of peace in the North-West, for the sake of getting the Government out of a difficulty, for the sake of settling difficulties in the North-West, which were preventing population from flowing into it, I think, when the Government decided to grant them aid, they should have gone to the extent of aiding them effectively without practically increasing the liability of the country. What have the Government done? They have agreed to guarantee the interest on \$15,000,000 for 50 years. There is no doubt that that is a very considerable privilege if these gentlemen are enabled to raise \$15,000,000 on the guarantee of the Government; but, Sir, they have given up

a great privilege when they have given up the monopoly privilege in the North-West; and they have done it, I believe, to the satisfaction of the Government without haggling or dickering very much over it. As I understand the condition of things in the money market of England, although I do not pretend to speak with a great deal of authority or information, the guarantee of the interest limits the range of purchasers of that \$15,000,000 of stock to a very great extent. I believe that all the trust estates, all the chancery funds, all the funds in the hands of executors, will be practically excluded from investment in these securities. That class of investors are precluded from investing in anything of which the interest only is guaranteed. Now, as the Government have taken over all the lands, surely they may be considered a sufficient security for this principal money. Those lands are taken for the express purpose of securing the principal money; and if the Government have any confidence in the future of that country—and I believe it will be the heart of Canada, and that if Canada is to have a future, it depends on the settling up of the North-West and the development of the fertile resources which it contains—surely the Government will be amply secured by the lands for the principal of that money. After having taken the lands into their hands, they had better go the whole way and enable those gentlemen to secure a larger number of investors than they can with only the interest guaranteed, and thus enable the country to realise to the extent of \$1,500,000 beyond what they will be able to realise under the arrangement as it stands. I say the country would realise the benefit from that. Some may question that statement; but, Sir, every benefit that company derive, every additional million of dollars they realise, whatever the security may be, comes to Canada, for we are bound to carry out that enterprise whatever it costs. The Government deserve great credit for the aid they have given so far, and I trust, that notwithstanding that this resolution has been submitted, that they may yet consider the propriety of doing the right thing, and enable the company and the country to secure as favorable results as are possible. Sir, there are no risks. If the Government are safe in guaranteeing the interest on \$15,000,000 for 50 years, surely the value of the lands and the earnings of the railway will be a sufficient security for the principal as well as interest. That is all. I have prepared a resolution embodying my views; I do not expect to carry it, but I have felt it my duty to place it before the House:

That all the words after the word "That" be struck out, in order to add the following instead thereof: it is the opinion of this House, that inasmuch as the effect of the Government resolution is only to guarantee the interest on the fifteen millions referred to in such resolution; and as the Government propose to take over the fourteen millions of acres of land of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in order to secure the principal of the said sum; and as the absence of the guarantee of principal as well as interest largely restricts the limit of purchasers of said bonds by the exclusion of trust funds, and thereby lessens the value of such guarantee to the extent of about one million and a quarter of dollars, it would be in the interest of the country as well as of the company to remove that objection by guaranteeing the principal as well as the interest, and thereby enhance the marketable value of such securities.

Amendment negatived.

House divided on motion of Sir Charles Tupper:

Y^{ES}:
Messieurs

Amyot,	Gigault,	O'Brien,
Audet,	Girouard,	Patterson (Essex),
Bain (Soulanges),	Gordon,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Baker,	Grandbois,	Perley (Ottawa),
Bell,	Guilbault,	Porter,
Bergeron,	Guillet,	Prior,
Bergin,	Haggart,	Putnam,
Bowell,	Hall,	Reid,
Boyle,	Hesson,	Riopel,
Brown,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Bryson,	Hudspeth,	Roome,
Burns,	Jamieson,	Ross,
Cameron,	Joncas,	Royal,

Cargill,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chisholm,
Cimon,
Cochrane,
Colby,
Corby,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Coulombe,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Davis,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Dickinson,
Dupont,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Freeman,

Jones (Digby),
Kenny,
Labelle,
Landry,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Laurie,
Macdonald (Sir John),
Macdowall,
McCulla,
McDougal (Pictou),
McDougal (O. Breton),
McGreevy,
McKay,
McKeen,
McLelan,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Masson,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mitchell,
Moffat,
Moncrieff,
Montague,

Rykert,
Shanly,
Skinner,
Small,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Thérien,
Thompson,
Tupper (Sir Charles),
Tupper (Pictou),
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Ward,
Watson,
Weldon (Albert),
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Argenteuil),
Wilson (Lennox),
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland),
Wright.—112.

NAYS :
Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),
Barron,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brien,
Burdett,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casey,
Casgrain,
Choquette,
Couture,
Davies,
De St. Georges,
Dessaint,
Doyon,
Edgar,
Eisenhauer,
Ellis,
Fiset,
Fisher,

Flynn,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Guay,
Holton,
Innes,
Jones (Halifax),
Kirk,
Landerkin,
Lang,
Langelier (Montmor'cy),
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lovitt,
Macdonald (Huron),
McIntyre,

McMillan (Huron),
McMullen,
Meigs,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Platt,
Rinfret,
Robertson,
Rowand,
Ste. Marie,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Trow,
Turcot,
Weldon (St. John),
Welsh,
Wilson (Elgin),
Yeo.—60.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Perry) was not in the House when the motion was put. The hon. member for Essex is recorded in the Whips' book as being paired with the hon. member for Toronto.

Mr. PERRY. I was in the House and in my seat when the motion was put.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I saw the hon. member come into the House.

Mr. PERRY. I was in my seat when the motion was put, and left it for a moment when an hon. member began to sing.

Mr. TROW. In reference to the statement that I made at the previous vote, I am aware that Mr. Marshall was paired but not with Dr. Brien. I forgot who was present because I had not the papers, and I mentioned Dr. Borden on that occasion, in order to get Mr. Marshall, a gentleman who, I knew, was away. I was not in the House when Mr. Armstrong was speaking, or I would have been the last man to pair him in that way. I did say on the impulse of the moment that Mr. Armstrong was away and paired him with Dr. Brien.

House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section c,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). As far as I understand it, the lands are mortgaged to pay the principal only, but the Government are responsible for the payment of the interest. If the company make a default in the payment of the

Mr. MITCHELL.

interest, would the mortgagees have the right to enter on the lands to secure their trust?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It is not so provided here.

Mr. THOMPSON. The provision will be in the mortgage. The provision in the resolution is that the mortgage shall be approved by the Governor in Council.

On section b,

Mr. EDGAR. I think on this section the whole question arises as to what the real security is which the Government is going to obtain from the company against their guarantee of interest; and I, for my part, am entirely unable to satisfy myself from the explanations which have been given so far as to what the security is which the Government will have. As far as I am concerned, if the security the Government takes under this arrangement, or can take, is clearly sufficient, the whole arrangement is one that I must approve of; because, as far as the principal is concerned, the Government assumes no liability whatever. That is a matter for the purchasers of the bonds, and I have no doubt that the land will be sufficient security for the bonds, as they are not to mature for fifty years. The whole matter, therefore, comes to a business discussion as to what security the Government of Canada is to have against the payment of \$525,000 annually upon this guarantee. The Finance Minister told us that the first security we had was the net revenue of the company over and above its fixed charges, and he told us that the net revenue of the company for the last year, as shown in their annual report, was \$253,000. But that is entirely inadequate, even if we had control of that net revenue, which we have not, to meet \$525,000. The Minister of Finance spoke very hopefully indeed of the future prospects of the railway as to its net revenue, and perhaps he is right, but certainly the net revenue has been going down in the last few years in a most extraordinary degree, as far as I can judge from the reports which I have examined very carefully. I find that, in 1883, the net revenue amounted to \$1,115,000. In 1884, it went up to \$1,126,000. In 1885, according to the condensed balance sheet attached to the annual report of that year, and after all fixed charges had been first deducted, which I understand to be not only the charges on the first mortgage bonds but also all the interest and all the bonds of the leased railways, it left a net surplus, according to the report, of \$3,781,000. Very well. It has gone down since construction was ceasing on the railway, as soon as the charges ceased which the railway made against itself and the contractors, which swelled its profits, and it began to come down to hard-pan, in 1886 the profits came down to \$635,000; and, as we have seen by the statement of the Minister of Finance, they went down last year still further, to about a quarter of a million. The Finance Minister told us, however, that the profits would increase, that it was all to be *couleur de rose*, because the first quarter of the year showed an increase over the first quarter of the last year. I think it is better to look back over previous years, and see the tendency, than it is to take one quarter of a year to which reference has been made. Fairly and reasonably looking at the prospects and finding that we have to pay \$525,000 out of this \$253,000, we do not see a very brilliant prospect. I cannot see where the immediate increase in earnings is to be as great as the Finance Minister states, but, supposing the surplus was to increase and was to go up to about the amount of interest the country has to pay, what security have we that we are to receive that? Provision may be made in the mortgage, and when we as sureties have to pay money for our principal, we may be subrogated in their rights, but I do not see how that will give us any claims except as a simple contract

creditor against the railway. We will stand in the position of an ordinary creditor against that net surplus, against that which would otherwise be a dividend on the shares, and we have not yet seen any way in which the Government propose to secure themselves in that respect. Then as to the postal subsidies. It appears from the report of the Minister of Railways that the company is willing to put in the postal subsidies payable by the Government to the company as security against our guarantee, but when they come to talk business and to draw an agreement between the Government and the company, they left postal subsidies out utterly and entirely. Now, I think that is most unaccountable. If it is intended that the postal subsidies shall be made security for the Government against this guarantee, why, when the business arrangement—the official documents which we have before us—came to be drawn up between the company and the Government, have they entirely left out all reference to these postal subsidies? I think it is a most extraordinary thing, and requires a great deal of explanation. Here we have the resolutions brought down, and we find all reference, also, to the postal subsidies left out of them. I think I know why. I think the reason is obvious,—it is that the holders of the first preference bonds, the thirty-five millions have an absolute legal claim against that postal subsidy, and I think the Government have discovered it. I think the Minister of Railways did not know it when he made that report to the Government, and I think he has discovered it since, and when they came to put that into form and shape in that agreement, the company refused to put this in. The Minister of Finance also left them out of his proposals to-day. I think there is very good reasons for his having left them out, because he could not put them in. As I understand the matter, the first mortgage bonds come in and control these postal subsidies completely, and it would be a breach of faith against the holders of the bonds to attempt to take away the postal subsidies from them, because these are tolls and revenues of the railway company, and they were pledged and hypothecated by Act of Parliament, and by the mortgage bonds over again. I think the first reference to the tolls and revenues of the company, is in a letter that Sir George Stephen wrote in 1885, asking for a temporary loan of \$5,000,000 for the company from the Government. He distinctly and in plain words proposed that this temporary loan should be made to the company on the security of the postal subsidy, payable by the Government to the company. And so I believe it was arranged, and that loan was paid off almost at once, by the issue which was authorised in 1885, of \$35,000,000 of first mortgage bonds, so that the postal subsidies became relieved from that charge, which was made in favor of the Government upon them, in respect to the \$5,000,000 loan, and came then under the operation of the Act which was assented to on the 20th July, 1885, and which authorised the pledging to the trustees for the bondholders of the first mortgage bonds of the entire property “real and personal, now owned or hereafter to be acquired, by the railway, including its main line, with its tolls and revenues”; and among these tolls and revenues were undoubtedly these postal subsidies. Then the bond on its face, which was issued by these purchasers for value, also states that it is secured by the whole line of railway, its tolls and revenues. Then the mortgage itself, which I had an opportunity of seeing, and which secures these bonds, also specifically and clearly covers the tolls and revenues, and also “all income, rents, profits and sums of money arising or to arise from said railway, or extensions and branches thereof, and in any way connected with or relating to the said railway or property.” Well, if that does not cover the postal subsidies, I cannot conceive any language that possibly could. So we have that as an absolutely good reason why the postal subsidies were left out of the bargain between the railway

company and the Government, and also left out of these resolutions. So as far as I understand it, the Government has not that security and cannot get it. I do not think that the Government, after Parliament has assented to the creation of these mortgages, and to the pledging of the tolls and revenues, would have a right to retain in their hands these postal subsidies which have been earned by the railway, and which are payable to bondholders. I do not think the Government would have a right to retain those as against the bondholders, even if there is default in the payment of interest on those bonds which we guarantee—if we have to make the advance, at least if we have, I would like to hear it explained on what theory we could do so. Then there is another more apparent than real security which the Government seems to have brought, in some sort of way, under this proposed agreement; that is, they seem to have the arrears of the principal and the interest on all uncompleted sales as distinguished from the unsold lands which are to be transferred to trustees, simply and exclusively for securing the principal of the bonds. But to secure the interest which the Government advances, they seem to have some sort of a lien proposed to be given upon principal and interest, payable on sales which have already been made and are uncompleted. Now, that view seems absolutely worthless and illusory for this reason: These are all covered by land bonds in excess of all the arrears of principal and interest, to the extent of \$2,263,000; that is, the land bonds which are a first charge upon the land held, and which have been sold, and upon which there are arrears exceeding the whole amount of the arrears upon these uncompleted sales by \$2,263,000. That is according to the statement made in the report of the Minister of Railways, in which he says:

“The lands are now subject to mortgage to secure outstanding bonds amounting to about \$3,463,000; but sums are due to the company for unpaid purchase money or lands heretofore sold, to the amount of \$1,200,000 which the company are willing to apply towards the payment of the bonds.”

That, as will be seen, leaves a deficiency over and above all these arrears upon bonds which are chargeable to the land, of \$1,263,000. So that that guarantee is absolutely a great deal worse than nothing. Then we come to what I suppose is considered the most tangible security that the Government get, that is, as I understand it, the interest which the Government may become liable to pay out to the company, at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, upon the net proceeds of the sale of the 14 millions odd of land by trustees. An important question to understand at first with reference to that is this: Who pays the charges of management? Provision is made in this arrangement that trustees should be appointed who shall take charge of these lands, and make sales of them, and pay over the proceeds to the Government. We know that a large land department like this cannot be managed without very great expense, and I think it is perfectly clear where that expense is chargeable; it is not chargeable against the Canadian Pacific Railway, because although the language of the resolutions is not very clear on that point, something else throws light upon it. The language of the resolution says the proceeds of the sales and lands shall be paid, but it says nothing about the management.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does it not say that the company pays it over?

Mr. EDGAR. It says the money shall be paid over by the trustees.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Together with any other sum the company pays over.

Mr. EDGAR. You might infer something of that kind. The whole point, however, is made clear in the agreement between the Minister of Railways and the Government, which says it shall be a condition of the mortgage that the net proceeds of the sales shall from time to time be paid

over to the Government. The trustees will take charge and hand the proceeds over, after paying all expenses of management.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is not a word of that there—that after the trustees have paid anything.

Mr. EDGAR. What can net proceeds mean?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They mean money paid by the company as net proceeds to the sale of the land to the trustees.

Mr. EDGAR. I cannot understand it so, and no court would interpret it so. They have to get the lands by deed into their hands. They are to sell them, and the condition is that the net proceeds of the sale of the lands be paid over to the Government by the trustees. They charge, as any trustee in law is entitled to charge, the cost of the management and the trust against the estate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That has nothing to do with the expenditure for sales by the company. That is perfectly clear by the resolution.

Mr. EDGAR. How can the company sell the lands when they are not to have a title to them?

Mr. THOMPSON. The title is passed to the trustees by the company, but it is not for the trustees to manage. It is only in case of default that the trustees may enter on the lands and sell them. In the meantime the Canadian Pacific Railway Company sell the lands. The moneys are paid over to the trustees and the trustees pass the title when the payments are completed, and it is a condition of the mortgage that the trustees shall be obliged to pay the receipts—after deducting their own remuneration, which is to be fixed—to the Government.

Mr. EDGAR. Does the Minister Justice of mean to contend that there is not to be an immediate conveyance of the lands?

Mr. THOMPSON. The company immediately passes the whole title to the trustees, but the trustees do not enter on the management or sale of them. The company will do precisely as they are doing now. The effect of the agreement is that purchasers are to get a title when they complete the purchase in full, and the payments of purchase money in advance of sale are to be paid into hands of the trustees, and when the purchase money is fully paid the trustees pass the title, the money being paid to the Government. The trustees do not manage the land.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). At what prices will the land be sold?

Mr. THOMPSON. At prices to be agreed upon.

Mr. EDGAR. When anything is left unstated in the resolution it is announced to us that it is to be put in the mortgage.

Mr. THOMPSON. There must naturally be conditions in the mortgage that cannot be inserted here.

Mr. EDGAR. If that be the meaning or intention of the resolution I do not think such is the evidence on the papers before us. However, I am very glad to hear that such is the intention of the Government, and I expect to see it distinctly provided for in the mortgage.

Mr. THOMPSON. There are many conditions not here, but they will form part of the mortgage.

Mr. EDGAR. I am very glad that the expenses of the management of the lands will be borne by the company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDGAR. More than that: the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will have little or no interest in those lands.

Mr. EDGAR.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They have a very decided interest.

Mr. EDGAR. Yes, but only in any surplus, if there is a surplus. However, they have not nearly as much interest as trustees and bondholders, and therefore I can hardly understand how any trustees for any mortgaged lands should allow the company making the mortgage to have entire control of the disposal of the securities which are held for the trust.

Mr. THOMPSON. Within certain limits.

Mr. EDGAR. This should be introduced in some measure before the House because it is one of the most vital parts of the whole scheme. One reason why it was of very great importance that the question of the management of the land should be understood was this: that I find in the report of 9th May, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the expenditures of their land department during the past year, 1887, was \$73,000 more than the entire receipts of their land department. I am not taking sales, which I fancy were in connection with land purchased in British Columbia, on the site of the town of Vancouver, and things of that kind, but under the ordinary heading of land department we find this distinct statement, showing that after the net and gross proceeds of sales of land, and the charges of management, it left a balance of \$73,280 against the company on the sale of lands. That is an alarming condition of things in one year. If the Government, or the company, or the trustees are not more successful in realising for their land than they happened to be last year we will not only have very little money for the principal of the bonds, but we will have nothing whatever to meet the \$525,000 which we have to pay every year no matter whether the lands are sold or not. These unsold lands which are security for the principal, and to the Government to a certain extent for the interest, are subject to certain charges. But before I refer to that I can go back one year further and see what the proceeds of the sales of land were by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I find that while in 1887 there was a deficiency of \$73,000 in the management, in 1886 55,936 acres were sold, but the startling information is given that there were cancelled sales amounting to 280,286 acres. About five times as many land sales were cancelled in 1886 as were made. We must hope there will be some little improvement as this is the only security the Government seem to have for the interest. By sub-section *g* of this agreement the unsold lands are subject to the land grant bonds of \$3,463,000, and of course it is anticipated that that will be somewhat reduced by the uncompleted sales. But it is rather an uncertain matter, when that reduction will be made as those are uncompleted sales and are in arrears, and are very often cancelled, as we see by the history of the company. That \$3,463,000 is the existing liability upon those unsold lands, which has to be met as to the principal, out of the first sales and the interest upon which is to be paid immediately.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How many acres were cancelled in 1886?

Mr. EDGAR. 280,286.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How many in 1887?

Mr. EDGAR. I have not the particulars as to the acres, but only the deficiency in cash as I stated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, there were 21,762. That cancelling in 1886 was, I presume, the arrangement with the North-West Land Company, in which you are aware there was a large quantity of land taken back.

Mr. EDGAR. Still the deficiency is enormous. Upon this 14,000,000 acres of unsold land which we get, the Government have got to face an immediate liability of outstanding

land bonds to the extent of \$3,463,000. That principal is to be met out of the first sales because they are a first charge.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Don't keep us here until daylight please. We have had it over and over again and it is a mere repetition.

Mr. EDGAR. It may be a repetition, but it is a very important matter, and it is a matter which should be discussed by this House when we are assuming an obligation of \$26,000,000 as we are doing here to-night.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have assumed the obligation.

Mr. EDGAR. With all deference to the Minister of Finance I may say that I would not bring it up unless it were a matter of great importance, and I am trying to present the position the country is in to the House. I do not trouble the House unless I have something of importance to say.

Mr. BOWELL. You think so.

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps the very important matter I once brought up relating to the blind shares are not in the eyes of the hon. gentleman who interrupted me.

Mr. BOWELL. Nor the sum you received when you sold the charter out west to the Grand Trunk Railway and all the men had to suffer by it. Nor the \$18 you paid for a bed in Haldimand when there.

Mr. WATSON. Do not complicate the question please.

Mr. EDGAR. We have also an annual charge for interest on this \$3,463,000 to be met, and I do not know whether that is at four or at five per cent. If it is five per cent. it is \$173,000, and if it is four per cent. it is \$138,000. If we do not get any more money for some years to come than we have been getting of late years from the sale of those lands, we certainly will not be able to get this interest, much less than to pay \$3,463,000 principal on outstanding bonds. It will be a great many years, I think, on the most reasonable calculation, before the trustees will be able to hand any of the proceeds of the sales of the land to the Government, so that the Government may be able to recoup itself out of the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest. There is another thing to be remembered and that is that those lands before long will become subject to taxation. It is important when we are arranging to-night a guarantee for 50 years, and according to the terms of the original charter, as the Minister of Justice has told us to-night, the titles in the lands are immediately to be conveyed to the trustees, so that taxes on these lands will run from 20 years hence at any rate, and there will in that respect be no very light charge, which will reduce the interest coming to the country. Now, I suppose, as a matter of fact, that the consideration which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company expect to receive for making the concession which we admit they must be paid for—their right to the monopoly in the Territories at any rate, whatever may be disputed as to their rights in the Provinces—is the difference between what they could get for the \$15,000,000 of bonds which they would give up on their unsold lands without guarantee, and the price they expect to get from those bonds with the Government guarantee. It may be many millions, I do not know how many, but the company may have made the calculation. That, I suppose, is all the consideration they are really asking or getting, if the contention of the hon. Finance Minister is that we are being secured entirely in the guarantee, and that the company are themselves going to pay all the interest out of revenue. Very well, if they are honestly doing so, I would like to know why they cannot say so, and make provision now, so that it can be clearly understood, for a second

mortgage bond on the line of the company and the franchises of the company, their tolls and revenues which will be held to secure the Government, and in that way avoid all dispute as to the nature of the security. If the company and the Government mean the same thing, that is, that we are to pay nothing on this guarantee, but that the railway company are to pay it all, why should not a second mortgage be given by the company to the Government, which could rank, if necessary, not only after the \$35,000,000 of existing bonds, but after the other fixed charges of the company, all the leased lines and all the bonds which the company have guaranteed. Then the Government would be secured before the shareholders of the company would get any dividends beyond the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. guaranteed by the Government. That, it is contended, is what the company are willing to do; and if that were provided in this agreement, now that we have decided on the principle of the affair, there would be little further dispute across the House, and the Government will be secured in the guarantee.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman could not have been in the House this afternoon when I went into all of these questions and dealt with them fully.

Mr. EDGAR. I was in the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If he was, I think I have reason to complain very much, at three o'clock in the morning, of his going over the whole ground and asking explanations which he must have heard very fully and explicitly. The only excuse the hon. gentleman could have for keeping us here for an hour at this time in the morning, in listening to a repetition of statements which have been made over and over again with quite as much ability and force as the hon. gentleman has displayed, I think is entirely taken away. The hon. gentleman knows that he has not undertaken, for a single moment, to answer the grounds which I gave for holding our security to be ample and complete. The speech the hon. gentleman has made I regard as a most valuable one; and, were it not that it is inconvenient for me to be here at three o'clock in the morning, I would listen with delight to that speech. Never since the Canadian Pacific Railway question came before this House has a speech been made of greater value to the Government than the speech the hon. gentleman has just delivered. What does it amount to? Let him go back and contrast it with the speeches made by himself and his leader and all the men who have spoken, year after year, in their puny, futile efforts to obstruct the greatest enterprise ever undertaken in the interest of Canada, and what will he find? He will find this Government held up to public execration, because of the enormous subsidy we gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in granting 25,000,000 acres of land, and yet he has taken from two to three o'clock in the morning, to prove that by giving them those lands, we gave them nothing, because the lands would not pay for the administration of them. I say the hon. gentleman has this morning given the answer to all those wild, reckless statements made throughout the whole of this discussion, as to the enormous consideration that was given to this company. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) told him, and told him correctly, in his place to-night, that he could go to the Bank of Montreal and by paying \$13,500,000 could get an annuity that would meet the entire outlay that these resolutions impose on the Government if we had to pay every dollar of it. I ask if, instead of a guarantee upon an ample and undoubted security that will protect this country from the necessity of ever paying a farthing, we had given the whole money according to the hon. gentleman, we would have given infinitely

less than he and those who have opposed this measure from its inception have admitted we had a right to give for the construction of this work. If the hon. gentleman was here this afternoon, he heard me say that the sale of lands in the inception of the work cannot yield any material result, but he heard me also demonstrate the value of those lands by an illustration that is familiar to every hon. member of this House. I stated that while the sale of lands during the construction of the Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway were not sufficient to pay the way of the company and they went into default and broke down and had to sell all their securities for a song, the people who came in and took those lands realised an enormous fortune from their sale. Why? Just because, as in this case of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, they could not sell their lands, because they were in competition with free grants given by the Government—and that as those free grant lands were settled in the vicinity of the railway, the railway lands would become of great value and give a great return to the company. And the hon. gentleman knowing that, knows there is no answer to it, he knows the thing is apparent, he knows that it has been demonstrated over and over again in precisely similar cases; yet he goes into the question of how much land has been sold and what the net revenue was during the past year. The object has not been to sell lands, but to advertise the free grant Government lands in order to give increased value to the railway lands. I can only say as to the security that is thus shown to be placed in the hands of the Government, is as it has been stated by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, over and over again, that there was no question as to these lands realising amply to cover the security of the bonds.

Mr. EDGAR. Ultimately they will.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then the hon. gentleman has wasted his hour's speech, which was devoted to showing that the administration of the lands would swallow up all the money. That was the whole tenor of the hon. gentleman's speech. Our contention, on the other hand, is that the sale of these lands will steadily increase, that the money they will bring will discharge the entire indebtedness which, at no distant date, will be handed over to the trustees by the company who have the entire charge of the administration of the lands on their shoulders; that the net proceeds will extinguish, at no distant date, the entire indebtedness of the land grant bonds; and that the Government will have in the Treasury the \$15,000,000, upon which they will afterwards have to pay interest at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. during the currency of these bonds, which is the next 50 years. The only point made by the hon. gentleman opposite is the fact that the Government would have to pay $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon the money they receive. But the hon. gentleman himself has admitted that it is of great importance to the country to get rid of the monopoly; he has admitted that the company are entitled to ample payment for the discharge of the monopoly; and yet, when we have shown the committee that we have extinguished the monopoly, hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be exceedingly annoyed because we have removed forever this ground of attack. They cavil at the Government for having been able to accomplish this without enabling the Opposition to show that we have paid a large sum of money for it. The difficulty is not in the terms of this arrangement. It is in the fact that the material to foment rebellion has been taken away from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. member for South Oxford, I say, in his place in this House, did all in his power, this very Session, to foment a rebellion in the North-West. He lent the sanction of his high authority in this House, and there is no gentleman on that side who

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

speaks with higher authority, when he declared there was ground for rebellion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly there was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What have you to say to this Government who have removed all that and given to the country peace instead of war, who have taken away any possibility of any difficulty? What have you to say when that has been accomplished on terms like these? I say that if hon. gentlemen opposite were sincere in their anxiety to relieve Manitoba and the North-West from the effect of this disallowance, if they were interested in relieving this country from the dangers that they declared threatened it, their conduct to-day is thoroughly at variance with their professions in the past, and it looks as if the trouble with hon. gentlemen opposite is that the last, the only cry with which they have been able to agitate this country has been taken away from them by the resolutions now upon the Table. The hon. gentleman referred to the management of the lands, and he talked about a second mortgage. Why, we have a second mortgage. To suppose the company will make default of one dollar in payment of this \$525,000, he must, in order to give plausibility to his imagination, leave out of sight the history of every railway on this continent, whether in the United States or this country, and ignore the experience of the past in reference to this railway enterprise, in order to throw a doubt upon the ability of this company to meet from their net surplus earnings the entire charge. The hon. gentleman knows that three years ago the whole earnings of the company were \$8,000,000, that two years ago their earnings were \$10,000,000, and that one year ago they were \$11,000,000. And the hon. gentleman need not rest upon the mere word or upon any imagination of mine, for I gave him the evidence. I showed that the net earnings of last year and of the first three months of this year were such as to ensure a return of no less than \$1,000,000 this year over and above all fixed charges. The hon. gentleman knows that, now, in the infancy of this great work, because the line is not completed, because it requires this money in order to get the means to handle traffic, that it is in the interest of the country and in the interest of the company that they should be furnished with those means. The hon. gentleman has to ignore all that in order to throw the slightest doubt upon the ability of the company, from their net earnings, to meet fully this insignificant charge, for insignificant it is compared with the enormous character of the work and the resources of the company. But suppose he does ignore all that, does not the hon. gentleman know that the moment there is a default of one dollar, the Government come in front of the \$65,000,000 of stock of the company? Does he not know that those stockholders to the extent of \$65,000,000 cannot divide a farthing among them, if the company does not meet promptly, at every demand, the entire interest charge? He denies that we have a second mortgage. Does not the hon. gentleman know that we come next to the first mortgage, and that the company cannot put a dollar of additional security on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that only \$35,000,000, for all this enormous work and this immense property is the entire amount that stands in front of the Government?

Mr. EDGAR. The fixed charges are there, and if capitalised, they would be \$100,000,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have disposed of the fixed charges. I have shown the hon. gentleman that the company will meet their fixed charges, and have a handsome surplus this year—a surplus which, beyond a shadow of doubt—will go on increasing year by year. We need only look at the history of the road and at the history of other similar roads on this continent, to see this. All that stands in front of the Government is the claim on the Canadian

Pacific Railway by the original bondholders, for they are not preference bondholders, they hold simply the first mortgage bonds—all that stands in front of the Government claim, in case the company makes a dollar of default, is that \$35,000,000 of the whole of this immense property. What value would a second mortgage on the road be? We have it now. We are in front of the stockholders, who cannot get a farthing if default is made, nor can they divide one farthing among them until the uttermost farthing of interest on the bonds is paid, and they cannot put any additional liability over the \$35,000,000 on the property without the assent of Parliament.

Mr. EDGAR. Is it intended that the \$15,000,000 and the interest on the \$15,000,000 shall also be a mortgage upon the line as well as the lands? If it is, my argument is wrong.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have told the hon. gentleman what it is exactly. The resolution and the agreement speak for themselves. But what I say is this: We are in the position of second mortgagors for this reason.

Mr. EDGAR. We are ordinary creditors.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, we are not. The Government of Canada represent the Parliament of Canada in this arrangement, and they cannot put a dollar additional claim or security on that work unless they can get the sanction of this Parliament to do so and therefore it requires no second mortgage in order to give us all the security we can possibly require. The hon. gentleman heard my statement, and I do not think, in reference to the view he takes as to the first mortgage bonds, he should have raised the question again. He says that he heard my statement, which was that, while the mortgage to the original bondholders gave them the security of the tolls as well as on the revenue of the road and on the road itself, I explained that the tolls would not accrue in the legal sense in which the bondholders could claim them until they were earned over and above the current debt of the company to the Government at that time, and consequently that, if default were made of a dollar the Government would not be called upon to pay any money for any service performed by the company until it had settled the charge which the Government might have against it. That is the statement which I made, and the hon. gentleman should have accepted it.

Mr. EDGAR. I should like to see where it is in the resolution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman does not suppose that the Government are going to pay any person who owes money to them for any service performed until that debt has been satisfied. Could any public contractor ask to have money paid over to him if he were in debt to the Government? The hon. gentleman knows that he could not. It would be the balance that would be paid to him after discharging the amount he owed to the Government, and so it is with this company. They will only be entitled to the balance. They will have to pay their debt to the Government before they can receive anything from the Government. As my hon. friend the Minister of Justice says, it is a set off. No question can be raised as to the justice or the propriety or the legality of the Government not being required to pay one farthing of that interest except when they had deducted what was payable to the company, and all that would enure would be the balance. I think I have answered everything the hon. member said that bears on the question, and I am only sorry that, after the lengthened discussion and the iteration that we have had on this subject all day, the hon. gentleman should have at this hour in the morning seen fit to have it gone all over again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the hon. gentleman is in a position to complain in regard to the lengthening of this discussion. In the heat of his argument he has made use of certain expressions which are very likely to call for some reply from this side of the House. If we question his figures, we have good reason to do so. We have heard before, both from the hon. gentleman himself and from the First Minister, calculations which were made with as much accuracy as those which were given to the House to-day and on Tuesday last, calculations by which it was a clear and well proven case that \$70,000,000 in the one case, and \$58,000,000 in the other were inevitably certain to go into the coffers of the country from the sales of lands in the North-West by the year 1890. We know exactly how much value is to be attached to these statements now; we know how likely we are to have \$58,000,000 from the sales of land in our coffers by the 1st January, 1890; and therefore we are justified in entertaining the gravest doubts as to whether one word of the calculations we have heard to-day will be verified now or at any other time. As to what the hon. gentleman was good enough to say in regard to our encouraging rebellion in the North-West, I assert that he and his colleagues are responsible alike to man and to God for all the blood which was shed in the two rebellions in that country, which were brought about by their gross misconduct, and it was only because they did not listen to our advice that they so narrowly escaped provoking a third and a worse rebellion than either, as they would have done if they had not at the last moment—not because they were convinced of the impolicy of their course, but because they were confronted by an indignant people, who were determined to put the railway through *coute que coute*—in consequence of the threats made by the people of Manitoba—brought down these resolutions to-day. What have we to say of men who dared to address Her Majesty a few months ago, and to tell her that it would be a suicidal thing for the people of Canada not to pursue the policy of disallowance, and to permit the American roads to make a connection with the people of Winnipeg, and who now come down and say that it is our duty, without cavil, comment or criticism, to pass a set of complicated resolutions which I venture to say the hon. Minister does not very well understand himself, though his colleague the Minister of Justice may? I desire to know whether the Minister means us to understand that we can, in defiance of the rights of the first bondholders, appropriate to our own use any postal subsidies or other sums due by the Government of Canada to the company; and I ask this particularly of the Minister of Justice. I make this enquiry because I am convinced that, if it is found that that is the case, there will very shortly be very serious remonstrances addressed to the Government of this country on the part of the holders of this \$35,000,000 of bonds. I am not sufficiently well skilled in the mysteries of the statute which my hon. friend (Mr. Edgar) has quoted to say how far the Government of the country may by Act of Parliament interfere with what these bondholders conceive to be their rights, but I can tell the Minister of Finance this, that if I correctly understand him, and if it is his policy and the policy of the Government to appropriate these postal revenues for the payment of this particular debt, if it should go into default, it will be taken very ill indeed by the bondholders in England, and a serious shock may result to Canadian credit, which the hon. gentleman may find very inconvenient when he proceeds to London to float the loan which he has taken authority to do. I should like to know if the Minister of Justice confirms the view which as I understand—and I am open to correction on that point—the Minister of Finance has enunciated, that the Minister now claims that the Government can appropriate to the payment of this 3½ per cent., if the company goes into default, the postal revenues we

are to pay to the company, and which I can tell him the holders of the bonds now existing suppose to be pledged to them. I ask for an answer to that from the Minister of Justice.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not suppose it is intended to interfere, by statute or otherwise, with the rights the bondholders have in regard to the securities on the road by which their bonds are secured. I understood the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) to say that the company had conveyed the future tolls and earnings of the road, they did so as far as they could, but they could only have power to convey the tolls and earnings they were entitled to convey, and certainly they could not avoid the right of set-off which any of their customers may have. They might, in the same way, convey all the tolls they are to receive for carrying freight for the Grand Trunk or any other company, but the trustees could not in consequence demand the gross tolls, therefore the right of set-off exists on the part of the Government as against this company, just as it exists on the part of any other company as against them, and the consequence must be subject to the right of set-off as it exists between all persons.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then do I understand — because this is a matter of the greatest moment to these bondholders — or, rather, I do understand, from the Minister of Justice that, in the event of default of the payment of this \$525,000, the Government will apply the sums due for postal and other services in payment of the default.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is their right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I may say to the Minister of Finance that I think that statement will be a surprise, and a very disagreeable surprise, to the holders of these bonds. However, it is extremely desirable that we should understand exactly where we are in that matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Nobody is more interested in this very measure than these bondholders, and nobody is going to derive greater benefit and security from it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I doubt very much whether they entertain that opinion. I think when the answer made by the Minister of Justice comes to be fully known, the Minister of Finance will find that the bondholders to whom I have referred do not entertain that opinion. I am not, of course, in a position to dispute the hon. gentleman's law on the subject: I assume it is correct. But I am in a position to assure the Minister of Finance, and the Government generally, that the bondholders are likely to receive that statement with a very considerable alarm, and he will do well to consider how far the injury which may be done —

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think that contingency will ever arise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman on that point, either. The contingency may not arise, I trust it will not arise; but I do not feel that we have any absolute warrant for supposing that it will not arise, nor most assuredly do I believe that we have any absolute warrant, looking at the position of the company as respects these lands, for supposing that we can depend on receiving, from the sale of the lands for a good many years to come, enough to meet these liabilities. I want, however, to enquire of the Minister of Justice whether this mortgage, which is so often referred to here, has actually been drawn up and agreed to between himself and the legal authorities of the company?

Mr. THOMPSON. It has been drawn and partially agreed upon, but not completed. It has not received the approval of the Government yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think, looking at the importance of the matter, that we ought to have that laid on the Table, as it is the basis of our security, and a perusal of it would remove, I presume, a great many of these difficulties.

Mr. WELDON (St John). I do not differ from my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, so long as the company fulfil their obligations. The object of taking the mortgage is to provide for a contingency of security in case there is a failure of obligation. Now, the peculiarity about this matter is: that while the lands are given for security for the principal, we look to other property for the purpose of being recouped in the payment of interest. If there were at any time default, and the trustees took possession of the railway, we then have no right to get anything at all; and the instant the trustees take possession they have a right to obtain the postal subsidies, an equitable right which may be enforced against the Government, and no set-off would arise. As long as the company fulfil their obligations, the question is immaterial, but the instant they should make default, not so much in the payment of money in regard to this mortgage, but in default of the first mortgage, then the trustees taking possession of the road, which, no doubt, they have the power to do, under the provisions usually made in mortgages, they would become entitled to these tolls and revenues, and no set off would arise. There is this curious anomaly under this mortgage, that the property which is a security for the mortgage, is simply to secure the principal, while we have to look to other sources where we have no security, for the purpose of being recouped for the payment of interest.

Mr. THOMPSON. No doubt the hon. gentleman is correct that, on default, in regard to the bonds on the railway, the road will pass into the hands either of trustees or a receiver. No question, as he says, at all could arise in relation to this off-set until there was default, not only in respect to this guarantee, this interest on the \$5,000,000, but likewise default in respect to interest on the charges on the railway. We are under no contract to give postal subsidies. The trustees would have to earn, or the receiver, on behalf of the company, would have to earn these postal subsidies under the conditions and under the right of set-off that may be provided in any contract that may be made. The hon. gentleman seems to be under the impression that there is now some fixed obligation in regard to postal subsidies lasting all time to come. The subsidies are running without any definite term.

Mr. WELDON (St John). I admit that my hon. friend might be right theoretically, but when we come to the practical working, and you allow that to go towards paying the debt, it would almost be a breach of trust. But if that contingency should arise, what position will the parties be in? The Minister of Justice says: We will make no arrangements with you unless you set-off. But I think the Government are hardly prepared to do it, because the trustees will say: We will carry the mail, and we will require these postal subsidies to be given us. We will do the work and we want to do it. In that case the Government would be bound to send the mails forward by that route. As I said before, the difficulty is this: that it differs from any other mortgage that I ever saw. The trustees hold certain properties for the security of the principal, but for the interest look to a property that is not secured. While it is true, as the Minister of Finance says, assuming it is correct, that they could not take up any more obligation without the consent of Parliament, yet they might involve themselves in liabilities to simple contract creditors, and the Government, under those circumstances, could only come in and share with them, unless the Government chose to exercise that very

doubtful right which might exist in such a case under the prerogative of the Crown.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister of Justice made a statement upon which we had better have a complete understanding. If I understood him aright, he stated a moment ago that, in case the company made default, in case the Government had to pay the interest which the company had failed to pay, then the postal subsidies might be appropriated by the Government to discharge the obligation which they had just made with that company, as a set-off; that is to say, that the amount paid by the Government and the amount due by the Government to the company, would be a set-off to enforce what we call in French, compensation, that is to say, the two things would annul one another. If that is the statement made by the Minister of Justice it seems to me it is at variance with the statute which already exists. I would understand the doctrine of the Minister of Justice under ordinary circumstances, but he cannot forget that all the earnings, if I recollect the statement well, \$35,000,000 of the earnings of the road, are already pledged to the bondholders of the \$35,000,000 which are issued by the company.

Mr. THOMPSON. So far as they had power to pledge them. They had not the power to take away the right of set-off to other people.

Mr. LAURIER. I cannot see that doctrine at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see it if he will reflect for a moment on the illustration I gave him of the dealings of the company with other railways. The company must necessarily exchange freights, say with the Grand Trunk Railway. Suppose, at the end of the year, the Canadian Pacific Railway has a bill against the Grand Trunk Railway for \$20,000, is it possible that, under that mortgage, they can claim that amount when the Grand Trunk Railway has a set-off of \$13,000 against the company?

Mr. LAURIER. The illustration does not apply. Let a case be taken such as is constantly taking place. Instead of exchanging cash in every transaction, there is credit given by the one company to the other. Can it be said that all the earnings of the road which are already pledged can be taken as a set-off?

Mr. THOMPSON. I would suggest this: that the mortgage and statute only cover the lines of railways which were in existence and operated by the company then.

Mr. LAURIER. No. It includes everything acquired by the company. It is idle to continue the discussion further. I cannot agree with the construction of the Minister of Justice in regard to the law; but the point brought out is that the Government believe they have a right to step in before the bondholders and make a set-off against the claims of the company.

Mr. EDGAR. Is the postal subsidy pledged?

Mr. THOMPSON. We are not giving up any right of set-off.

Mr. EDGAR. Is it proposed to obtain any pledge or hypothecation of the postal revenue? In the \$5,000,000 transaction in 1885, the company gave this specifically.

Mr. THOMPSON. The mortgage will be merely a conveyance of the land.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. the Finance Minister a trustee of the bondholders?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; of the original bondholders. I do not intend to raise any trouble on this point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Although the Minister of Finance is trustee of the bondholders he is not holder of the bonds; and he may have to like it whether he wishes

it or not. These bonds cover not merely the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway but the branches as well.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, all except the Algoma Branch.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All I can say is that the bondholders, the great proportion of whom are foreigners, considered themselves under the statute passed by the Parliament of Canada as entitled to participate in this matter, and I would very strongly recommend the Minister of Finance, who is occupying the double position of trustee to them and also fills the position of Finance Minister, to make enquiry as to how this is regarded. If the bondholders do so regard it I think it will be extremely important in the interests of Canada that a future collision should be avoided, and that the question should be fully understood.

Mr. EDGAR. I shall be very glad on behalf of the country if the view expressed by the Minister of Justice is correct and is carried out, as it will offer further security to the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. I shall be very sorry if that is the case, because it will discourage us in England in regard to the holders of the original bonds. It is very clear that we should have the mortgage submitted on the Table of the House so as to see its exact terms.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I should like the Minister of Justice to say whether he will avail himself of the right of set-off in regard to postal service.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is a question for the future entirely.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister of Justice of that day will be very glad to avail himself of the opinion of the present Minister of Justice if he can have it.

Mr. MITCHELL. After listening to some very obtuse explanations, am I to understand that the Minister of Justice has said that the Government have the right, if they so choose to exercise it, of doing what the hon. gentlemen are contending about?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is what the Minister of Justice has said.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, then I understand the Government on this matter.

An hon. MEMBER. What do you understand?

Mr. MITCHELL. I understand they have got a claim to exercise the power, and, of course, if they have the right they will do so, if it is in the public interest.

On section *h*.

Mr. THOMPSON. I wish to add a few words to that section which will not alter the sense. The words are:

Nothing herein shall affect or diminish the rights or remedies of any holder of any of the said land grant bonds now in the hands of the public

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that there is something which requires explanation here. In section *d* it is provided that if the company make default we can be recouped out of the money which may still be due to the company out of uncompleted sales. If I understand this aright this money is already pledged to the present creditors of the issue of the land grant bonds.

Mr. THOMPSON. What section do you refer to?

Mr. LAURIER. Section *g*.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is so. Section *g* pledges the uncompleted sales to the extinguishment of the outstanding land grant bonds. The purchase moneys which are provided in section *d* are these hereafter to be made.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Would they not be, under any circumstances?

Mr. THOMPSON. The principal would, and not the interest.

Mr. LAURIER. Sales to be made hereafter are to be made by the trustees?

Mr. THOMPSON. The land will be in the hand of the company and the sale is really affected by it. The trustees approve the transfer. While the purchase money is accruing, the company is receiving the interest. The objection of section *d* is if they should be in default they would be able to pay over the principal moneys which become due, and the interest as well.

Mr. LAURIER. If I understand aright section *d* only refers to the 14,000,000 acres, which are pledged to the capital bond, and nothing else.

Mr. THOMPSON moved the insertion of sub-section *i*. He said: The object of it is to enable other forms to be issued that might not be covered by the word "bond," such as inscribed stock or debenture stock.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Should not that be approved by the Governor in Council.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will do that. They propose to have power to use registered bonds or inscribed stock, because that is a much more attractive security to a large class of investors than debentures which might be destroyed.

Mr. MITCHELL. I might ask the hon. Minister whether the claim he now puts forward of the Government's right to maintain moneys for postal subsidies also covers transport service?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, it covers everything; every service that they may do for us.

Mr. DALY. I beg to move the following as sub-section *g*:—

Provided further that it shall be a condition to the above provisions being carried out, that the Canadian Pacific Railway shall expend a portion of the proceeds of the sale of the bonds referred to herein in the immediate construction and equipment of the projected branch lines of the said railway in South-Western Manitoba and the North-West Territories.

I move this section, seconded by my hon. friend the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Perley). I am not going to take up the time of the committee further than to say how sincere I am in moving it, and I trust, sincerely, that the Government will accede to my request to allow that amendment to be added.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret to say that it would be impossible to accept the motion of my hon. friend, and I cannot but feel that it is an unreasonable motion. Both my hon. friends have been vehement advocates of the extinguishment of the policy of disallowance, on the ground that if it passed other people in addition to the Canadian Pacific Railway would come into this section of the country and provide railway facilities. The object that we have in giving this guarantee, and in making this arrangement, is that the money should be expended in order to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway, in such a thoroughly efficient condition, as to be able to handle all the traffic on that line. I have no doubt that the resolutions which are now on the Table will compel the company to do what my hon. friend requires; that is to extend these branch lines where the development and settlement of the country makes it absolutely in the interests of the company that railways should be extended; and for the additional reason that now they will be in a position that they will have no option but to extend the branch lines, because the monopoly being removed, they will be exposed to competition, and other parties may come

Mr. THOMPSON.

in and make these extensions if they do not do it themselves. I look on the passage of these resolutions as the best guarantee for the extension of branch lines that could possibly be given. I do not know any mode in which a more complete guarantee could be given. As this is a matter of agreement, and as it would throw open the whole question to introduce this matter which has not been the subject of agreement, I must ask my hon. friends to leave that matter now, relying on the assurance that the Government will do everything in their power to promote the extension of branch lines, using all the influence they possess with the company towards that end, and that if the company do not extend branch lines, others will be free to go into the country and extend them; and I think it would only jeopardise these resolutions if we should put anything into them that has not been a subject of agreement.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But the agreement between the Government and Sir George Stephen absolutely provides how this money shall be expended, and it is not to be expended on branch lines. Now, I understand the hon. Minister to say that, at least, some of this money will be expended on branch lines.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all. I said we required this money to carry out our original policy, that is, to keep the traffic on our own lines and in our own country, and therefore this money is to be expended in providing such additional elevator accommodation and rolling stock as will secure that end. But my hon. friend will see that the object in having these facilities for increased traffic, which will enable the company to handle the traffic of the North-West, will very greatly improve their financial position in every respect, and will enable them better to extend their branch lines than any other course that could be adopted; and, therefore, the company will have an interest to do so, while the people will have the assurance that the removal of the monopoly will secure them, because they have always said that if the monopoly were removed there was no doubt that the country would get all the facilities it required. The company must either construct branch lines themselves, or allow the finest section of country to be supplied with branch lines by others.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood that we were to have a completed road without this guarantee of money at all, and I think we have a direct interest in the construction of branch lines under this arrangement. If they are constructed out of this fund and constructed at once, what will be the effect? The effect will be to enhance the value of the lands, in which we shall have a decided interest. Therefore, the motion seems to be an eminently right and proper one. I must say I do not understand this schedule. It provides that the money shall be expended as follows:—

"1. On account of capital expenditure on main line between Quebec and Vancouver, in buildings of various kinds, snow sheds, sidings, permanent bridges, filling trestles, reducing grades and curves and other improvements and facilities, and on vouchers and pay rolls \$5,498,000

"2. For rolling stock, locomotives, box cars, passenger cars, flat cars, tool cars, snow ploughs, &c., \$5,250,000.

"3. For required improvements on the main line, elevators, bridges, locomotive shops, filling trestles, sidings, docks, lake and coast steamers; the residue, whatever it may be, estimated at \$4,252,000."

There is this significant note:

"The expenditure on item 3 may be increased, and for that purpose the expenditure on either of the other items may be diminished."

In No. 3 there is a repetition of several articles, apparently to cover up what is new, "docks, lake and coast steamers." It seems to me that under this third item this money might be wholly denied to local traffic and devoted to the development of their steamship line on the Pacific. Elevators, bridges, locomotive shops, filling trestles, and sidings are all included in the first item, and what remains in the third

clause is, "docks, lake and coast steamers;" and they have power to increase the expenditure under this third item to any amount; so that they need not expend any of the money on the main line at all. I think we are interested in having at least a portion of this money expended on branch lines, because it would develop the country and make the land valuable. That was one of the strong reasons I had for supporting that resolution, and I am glad that the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) though he voted against it before, is prepared to vote for it now.

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps the hon. Finance Minister can tell us what he understands by schedule A, because I understand it a little differently from my hon. friend who has just spoken. I understand the first part to refer to past expenses, to the floating debt.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is so.

Mr. EDGAR. And No. 3 is for future expenses?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. EDGAR. If so, there must be a misprint in the first part; "and on vouchers" should be evidently printed "as per vouchers."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. The main line is between Quebec and Vancouver, and it must be all expended on capital account between those points.

Mr. MITCHELL. It strikes me that the hon. member for Selkirk is very inconsistent in the attitude he has assumed in submitting this amendment. When the amendment of my hon. friend was submitted, it appears he voted against it.

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very properly too.

Mr. MITCHELL. There may be a difference of opinion about that, with all due respect to the Minister of Finance

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think so.

Mr. MITCHELL. But I think there are other portions of the country besides the North-West. I think that this liability and the interest in which it is created is one attaching to the whole of Canada; and although the first item says between Quebec and Vancouver, the further provisions give the company power, where the necessities of the case require, that a portion of the expenditure shall be taken from one and placed to the other, to do so. I think it is right they should have this power. I do not think the hon. member for Selkirk has the right to come in and attempt to specify the branch lines which must be built in that country by the company. That is a matter for the company to decide, and which they will decide according to the necessities of the country. I do not think we should tie the company by the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Selkirk.

Mr. DALY. I am very willing to be lectured by the hon. gentleman as to the course I have taken in this matter. I was perfectly justified in the vote I have given; and if the last part of the last clause of the amendment of the leader of the Opposition had stood alone I should have voted for it. But there is a great deal of extraneous matter in the amendment which I could not consistently vote for, in connection with the position I took on the question of disallowance last year. In reading over this agreement signed by the Minister of Railways and Sir George Stephen, I noticed exactly what the hon. gentleman for South Brant has noticed, and it occurred to me that when the Government were giving this company \$15,000,000, it would have been only just to the people in my constituency, who were promised by the Canadian Pacific Railway these branch lines, and there is a declaration in our Statute-book that we should build fifty miles of railway

in that part of the North-West, that a stipulation to this effect should have been exacted from the company. The people out there are suffering from the want of railways, and it would be but an act of justice to my constituents, under the circumstances, to have provided in clause 3 that a portion of the money should be expended on branch lines. As the hon. member for South Brant has said, the effect of those lines being built there would be to increase the value of lands \$3 or \$4 an acre, and that would recoup the Canadian Pacific Railway for any expenditure under that head.

Mr. WATSON. I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment of the hon. member for Selkirk.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course.

Mr. WATSON. I generally do support proper legislation. It seems to be that the legislation introduced by the hon. the Minister of Finance is altogether in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the interests of the general public and of a suffering community are never considered at all. I know the sufferings of the settlers in this particular section of the Province of Manitoba, and have great pleasure in supporting, as the Finance Minister might suppose, my hon. friend's amendment. As a rule I generally advocate the interests of the people in preference to the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think the amendment of my hon. friend is a proper one, and for that reason I support it; and for the same reason I supported the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. By the second clause it appears to me that the company can spend the money where and for almost anything they please. There is nothing to prevent them spending it in getting rolling stock to be used on the roads of the United States of which they have obtained control.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Exactly.

Mr. WATSON. I think it is in the interest of Canada that the money should be employed in developing our Canadian North-West in preference to any foreign country, and for that reason I feel that this amendment should be carried.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope my hon. friend from Selkirk will withdraw his amendment, as if pressed it will go a long way towards stultifying himself as completely as the hon. member for Marquette has stultified himself. After professing to be a very earnest advocate of doing away with the policy of disallowance, when the Government have prepared an arrangement by which that policy is to be removed, that hon. gentleman endeavors to defeat it. He has shown that his object was not to do away with disallowance at all, but to embarrass the Government; and that in order to do so he was prepared to defeat the policy of removing disallowance. The hon. gentleman knows well that had the resolution, for which he voted to-night, carried, the policy of disallowance would not have been abrogated, the monopoly would have remained on the Statute-book, and he would have had to go back and meet his indignant constituents to answer to the charge that he had prevented disallowance from being abolished. That is the position of the hon. member for Marquette; and my hon. friends, the members for Selkirk and Assiniboia, are in danger of being in that position. They have been perfectly consistent in voting down the proposition moved for the express purpose of embarrassing the Government and defeating any attempt to carry out this arrangement, by which alone the Government could hope to take that monopoly off the Statute-book; they have also stated they are very anxious to have branch lines, and if a motion for such should come up in Parliament, and we were free to advocate it, we would take every means in our power to secure the extension of

branch lines, but when that is attached to a resolution crippling the Canadian Pacific Railway by making them less able to build branch lines than they otherwise would be, and maintaining this policy of disallowance, we have to vote against it. The same principle that obliged those hon. gentlemen to vote against the proposition of the leader of the Opposition precludes from pressing this resolution, which if passed would defeat the policy of the Government. This is a contract, and if we cannot obtain the support of Parliament to it, the resolution will go, and the monopoly will remain on the statute. The monopoly remains on the Statute-book, and, consequently, I think my hon. friends will see, under those circumstances, that it is not wise for them to press this resolution. I think they should withdraw it, with the assurance that the Government will do everything in their power to promote the construction of these branch lines, which they know to be vital to the development of the North-West, in regard to which they have given abundant evidence of their interest.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson), has been consistent in the course which he has always asserted, and which he has asserted to-day, and which we have asserted on this side of the House, that there was no monopoly in the Province of Manitoba, and that it was only forced on that Province by the undue stretching of the prerogative by the Government of the day. If the resolution had carried, what would have been the position? It would have been that, while the majority of the House would have asserted that there was no monopoly in the Province of Manitoba, still there was a monopoly in the North-West Territories, which would have been dealt with by any Government that might have been in power, and for which there was compensation due to the company. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Daly) did not choose to vote for the amendment which I moved, though it embraced what he has proposed now, and which I am glad to see he is going to stick to; but I can assure him that we will give him what little assistance we can on this side of the House, though I am afraid his amendment will not be carried.

Mr. DALY. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) when he says that no monopoly existed in Manitoba. He forgets that monopoly existed in the added territory of Manitoba. I represent a portion of that added territory and so does the hon. member for Marquette. The mistake he made was in not making a difference between disallowance and monopoly. The monopoly certainly applied to the new portion of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. WATSON. I have been lectured by the Finance Minister before, and I can assure him that his words of castigation fall off me very much like water off a duck. I can stand it, at any rate.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. WATSON moved that the following be added as subsection j:

That, as a condition of the proposed settlement, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall relinquish all claims to the right of exemption from taxation on all lands held by said company as set forth in section 16 of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract.

I will just say that it is of the most importance that that section should be added to the resolution. There are several municipalities in the Province of Manitoba, in fact I may say that every municipality in that Province is subject to great hard-hip in consequence of these exemptions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think you went fully into this subject in your speech to-day.

Mr. WATSON. I may have done so, but I have a perfect right to repeat it if I choose.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think it is in good taste to repeat at this time of the morning.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. WATSON. I do not require a lesson from the hon. gentleman, but I simply desire to say that I think it is in the interest of Manitoba to have this question settled in the settlement which is being made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. As I pointed out before, the different municipalities on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway are suffering from these exemptions, and so are those on the land which has been sold to the North-West Land Company.

Amendment negatived.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 132) respecting a certain agreement between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Bill read the first time.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 4.25 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 12th May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FRAUDS ON FARMERS.

Mr. BROWN moved:

That the Select Committee appointed to enquire into the fraudulent practices which have prevailed, and still prevail, in various parts of the Dominion, by which farmers have been and are induced to give their promissory notes and securities to a very large amount in the aggregate, for seed, agricultural implements, and other goods and merchandise, by various pretexts, be empowered to examine on oath, or affirmation, where affirmation is allowed by law, such witnesses as may appear before the said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

THE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to bring under the notice of the Postmaster General some matters connected with the mail service in the county of Northumberland. Fifty years ago the mails were carried by a one-horse shay between Newcastle and Fredericton; sometimes it was carried by a two-horse shay. Now I find, although there are railways the whole distance, and I think there are twenty post offices on the route, an advertisement has been issued within the past few days inviting tenders for carrying mails in the way they were carried before railways were constructed.

Mr. McLELAN. The notice was issued without my knowledge. I have received a report from the inspector on the matter, which I am now considering, and I will come to a conclusion in a day or two.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad the notice was issued without the hon. gentleman's knowledge.

Mr. WELDON (St. John's). I call the attention of the Postmaster General to the mail service between Grand Falls and Edmundston, where a railway now runs. The mails carried by stage arrive 24 hours behind the train.

Mr. McLELAN. The carriage of mails over these new railways is under consideration. Some little time has to elapse before arrangements can be made, and we require to ascertain whether the trains are running regularly.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understand the hon. gentleman will give the matter consideration and will give us his conclu-

sions in a few days, and in ample time before the Session closes, and that he will make use of the railways in the transmission of the mails.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. I desire to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that an Order of the House was passed last Session for a return concerning the removal or dismissal of David Wellbank, mail carrier, and that such return has not been brought down.

Mr. McLELAN. I will make enquiry into it.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 132) respecting a certain agreement between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved second reading of resolution (p. 1136) respecting the raising, by way of loan, of such sum as may be required for the purpose of paying the floating indebtedness of the Dominion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before concurrence is taken in the report I should like to say a word or two. I see the Minister of Finance was good enough to express a regret that I was not present at the time he made his statement with regard to this loan. I share the regret. I have just within the last few minutes, succeeded in reading through the speech which the hon. gentleman delivered on that occasion, and I must say, if the hon. gentleman will pardon me, that I have risen from the perusal with feelings of considerable astonishment and considerable amusement. I always like to see an experiment properly and carefully conducted, and I have a sneaking kind of regard for the hon. the Finance Minister. There is a boldness and a dash about his proceedings which are very often lacking in the proceedings of his colleagues, and certainly of his predecessors, and these characteristics have rarely been more conspicuous than on the present occasion. After reading the hon. gentleman's speech carefully, I came to the conclusion that he has been practicing a huge joke on his supporters, and that he was really desirous of seeing what they could be induced to swallow.

Mr. MITCHELL He seemed quite serious though.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I am sure. The hon. gentleman has great command of muscle, in addition to many other valuable qualities. I think, however, he was rather hard on his supporters, considering all they have had to go through during the past few weeks, considering that they have had to do a great many unpleasant things, and to contradict themselves very grossly, and also in the case of not a few of them to put their seats in very serious peril, in following his various utterances with that implicit obedience which the hon. gentleman is apt to exact from his followers. It was rather too bad to laugh at them, as the hon. gentleman evidently did when he introduced those resolutions we have now under discussion. I cannot say that the doctrine he announced is altogether new. In fact I think there is good precedent for it. I think I recollect, in a book which ought to be familiar to all members of this House, that on a certain occasion debtors who owed fourscore were told to take their bill and write down fifty, but there was this difference: the steward there referred to had the power to abrogate the debt. The hon. gentleman, in this instance, has not that power. The hon. gentleman lays down two cardinal propositions in this document I have in my hand. First of all, I take it, that his major proposition, if I may so describe it, is that the moment you give your note of hand to a

fellow you cease to bother yourself about any debt you may owe to him. In the second place, and this is rather more important, the hon. gentleman defines the actual liability of the people of Canada, not by the amount which we owe, but by the annual charge on the revenue which it entails. I do not know that I am disposed altogether to object to that mode of stating the question, but we will see how it works out. My time has been very brief for considering this speech, and if there be any errors in it, as it is only the unrevised copy, I trust that the hon. gentleman will excuse me and correct me. The results that I have arrived at differ slightly from the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, he will follow me if he so chooses. Our annual charge in 1878 was \$7,238,000 for interest and expenses of management. The rate of interest the hon. gentleman states, and I presume he is correctly reported, was then $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Now, the hon. gentleman proceeds later on to capitalise our present debt, and I propose to apply the same rule as he does to see how it works out. We had, Sir, as the House will observe, an annual charge for interest and expenses of management in 1878 of \$7,238,000. If you capitalise that at $4\frac{1}{2}$, which the hon. gentleman declares was the then rate of interest, you will find that our debt capitalised in 1878 would have amounted to \$152,476,841. In 1888-89, the present year, our annual charges are \$10,250,000; our rate of interest, according to the hon. gentleman, is $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and the consequence is, if we apply this identical rule he lays down, to which I do not object, although it is his rule and not mine, our present debt capitalised at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., amounts to \$315,307,692. It is only fair that my hon. friend should remember, that the amount of difference between the debt capitalised in 1878 and 1889 would amount to exactly \$162,832,851. That is just as logical a way of stating the case, as the way the hon. gentleman has stated it, when he declared that the liability is not to be measured by the amount we owe, but by the annual charge on the revenue. We will capitalise it, and it follows clearly and distinctly that if capitalised, our debt at the present rate of annual charge is \$162,832,851 greater than in 1878. If you like to apply that doctrine further, take the fixed charges of debt and subsidies in 1878. They amounted, all told, to \$11,755,000, and the rate of interest is, say, $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. If you capitalise the debt it will be \$247,473,685, and if you take our present fixed charges, which amount to \$16,250,000, and if you follow the hon. gentleman's ruling and capitalise that at a rate of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., you find that our present fixed charges, capitalised at that rate, would represent a total indebtedness of \$500,000,000, or an increase in ten years of \$252,526,310. If you go a step further, and if you capitalise our necessary taxes in 1878, allowing that they amount to \$19,000,000, you would get an indebtedness of \$400,000,000. Take necessary taxes to-day which amount to \$30,000,000 and capitalise them at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and they amount to \$923,076,923. On the hon. gentleman's own showing, and applying his own mode of reasoning, which I do not intend to dispute, although I do not endorse it either, the difference between our position in 1878 and 1889 amounts to \$523,076,923. The hon. gentleman will see that this is just as good an argument as the one he has submitted here. It may be open, no doubt, to the charge that it savors a little of the *reductio ad absurdum*. I submit, Sir, with all due deference to the hon. gentleman that, on his own principles, he cannot gainsay one of those figures or facts. There is no doubt our necessary taxes were \$19,000,000 in 1875. He puts himself the rate of interest at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent then. He puts the rate of interest at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. now. He places our necessary taxes now at \$30,000,000, and he cannot gainsay that capitalised on his own principles it would amount to \$923,076,923, and that we are so much worse off now than we were a few years ago. I contend, Sir, that this is just as logical a deduction from the proposition he laid down, as the de-

duction he has made. It is the rule reversed it is true, but it is a poor rule that will not work both ways, although this way of working it will not perhaps be as convenient to the hon. gentleman. He undertakes to tell us what the rate of interest will be in twenty years hence. That is a bold statement. No human being can tell what the position of Europe will be twenty years hence, and no one can tell what the value of money will be. Men who are entitled to the highest respect are of opinion that Europe is on the eve of a tremendous war. If a tremendous war should break out, and should be but a prelude to other wars, as has been the case over and over again, it is extremely doubtful whether the great fall in interest which has taken place in late years may not be checked, and whether we may not have to borrow at a higher instead of a lower rate in the market than we are able to do to-day. I trust, for our sake, that that will not be the case; but the hon. gentleman surely cannot deny that that is a possibility; and as a great portion of our debt does not mature, according to his statement, for twenty years, we should be very indiscreet in heaping up liabilities on the assumption that everything will go on as prosperously as it has done in the last few years. But, Sir, I was very sorry to find the hon. Minister, in existing circumstances, using language in his speech which goes to show that in his opinion Canada has no hope or chance of paying off or reducing her debt. I am sorry that that statement has gone abroad on the authority of the Minister of Finance, even though there may be too much ground to fear that he is correct. At any rate, it is an unfortunate thing to parade at the very moment when we know the people of the United States have been using enormous exertions to clear off their indebtedness—when it is probable that the same hour and day that sees us renewing this large indebtedness of ours will see the United States absolutely without a single dollar of indebtedness. I think, therefore, that it was an ill-judged thing to parade the fact that in his opinion there was very little chance of our reducing our debt, but that we shall probably, on the contrary, have to increase it considerably. As to the observation the hon. gentleman made that we had good assets to show for this indebtedness, we have certainly assets, but I do not know what kind he describes as good. I do not believe that among all our canals and railways there is a single one which is paying interest on its cost, or even a fraction of it. If there be, I should be glad to know it. It is not the Intercolonial Railway; it is not the great majority of our canals; I have examined the Public Accounts, and I know of none, and I can think of none which at this moment will pay even its working expenses; and I doubt if those are the kinds of assets which it is desirable to parade to the world. The hon. gentleman goes on further to say that in dealing with the savings banks he has come to the conclusion to reduce the rate of interest. Well, Sir, I congratulate the hon. gentleman on having had the good sense at last, after much struggling, to adopt the policy which has been recommended from this side of the House for several years. In this case also his course is rather at variance with what his predecessors argued and did. But I think the hon. gentleman is correct, and I shall uphold him. At the same time, what is to be said of the arguments advanced to us so often by his colleagues and supporters? We were told, Sir, that this rate of interest was kept up for the special benefit and advantage of the poor of Canada, who had been no doubt heavily oppressed by the hon. gentleman's tariff, and might, therefore, claim some right to be considered in these matters. Now, Sir, I know very well, and the returns brought down to this House show clearly, that the great bulk of the deposits, as to amount, if not as to number, are not held by poor people or by people who can be described as needy at all, but by people of considerable means. I always have thought that it was a mistake on the part of the Government to compete against the banks

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

and to offer to borrow money at a higher interest than the current market rate. I say that the hon. gentleman is right, but again he puts himself into contradiction with his supporters, and again he has adopted the policy recommended on this side of the House. That, Sir, however, is to his credit. The only pity is that it was not adopted earlier and practiced by those who preceded him, although it is better that it is done even now. Then, Sir, all through these remarks the hon. gentleman calls attention to the fall in the rate of interest, as if the hon. gentleman was entitled to considerable credit, because all over the civilised world in the last few years there has been a very marked reduction in the rate of interest. Well, Sir, I am very glad, for the sake of the people of Canada, that we have had a reduction in the rate of interest; but perhaps I may be permitted to quote to the hon. gentleman some remarks which caught my eye sometime ago, as to the share which the hon. gentleman and other persons similarly situated, on the other side of the House, may have had in this matter. I find that, a long time ago, a gentleman dealing with questions of a somewhat similar character, took occasion to observe as follows:—

"The wheel is now revolving, and we are only the fly on the wheel, we cannot delay it."

The name of the person who made that statement was John A. Macdonald, and it was made on the 21st day of September, 1864, at a certain dinner at Halifax. I cannot for a moment suppose that the John Alexander Macdonald, who is stated to have made that remark, could be the hon. gentleman of the same name who took part in a little incident a few days ago. He was the hon. gentleman's countryman and namesake, no doubt, perhaps a godfather to him. At any rate, whatever he was, he was truly the only and original fly on the wheel. I regret, Sir, that my inadvertency in quoting a statement of the hon. gentleman should have led to a misunderstanding between myself and him and some of his colleagues. I remember some years afterwards quoting this remark of his, and I am now calling attention to the fact that this aforesaid John A. Macdonald, whoever he may be, said that himself and his colleagues were the only original flies on the wheel.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is convicting himself as a plagiarist, because I have always given him credit, when he used that simile, of being original; but we now find that it was stolen, without being credited either.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly, certainly; and with that spirit of justice which has always distinguished me, I now put the laurel crown on the right head, regretting that it is a little balder than it was when the speech from which I am now quoting was made, and therefore more in need of laurel crowns. The truth is that the income of the people of Canada has been considerably reduced. There is no doubt that large classes of people are receiving smaller incomes to-day than they did a few years ago; there is no doubt that the fall in the rate of interest would slightly alleviate that misfortune; but what sort of statesmanship, what sort of policy is this? Here, by a special dispensation of Providence, as one may say, over which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues certainly had no control, by an extraordinary fall in the rate of interest all over the world, our burdens were in a fair way, no thanks to them, however, of being reduced, and the hon. gentleman comes along and absorbs it all, and makes it an excuse for imposing other burdens on the people that there has been a fall in the rate of interest. That has been his argument; and the hon. gentleman did not, so far as I can see, show why he demanded so large a sum. If I am correct in my reading of the statement, he had already the power to borrow \$11,000,000, and he now wants \$25,000,000. That makes

\$36,000,000 in all. He, I presume, intends to apply \$3,000,000 of that to the redemption of debts due.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Anything that falls due of course will be paid out of the \$3,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is about \$1,000,000 of deficit expected, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman. He asks for \$6,000,000 for Public Works, and he has \$5,000,000 floating debt, which, if I understood him correctly, he will pay out of the proceeds of the loan.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And there are about \$4,000,000 of railway subsidies, which may be expected to mature within the next year or two, making in all about \$19,000,000. Well, I would not object to the hon. gentleman taking a reasonable margin, but I must say that between \$19,000,000 and \$36,000,000 there is a very wide gap, and that the House has some fair ground to suppose that there must be some other reason for a demand of this kind than those the hon. gentleman finds it convenient to give. No doubt it is true we have not infrequently allowed large sums of this kind to remain at the disposal of the Government, but not, I think, as large a sum as that which he now proposes, which amounts to about \$17,000,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I will give the hon. gentleman a very good precedent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not examined that subject minutely, and it would require me to go through a lot of details before I could do so, but evidently there is a large gap there. Then there was another point which the hon. gentleman made, and which I fail to understand, although possibly he may be correct in that respect. The hon. gentleman stated, I think, that he required legislative authority to lower the rate of interest on the savings banks deposits.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What clause or what statute contains that provision? I do not at the moment recollect that we did anything more than take power to pay on those deposits a rate of interest not exceeding four per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; it is not less than four per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, if it is not less than four per cent., of course the hon. gentleman is justified in taking legislative authority to reduce the rate. My recollection may be wrong, as I had only time to peruse the hon. gentleman's speech within a few moments, and I was under the impression that we had the power to reduce the rate of our own proper motion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; the clause in the Bill in the Statute requires it to be not less than four per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If that be the case, I have nothing more to say on that point. I only regret I am unable to share in the very roseate view the hon. gentleman gave us, and I will point out to him that the calculation on which he relies will apply with as much force to the mode of capitalising the debt, which I lay before the House, as to that which he lays before the House; and I regret that the hon. gentleman, in his speech, should have made use of calculations of that kind, because I doubt, if they should happen to make their way to the other side of the Atlantic, whether they will receive there that unbounded approbation which, I am given to understand, they received here on the occasion of the hon. gentleman's last speech, at the hands of supporters.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman was not here when I brought this subject to the

notice of the House; and I was so anxious the hon. gentleman should be here that I not only mentioned to him my intention of bringing the matter up the next day, but also indicated to him the line I proposed to take, in order that he might be quite prepared to discuss this question with that financial ability which always distinguishes the hon. gentleman. I must say this, after listening to the very extraordinary calculations he has submitted to the House, that if I have taken liberties with the supporters of the Government in submitting the calculations I did, I think the hon. gentleman will not be in a position to challenge me with taking liberties of that kind after addressing to his supporters the remarkable calculations he has made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are yours, not mine.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is an old adage that figures cannot lie, but I can only say, after listening to the hon. gentleman, that that adage should no longer exist, because if any figures can be said to be of a completely misleading character, they are certainly the figures the hon. gentleman has used. The statement which I have submitted to the House was based upon a careful actuarial calculation. The hon. gentleman, if he has done me the honor of reading my speech, will do me the justice to say that I did not approach this subject, in the slightest degree, from a party standpoint. He will search in vain in any remarks I offered to the House for the slightest suggestion that the action of the Government, or the party with which I have the honor to be connected, had anything to do with bringing about the improved condition of the credit of the country. And if I had not desired to avoid and been careful to avoid raising any party feeling on a question in which we are all equally interested, the question of the credit of the country, I could have claimed for the policy of my right hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald) and his administration a very large share in the financial credit Canada now enjoys. I did not do so; I did not make the slightest reference to what had brought about the change, but simply stated that it is as well known to the hon. gentleman as it is to myself that, fortunately for Canada, our credit has gradually appreciated from 1877 down to the present time. The hon. gentleman is no doubt right in saying that money has become cheaper, and that that has had a very large share in the rate at which we can float loans on the market; but it does not account entirely for the improvement seen in the financial position of Canada, and I will show the hon. gentleman why. The best financial standard in the world, my hon. friend will agree with me, is the credit of England. If there is a country in the world, concerning which there exists no doubt whatever as to any liability that it may incur being paid, that country is England. She stands at the head of all the world in financial credit; and in 1877 the difference between the credit of Canada and the credit of England was $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The Government of England could borrow money at $1\frac{1}{2}$ cheaper than we could, and the hon. gentleman will remember that our credit had then been steadily appreciating. Let us go back 20 years. Take the credit of old Canada, take Nova Scotia or any one of the Provinces of which the Union is composed, and compare it with the credit of Canada to-day, and you will find that steadily, from the date of Confederation, the credit of Canada has appreciated. But at the time we are speaking of, ten years ago, measured by the most undoubted standard of credit in the world, the credit of England, we were $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. below that credit, and we were obliged to pay $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. more than England was obliged to pay for money borrowed. When my hon. predecessor, Sir Leonard Tilley, was here, our credit had appreciated, and instead of our credit being $1\frac{1}{2}$ below, it was only one per cent. below that of England. That appreciation of the credit of Canada has

gone on until to-day, we are in the proud position of knowing that our credit is only a half per cent. below that of England. That is a statement of the most gratifying encouraging character, because it is not a sudden change and has not arisen from any peculiar state of things. I will make comparison with the Australian colonies. My hon. friend knows that, a few years ago, the credit of Canada was a great deal below that of almost all the Australian colonies, to-day it is above that of the highest and best of the Australian colonies. Why? Because the financiers in the great money market of the world, where they make a careful and exhaustive study of the ability of foreign countries to pay, the credit of Canada has steadily improved, until to-day the credit of England is at the outside only a half per cent. better than that of Canada. All I undertook to do was to speak from the standpoint of the financial position of the country and not from any party standpoint, and I pointed out the importance of maintaining our credit, in the interest of every Canadian. I admitted the statement of the hon. gentleman that we had a great increase in the indebtedness of Canada from 1877 to the present time, but I stated that, in connection with that indebtedness the burden upon the people was not so great in reality as nominally it appeared to be. My hon. friend will not dispute that. He will not dispute that, if you incur a debt at a certain rate of interest, and you borrow the money to pay that off at a reduced rate of interest, the actual cost to the people is not as great as it would appear to be. It is true that I stated that our debt, with the exception of something between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000, which was caused by the unfortunate outbreak in the North-West, was represented by assets, but I did not say that those were assets paying interest to the Government, but that they were assets which were conducive to the progress and the prosperity of Canada. That was a perfectly legitimate statement, and my hon. friend will remember also that of those assets \$19,000,000 of cash is deposited in the sinking fund of Canada. Surely that is a good asset. Then, take the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman says very truly that it does not pay the working expenses, much less anything towards the interest on the money invested. I admit that, but I say it is a good asset. In Nova Scotia before the Union with Canada, we borrowed money at 6 per cent. In fact, we had to pay a little more than 6 per cent., because our 6 per cent. bonds would not realise par. That money was borrowed in order to build railways, which never returned a farthing of interest, and you had there no revenue from that investment, but the trade and the business of Nova Scotia was so increased by the increased facilities thus given that the Treasury obtained all the 6 per cent. interest, and we were better off than we were before the debt was incurred, although we got no return from the railways themselves. It is the same in regard to the Intercolonial Railway which, I am sorry to say, for the last year or two, has not been paying even working expenses; but you cannot measure the value of that railway without taking into consideration what it has accomplished for the country, the extent to which it has developed trade and commerce, the extent to which it has developed the business and the industries of the country which it serves, and that is shown by the enormous increase in the gross receipts and in the tonnage and the number of passengers carried. Thus indirectly, that is a good asset. It is the same thing in reference to the canals. They do not pay the interest on the investment directly, as my hon. friend knows; they hardly pay enough to keep them in an efficient state of repair; but they form a channel of communication for Canadian products from Quebec to the head of Lake Superior, and they even have their influence beyond that. They bring the products of the great North-West down to Montreal and Quebec, and so they afford an

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

internal line of communication through Canada, the value of which can hardly be estimated, though they do not pay interest on the amount which has been expended on them. Still, I think that is a good asset. I submitted a detailed statement showing that, measured by the amount of what it would cost us to pay off the debt when we had the opportunity of doing so, the debt of \$227,000,000 was susceptible of a deduction of \$53,000,000. I placed the actuarial calculations before the hon. gentleman, and I am willing, in regard to that matter, to go before a committee of this House and to produce the evidence of the best actuaries in Canada to show that there is not a flaw in that calculation. If the hon. gentleman will accept my challenge, I will let him name his own committee of three persons, and he may be the chairman, and I will be prepared to show that these calculations are correct. I think it was my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who said I had reduced the charge of \$150,000,000 payable in England to \$114,000,000, and that I had forgotten that it was twenty years before we could be relieved from the 4 per cent. interest. My hon. friend was wrong. In reducing that amount, I have had careful actuarial calculations made, by which I charge against the reduction the fact that we have to pay the 4 per cent. for twenty years, and I discount that in the calculation. I understand that the 4 per cent. is to be paid for twenty years, and that it will be that time before we can receive the benefit of the reduction to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., but, if the hon. gentleman will look at the difference between $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., he will see that the reduction from \$150,000,000 to \$114,000,000 would not represent anything like the saving effected. It is after the most careful actuarial calculation that we have found that the net result so reduces this amount, allowing for the twenty years of the 4 per cents. The hon. gentleman has challenged my right to do this—and I admit that he has some justification for doing so—on the ground that it is impossible to say what may occur; that a war might arise in Europe, or other matters might arise to increase the price of money. I admit his right to raise that point, but it is impossible to deal with the future, and I think we must judge the future by the past. If Canada can raise its credit, as it has done, from the first loan which we placed on the London market to the present, step by step, while incurring the enormous expenditure for the great public works we have grappled with; if we have been able to bring our credit so close to the credit of England, which, as the hon. gentleman knows, is the great standard of credit in the world, is it not a fair assumption that we will be able to obtain, on as favorable terms, what we desire in the future? I agree with the hon. gentleman that, if, as he seems to imagine, this was to induce us to branch out into great expenditure on public works, something might be said in opposition to it, but I think the time has come when we should exercise the greatest possible economy, and my object now is to show that we have incurred an amount of indebtedness which is quite sufficient for our resources, and I desire especially to strengthen our credit in the money market of the world. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe there is no place where a financial calculation can be properly estimated better than in London, and I am prepared to stand or fall by the accuracy of the calculations I have made and the manner in which I am convinced they will commend themselves to the men who are best able to test their accuracy. The hon. gentleman says we may have a war. Well, Sir, a war is very likely, but a war would, in all probability, enhance our credit; because the moment there is an European war, the capitalists of Europe, feeling the insecurity of investment which may be affected by that war, would look for such securities as would be afforded by Canada, remote from the scene of action. There is no reason to suppose there will be any war that will affect Canada itself; but a

war, instead of being a disturbing element and threatening our credit, would, in all probability, enhance it, just as it usually enhances the credit of great powers like England, which are supposed not to be susceptible of having their financial condition materially affected by a contingency of that kind. Therefore, I do not regard even a contingency of that kind, which is not at all impossible, as likely materially to affect us. I say that if our credit has steadily improved while we were making these large expenditures, now that they have been made, and that the country has the means of continuous development as a result of them, I think our credit ought to improve as steadily, at all events, as it has done during the period when we were incurring these expenditures. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has said it was very unfortunate I intimated that we did not intend to pay our indebtedness. I did not intimate anything of the kind. I say that the credit of Canada depends upon her ability to maintain that credit and to pay. What I did say, was this: that in making a calculation of this kind, we were warranted in treating it as a loan in perpetuity. When the hon. gentleman borrowed in England four millions sterling, and undertook to pay it in 30 years, he had not the slightest intention of saddling Canada with the load that would have been involved if, at the end of 30 years, she had been obliged to pay off that loan. The hon. gentleman intended to do, as his predecessors had done, and as his successors have been obliged to do—he intended, when the loan matured, to replace it with another loan upon the best terms that he could: and inasmuch as these loans involved a charge of interest necessarily in consequence of the then condition of our credit, of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., there was every reason to suppose that when they fell due, we would replace them with money borrowed, at the worst, at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I think we may fairly take into calculation, in estimating the debt of the country, the burthen that it imposes upon the country. Now, the hon. gentleman has referred to my asking rather a large amount for the loan. Well, I was very sorry, when I was pressed hard yesterday by hon. gentlemen behind him, who did not understand that question at all as well as he understands it, and who have not had the same experience—I was very sorry he was not in his place in the House, because I believed that his presence would at once have relieved me from any pressure respecting the amount of margin that I was taking in asking for borrowing powers to the extent of \$25,000,000, when we had unused borrowing powers to the extent of something like \$11,000,000—I am speaking in round numbers. As I stated to the House, and the hon. gentleman will confirm my statement, the margin of borrowing power does not necessarily imply that you are obliged to put that upon the market; it merely gives the Government power to be used as the public interest may demand, in borrowing such a sum, and at such a time, as may best serve the public interest. I want no better illustration of that principle than the fact that when my hon. friend was Finance Minister of Canada, he obtained authority from this Parliament to borrow \$3,000,000 sterling, and he only borrowed \$4,000,000; he therefore took a margin double the amount that he proposed to put upon the market. I merely give that as an illustration, as a single instance of what has occurred all along. When Sir Leonard Tilley was here, and from time to time, asked borrowing powers from Parliament, he did not at all confine himself to the margin which he was authorised to use.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will excuse me in pointing out that at that time there were distinct liabilities ahead, absorbing all that sum and more.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am speaking of whether at the time you ask borrowing powers, it necessarily follows that you are to use them. I say no. You are to use what

you require, perhaps it is not even what you require, but it is the amount that can be most advantageously placed upon the market at the time. When the hon. gentleman went home he found that it was the wisest course, in the public interest, to float only one-half of what Parliament had authorised him to do, and the \$10,000,000 of additional borrowing powers remained unused at that time. Now, I do not raise the question here, but my hon. friend knows perfectly well that the question of a sinking fund is a very important and interesting question. He knows that while I am not prepared to go into that discussion at the present moment, owing to the peculiar position in which, as I have personally stated to him, that person stands, it is desirable the Government should have a margin to enable them to deal with the question as circumstances may require. I do not think it will be necessary to say more on that point. I may say this, however, that all I said with reference to loans in perpetuity, was for the purpose of explaining that, as that had been the practice, and as, in a new country like Canada, that must necessarily continue to be the practice for a considerable period, I was warranted in treating this question in the same way as Imperial consols are treated. But as for not paying—why, what is the fact this year? We have already paid \$11,654,308 of the public indebtedness, and this very year I shall be paying off \$1,729,409 of our capital indebtedness, and that out of revenue. So my hon. friend and hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, will see that, although I intimated the possibility, I may say, perhaps, the probability of a deficit at the end of the present fiscal year, there would be no deficit, but there would be a handsome surplus if we were not paying off the capital debt. The entire deficit, and much more than the entire deficit, will be covered by the annual payment of capital that we shall pay out of current revenues during the present year. With reference to the reduction of interest in the savings banks, the hon. gentleman knows that I never hesitated to say that I was only too happy when I could receive a suggestion that I could use in the public interest, from gentlemen on the other side of the House. The hon. gentleman knows that I have not often had an opportunity, but I am the more anxious to avail myself of it, when I do have one, in which I think that, by following their example or by adopting their precepts, I can do anything to promote the public interest. Hon. gentlemen have long maintained that we paid too high a rate of interest to depositors in the savings banks. I think my hon. predecessor was quite right, nay, he would not have been justified in paying them any less while it was costing Canada as much to borrow money outside as we have to pay to depositors in the savings banks. I am asking this authority from the House, in order that as we obtain money cheaper, we shall not be obliged, while we give the best security that can be given to the depositors, to pay a higher rate of interest than we are able to obtain money for elsewhere. I think we are bound, in the public interest, to adopt that course. There is no change of policy. We are paying 4 per cent. for money now, and there is a prospect of being able to obtain it on easier terms, and we ought to put ourselves in a position to avail ourselves of that privilege whether we borrow money in this country or in a foreign market.

Resolution concurred in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 133) to authorise the raising, by way of loan, certain sums of money for the public service.

Bill read the first and second times, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Finance Minister was making some time ago a comparison, if I understood him, with the rate of interest in England. The rate in England may be placed at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. now, or it will be as soon as the Goschen conversion scheme is carried out, and the hon. gentleman proposes to give $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. for our Canadian loan, being a difference of $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., instead of $\frac{1}{2}$. The conversion scheme has been in the air for many years, certainly for the last five or six years, that is the turning of the 3's into $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cents, and therefore the 3's have remained stationary. Had this not been the case, they would have gone up just as the American 4's have advanced. When I made my last loan I obtained as good terms as the United States secured, and that is a better comparison even than Australia.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No 132) respecting a certain agreement between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee)

On section 1.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to know from the Government, as we are putting this bill through contrary to precedent and custom, whether they will be prepared to lay on the Table of the House the mortgage, within the next three or four days. The Minister said it was ready and in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's solicitors.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will take the very earliest opportunity of placing a copy of the mortgage on the Table.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can we rely on that being done before the end of next week?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because we should see it before we rise.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have turned over a good deal the remarks made last night by the Minister of Justice, by the First Minister, and also by the Minister of Finance, on the question of the position of the bondholders, the holders of the \$35,000,000 of bonds. It is very much in the public interest that there should be no misconception on the part of the persons who have invested in those bonds, and who stand to us in a totally different relation, as the Minister knows, from the ordinary shareholders. I cannot help feeling that what we are doing in this matter, without the consent of the bondholders, is, so far at all events as regards part of the security, to make the holders of the first mortgage practically the holders of the second mortgage. As the bondholders now stand they are the first mortgagees on everything that the company earns, and so soon as the working expenses are defrayed, the claim of the first mortgagees inures. I can see no way out of the proposition now made but that so far as regards sums which are to be paid by Government for postal or other subsidies, the Government cut out the bondholders to that extent. It may be argued, I know, that the money which is proposed to be obtained will go to increase the general security of the bondholders, as it will be expended on the line. There is something in that as a matter of equity no doubt,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

but neither equity nor law allows you to interfere, without the consent of the original mortgagees, with their security, and I am seriously afraid lest this matter will be taken up and used to the detriment, it may be, of the company, and at all events of the Government of Canada, if it continues to be assumed, as we understood it was last night, that the Government have the right to retain as a set-off or in any other way the postal earnings and the earnings which would accrue from the transport of troops and other purposes. As to the law in the matter I am not in a position to discuss that question; but I think the plain common sense of the case is, that the rights of the first mortgagees are more or less interfered with by what is proposed to be done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The position taken by the Minister of Justice last night was, that he did not desire in any way to affect the rights of the bondholders. He expressed his opinion as a rule of law, that there was not any right or security held by those bondholders that prevented the Government in case the Canadian Pacific Railway owed the Government, of setting off that claim by any counter claim that the railway might have over postal or other earnings. That is either law or it is not law. The Minister of Justice has expressed, without doubt, his opinion that that is the right which the Government has, and if the Government has such a right by law there is no danger to the bondholders. If the Minister of Justice is wrong in his opinion that can be easily ascertained. The Government certainly do not desire in any way to affect the security held by those bondholders, and that is the illustration given by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, that the revenues must mean what is coming to the bondholders after an adjustment of the debit and credit accounts. Whether it is with the Canadian Pacific Railway or another railway, or any other creditor, under the ordinary principle of set off, one can be set off against the other and the balance is the revenue which belongs to the bondholders. That, I think, is the position. I do not think, however, that the question will have any practical bearing, for I am quite satisfied beyond a doubt that the Canadian Pacific Railway will meet the interest. They cannot afford not to pay the interest. They cannot afford to be in default anyway whatever, and we have immense resources which shall be increasing from year to year. There is, I was going to say, no possibility of any failure, the land now will be selling much more rapidly than it has hitherto. The proceeds of the purchase money will be lodged with the Government, and the Government is obliged to pay $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on such deposits, and that $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. will be applied to the payment of the interest under guarantee. First there is a general claim against the Canadian Pacific Railway for the guarantee, then there is the claim which the Government will have to have a set off for, in case the Canadian Pacific Railway should owe the Government anything on that guarantee, and, lastly, there is the interest—the annually increasing interest—on the sales as they are made, all of which three sources of revenue will, beyond a doubt, remove any chance of the Government being responsible for any portion of the guarantee, in case of the possible contingency of a failure to meet the guarantee.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Have any of the existing bondholders made any representation to the Government about this?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. None at all.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must say that I quite agree with the hon. the Premier in one thing, that I do not think from the reasons he has given in the increasing population of the country, the increasing value of the lands, and the increasing business of the road, that the question is likely to arise as a practical question, creating a doubt of the payment of

interest. When the hon. gentleman speaks with so much confidence in relation to that matter it appears to me it would have been wiser for the Government, if they had settled that question the other way and not to have raised doubts in the minds of the bondholders, that any question can possibly arise affecting the security which they firmly believe they possess. I have seen some of these gentlemen holding securities and they have expressed very grave doubts about whether it is just to them that what they have believed to have been mortgaged to them as security on that road, should at the option of the Government be taken from them, and used in the way of paying any liabilities that may be incurred towards the Government of the country in connection with the measure now before the House. While I believe that I do not think this is likely to arise, yet I know there is this anxiety in the mind of some of the bondholders. I venture to say the general class of bondholders have not had an opportunity of considering this question, and that 99 out of 100 of them do not know that such question has been raised here, because a large number of bondholders are in England, and it is there that any sensitive feeling in relation to this matter would have a detrimental effect on the securities of our country. The hon. the Minister of Justice having given his opinion to that effect, and having stated last night the constructions put upon their rights in relation to that matter, I made a synopsis from what I understood from the very ambiguous discussion which took place and to which the hon. the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance also assented; that the Government claim, what they now stated they do claim, their right to exercise the power of retaining those mail subsidies and paying any deficiency of interest. Such an opinion as that going abroad in England, that great centre of commerce and finance of which the Minister of Finance speaks so highly, cannot have otherwise than a detrimental effect. I regret that the Government could not have seen their way to declare, that they did not propose retaining any portion of those subsidies, and which subsidies have been mortgaged and pledged, in my opinion, at least, for the former securities that were issued. The member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) has asked the question, whether or not any of the bondholders have made a protest to the Government in relation to this matter. I can quite understand that the bondholders have not made that protest because they have not had time to consider it, or, indeed, they may not have even heard of this Bill. Indeed there is a question of doubt as to the construction of some of those resolutions, which has given occasion to an immense amount of discussion in this House. It can scarcely be expected in so short a time after those resolutions were submitted, that the bondholders, particularly those in England, could have had time to make remonstrances or protests against what they believed to be depriving them of the security they think they have the right to possess. I know that some of the bondholders in this country very seriously object to any such construction being placed upon the security which they claim they possess. I trust it will not affect our securities abroad, because if the Minister of Justice should happen to be wrong in the law, it would practically be regarded as confiscation of security which those gentlemen rely on to secure the payment of both principal and interest.

Mr. LAURIER. I am disposed to agree in a large measure with what has been said by the Prime Minister. I am fully confident, as the company now exists, that all liabilities of the company will be honorably discharged. The hon. gentleman implied that the present strength of the company was the best guarantee to the bondholders. No doubt the company so far have discharged their liabilities in a practical manner, and the present managers and officers of the company are men who prove themselves to be able,

and honorable at the same time. And their personal honor and ability is certainly quite a guarantee to all their creditors, prospective and existing. But fifty years is a long period, and we do not know what will be the standing of the company after a certain number of years. If the company were to remain such as it is now, I confess I would share altogether in what has been said by the hon. gentleman; but we must provide for the possibility of changes, or of mistakes being made, and if they should not be made, then would arise the very contingency that we discussed last evening, what creditors, whether the Government or the shareholders, would have the first claim. It seems to me a pity that we cannot reach a conclusion on that point. Whatever may be the technical right of the Government, I think that for the honor and credit of the country we should adopt a broad construction, and say that, at all events, the bondholders must have advanced their money under the belief that all the tolls of the company were mortgaged to them in satisfaction of the moneys they had advanced, and I do not see that we can adopt any other construction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Unless the Government have a clear right at law, not a mere technical right, to make this set off, of course they will not do it; but if they have a clear right at law, beyond a doubt the Government have no right to surrender their claim without coming to Parliament and getting the consent of Parliament. If I remember aright the words in the mortgage are, "all the tolls and revenues." These words are very wide. They must mean the net tolls, the net revenues. If all the revenues are to be secured they must be handed over irrespective of the working expenses. The word revenues cannot mean the gross revenues; it must mean the net revenues. In any adjustment of accounts between the Government and the company, that must be borne in mind.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The Government may have a strict legal right, but there is an equitable right to be considered. It is true it is the net revenues that are pledged; but would the Government have a right in equity, after having authorised the company to pledge those net revenues, to come in and claim them as against a subsequent debt?

Mr. EDGAR. The Government, if they undertake to retain these revenues, are representing Parliament of course; and Parliament has pledged itself in language as strong as it could use, that the whole of these moneys, including all the postal subsidies that go to the company, are net revenues going to bondholders. The Government are obliged by the action of Parliament, and are not in the same position as an ordinary creditor negotiating with an ordinary debtor. However, we are discussing this matter from a legal point of view, and in an indefinite sort of way. What we would like to know, I think, is what view the Canadian Pacific Railway Company take of this question. We have heard the view of the hon. Minister of Justice, and I see sitting beside him an hon. gentleman who is on the board of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and, perhaps, he could tell us what the view of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on this question is. I appeal to him whether the hon. Minister of Railways was correct when he reported to the Government in these words:

"The company are willing that all postal subsidies and other moneys payable to them by the Government of Canada may be set off against any interest which the Government of Canada may be called on to pay, and these moneys will, at no remote period, be sufficient of themselves to cover the interest guaranteed."

Was the Minister of Railways correct when he made that report to the Government? If he was correct, have the company changed their mind? Are the company not willing to put it in that shape? We have had no clear statement as to what is the opinion of the Canadian Pacific

Railway Company on that point, and, perhaps, the hon. gentleman sitting beside the hon. Minister of Justice can tell us.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. Premier stated that the Government had certain legal rights, and if the construction put upon those legal rights by the hon. Minister of Justice was right, they would not be warranted in making any arrangement different from those legal rights. But, Sir, we are now practically making an agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Parliament of the country; and as this question has arisen, it seems to me that it is the duty of the Government to deal with it, and to deal with it now. The right hon. Premier stated that this could not mean the gross receipts of the road, which I admit, but that it must mean the net receipts. Now, what are the net receipts of the road? Are the earnings of \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 which come from passengers and freight, and the postal subsidies, to be considered as net earnings after the gross working expenses are paid? Can the Government deduct a sum from those net earnings, and then say that what remains are the net earnings. Because that is the reasoning of the right hon. gentleman, and it does appear to me that his reasoning is fallacious. It is this Parliament which has the right to say whether or not the Government shall be permitted to enforce the claim they are setting up by this arrangement. When a doubt exists as to the construction which the Government may put on an arrangement entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is the duty of Parliament to explain that, so as to leave no room for doubt. Why do the Government desire to impair the securities not of the Canadian Pacific Railway alone but of the whole country, by leaving a doubt,—and that there is a doubt is evident from the various opinions expressed in this House, and I know that doubt exists in the minds of the bondholders of the company,—and by permitting a measure of this kind to pass without removing that doubt, great injury may be done to the credit of the country? Why should they attempt to force the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the wall by lessening the character of this security? I am not here speaking for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but for the credit of Canada, and I think that the Government should at once announce to this House that they do not propose to hold any portion of those postal subsidies, which have already been hypothecated to the people who advanced \$35,000,000 on the earnings of the road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It appears to me that the hon. member for Northumberland has not exactly appreciated the position of the question.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think I have.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If we were proposing by this Bill to legislate that we should take these postal subsidies, his argument would have force. But we are not. We are leaving the law just as it is. Now, the rights of the original bondholders are based upon an Act of this Parliament, and as we are not proposing to touch that matter by legislation at all, we are doing nothing that can impair in the slightest degree any legal right they possess. There is therefore no necessity, as my right hon. friend has said, for raising this question at all. If, under the charter which Parliament gave to those bondholders, they have not a legal right, it is not in the power of the Government to give up to them or to anybody else what belongs to Canada. It would require an Act of Parliament to do that. We are leaving the law as it stands on the Statute-book and are not proposing to impair a jot or tittle of bondholders' rights by any legislation. I put out of sight the fact that the whole \$15,000,000 is going to inure to the direct advantage of the bondholders; I put out of sight the fact that \$35,000,000 upon that property is a very small sum, and that the bond-

Mr. EDGAR.

holders have the most ample security for receiving, under the mortgage which has been made an Act of Parliament, the full return of their interest from year to year. But we are not proposing to touch the matter by legislation. Supposing the Minister of Justice be wrong or right in any contention he may make, we have not the power to touch one jot or tittle of any legal right the bondholders may enjoy. Were we proposing to enact that we could do this, the question might fairly arise whether Parliament ought to do that, and we should then settle what the legal rights of the bondholders are. But we are not proposing to alter the law in the slightest degree, or to impair in the slightest degree the securities we have given the bondholders by Act of Parliament.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman does not quite comprehend the argument I have made, and in place of my failing to understand, it is he who fails to comprehend the position. I am quite sensible that we are not proposing by this Bill to alter any existing legislation, but, by a certain ambiguous expression in those resolutions—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not in the resolutions.

Mr. MITCHELL. In the Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not even in the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, in the correspondence connected with it, in the report to council of the Minister of Railways.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is matter of opinion.

Mr. MITCHELL. And in the fact that the Government have been asked distinctly to state whether they claim the right to appropriate these postal subsidies, which right they practically admit they do claim. That being the case and the postal subsidy having been, according to the opinion of the bondholders and the general opinion of this country, and I believe the opinion of the legislature, hypothecated to the bondholders of that \$35,000,000, the course of the Government raises the doubt whether these subsidies will be affected by this legislation or not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We did not touch the question.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman says they did not touch the security. Well, he has the opportunity, whilst doubts are being raised on both sides, of settling those doubts by declaring, or, if necessary, putting it in the Bill, that no portion of these postal securities will be claimed by the Government for the payment of interest. That is what ought to be done, and that is what I have been urging the Government to do. The bondholders understand that the postal subsidies are hypothecated to them as security for their bonds, and if they find that by legislation we have impugned the character of that security—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have not touched it.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has stated through his officers that the construction he puts upon it is that the postal subsidies are open to be taken by the Government to make up a deficiency of interest, and if that does not mean impugning the character of that security, then I do not understand anything about it. I thought it was my duty to lay this point before the hon. gentleman in view of the doubts which have been expressed on all sides, and certainly by every hon. gentleman who has spoken on this side.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that the object of the Government should be not to do anything that would interfere with the credit of the country or affect the character of their bonds; and, therefore, if any question arises at all on this point, it should be dealt with specifically. It strikes me that the Act by which we have declared that those tolls and revenues, all rents and profits, which practically means deducting net working expenses, shall be applied for the purposes of those bonds, is practi-

cally an agreement on the part of this Government that in any subsequent arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway they will leave that intact; and, therefore, if the Government have a legal right to set against that, and I do not say they have not, they should not exercise it, because to do so would be clearly acting against equity and good faith.

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to the first clause a very important question arises. The clause reads:

"The agreement set forth in the schedule is hereby approved and ratified, and the Government is hereby authorised to perform and carry out the conditions thereof according to the terms thereof."

I do not suppose the Government intend by that language to enact Private Bill legislation for the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is not connected with this transaction between the Government and the railway. As I understand, it is only intended to ratify the terms of the resolutions which were passed at the last Session. It appears to do more than that, because it does not ratify the resolutions simply but it ratifies an agreement which was signed by the Government and the railway, and that agreement contains a good many more terms than the resolutions which we passed at the last session, and some of those terms relate, as far as I can understand, entirely to some domestic matters of legislation between the railway company and leased lines, or at least to matters which should be the subject of Private Bill legislation in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company just as to any other railway company, and of which no notice has been given according to the rules of the House. I would ask the Minister of Public Works, who is chairman of the Railway Committee, whether he thinks that we can allow Private Bill legislation to go through in favor of any railway in this way. Clause 11 of this agreement is of that character entirely, and it says:

"Whenever a railway company which has leased its line to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for more than sixty years has power by law to make any arrangement concerning its line, or any branch thereof, with another company, then the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall, during the currency of the lease, have power to make the same arrangement, and to do whatever is necessary to carry it out."

Now, what under the sun can that have to do with the guarantee of these bonds? I am not sure that the language of this first section would or would not make that law. It says that the agreement shall—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do you see any objection to putting that in?

Mr. EDGAR. I think it requires some explanation. We do not know what these leased lines are, or what their powers are. In Private Bill legislation, notice would have to be given for this, but here is an attempt to put in Private Bill legislation without any notice and without any explanation. If the members of the Government can explain what the powers of these leased lines are, and what object is to be attained by conferring these powers on the Canadian Pacific Railway, then we would know what we were doing?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the hon. member is mistaken in supposing that this is Private Bill legislation. It is part of the agreement under which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has given up the monopoly clause. One of the considerations is that they shall have this power in regard to the leased lines, and that is a power which nearly every railway company has, and it was contained in the Bill of 1880. I may say that I propose to move that this section 11 shall be made a clause of the Bill.

On section 7,

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to that proposed new clause, reserving the remedy of the holder of the outstanding land grant bonds, can the Government say at what period

those bonds mature for the principal, and at what rates of interest?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think they were 5 per cent. bonds, and twenty years.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE MONTREAL HARBOR.

Resolution reported from Committee of Whole on the subject of the release and discharge of certain liabilities of the Harbor Commission of Montreal was received, read the second time and concurred in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER, introduced Bill (No. 134) to make further provision respecting the construction of the Ship Channel between Montreal and Quebec.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second times and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand, from this time out, we become responsible for keeping this channel in order?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The matter may have been stated, but, unfortunately, I was not present. What is the annual or possible charge that may be incurred thereby?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The question was put the other day and I had not the answer at the moment before me, so I telegraphed to Mr. Kennedy, chief engineer of the Harbor Trust of Montreal, and his answer, which is dated the 9th inst., is as follows:—

"Absolutely no cost for maintenance except at one small place at Upper Light Ship, Lake St. Peter, and another near Champlain Village where the sand filling in requires insignificant cost to remove every two or three years. Experience of the past shows that as a whole the channel does not fill up, that cost of maintenance is practically nothing."

Mr. MITCHELL. That pretty much agrees with the statement I made, and what my experience taught me was likely to result.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). Why do the Government take over the appliances at an enormous cost if they will not require them hereafter?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They were bought with money advanced to the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal, and as we are now assuming the debt, and this represents a portion of the debt, they must be taken over by the Government; but when the works are completed, probably within a year, we will be in a position to dispose of so much of the plant as may not be required either at that work or other works.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). The hon. gentleman expects to realise a large amount from the sale?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The plant cost about \$600,000; I suppose if we realise one-third the cost, we shall be very fortunate.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

GRAVING DOCK AT LEVIS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved second reading of resolution on the subject of the discharge of certain liabilities of the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec in connection with the graving dock at Lévis, and the assuming of the same as a public work of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The proposal under this resolution is a somewhat different one from that respecting the

assumption of the Montreal and Lake St. Peter debt. We were able to agree with the Government that the assumption of the debt for deepening Lake St. Peter might fairly be regarded in the nature of a work in the general interests of the Dominion, because it was intended to promote the navigation of the St. Lawrence and to enable vessels of great draft of water to come to Montreal to carry away the products of the west. In this case it is a matter of a local nature, and according to my judgment it cannot be treated in the same way. The first proposal calls upon us to assume the cost of the construction of the dry dock at the port of Quebec and to maintain it in future as a public work. With respect to this proposal there is this to say: there are other works of a similar character in the Dominion which the Government should have treated in the same way as they propose to treat the Quebec dock under the present resolution. A few years ago there was an agitation in Halifax for the construction of a dry dock, and we had several interviews with the Minister of Finance on the subject. The hon. gentleman stated to the committee, of which I happened to be a member, that so far as his own opinion went the dock of Quebec should be assumed as a public work by the Dominion, the same should be done in regard to Victoria dock, and the Halifax dock should also be constructed as a public work in the same manner and operated by the Dominion. The hon. gentleman was, of course, careful to say that that was only his opinion and he did not commit the Government to that policy; but he led us to hope that from the influence he possessed with the Government, of which he is such a prominent member, any opinion expressed by him would be favorably entertained. As time passed on the views of the hon. gentleman seemed not to find favor with his colleagues and we were led to believe that it would be impossible to carry out that policy. We then changed our mode of approaching the question and communicated with the Government to ascertain whether they would not advance us the money on same terms and conditions as they had advanced money to the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec for the construction of that dock. That appeared to be a reasonable proposition, that if the Government had seen their way to advance money to Harbor Commissioners for the construction of that dock and the other tidal dock, the citizens of Halifax had a fair right to expect that the Government would give them the benefit of their credit and grant the amount for the construction of a dry dock in Halifax. However, after some negotiation and correspondence the Government, I am sorry to say, refused to advance the money in that way as had been done in the case of the Harbor Commissioners in Quebec. We, therefore, were obliged to adopt other measures to enable us to carry on the construction of that dock, and the city of Halifax guaranteed \$10,000 a year for 20 years, the Government of the Dominion at the same time agreeing to guarantee an equal amount. My contention is this: that if the Government are assuming this dock as a public work and relieving the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec of all responsibility in future in connection with that undertaking, they should now assume the \$10,000 which the city of Halifax has undertaken to guarantee for 20 years in order to secure the construction of the dry dock there. That work is going on at the present moment; it is being constructed by an English Company under the guarantee of \$10,000 from the Imperial Government, as well as \$10,000 each from the Dominion Government and the city of Halifax, and although some delays have occurred, the work, I believe, is now fairly under way and in the course of another year no doubt will be successfully completed. Still there remains a charge on the revenues of the city of Halifax for the next 20 years of \$10,000 per annum, amounting to the large sum of \$200,000, which I think, according to the policy adopted by the Government here in

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

regard to this measure, the Government are bound to assume. They are bound to assume that sum and relieve the citizens of Halifax from this charge that the citizens have undertaken in order to obtain a dock of the same kind as has been built at Quebec. I press that point strongly on the Government, and I think that the Government will see the equity of that claim. I think the Government must see that if we are going to make one a public work in the interest of the Dominion, that they should not expect that the city of Halifax would be called upon to assess themselves for this \$200,000 for the completion of the work of a similar nature there. The next proposal under this arrangement is that the Government are to relieve the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec of \$493,000 of the money which they have expended out of the money advanced by the Dominion for the tidal docks at Quebec. This, remember, with the \$204,450 of accrued interest makes \$1,536,160 which we are called upon by those resolutions to assume on behalf of the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec. That is not the worst view of the case. The hon. gentleman told us the other night that up to the present moment there has been spent on the tidal docks in Quebec \$3,241,000. He also informed the House that there was remaining to be spent out of grants, \$734,000, making a total of \$3,975,000. Out of this sum, we assume, by the resolution now before the House, \$493,000, leaving a balance of \$3,482,000 which will be at the debit of the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec, when this balance is expended. This is the gravest part of the whole position, because looking at the revenue of the Harbor of Quebec, and looking at what has been done in the past with regard to it, we have every reason to apprehend that we shall never derive one cent of interest for that \$3,500,000 of advances which we have made them. There appears no reasonable probability that the tidal dock, and the Harbor of Quebec, will ever enable the Harbor Commissioners to make any payment on account of this three and a half millions which still remains at their debit. I have been told by members from Quebec, and it is a matter generally known, that that expenditure going on in the Harbor of Quebec at the tidal dock has been a gross and absolute waste of the public money. That it has been expended there without reference to the value of the work itself, that it has been made largely in the interest of political parties, that the money has been wasted, that properties have been acquired for which there was no necessity, that contracts have been given out in an improper manner, and, indeed, I am given to understand that more serious charges than that were made by a gentleman holding a very high official position in Quebec, and it was intimated to him a short time after, that if he did not retract such a statement he would leave himself open to criminal accusation. The hon. gentleman never withdrew that statement, and the people connected with the expenditure of that money never ventured to carry the case any further. It would show that my information is correct, that the opinion is generally entertained, as to the misappropriation and squandering of the public money at Quebec, as it has been notorious all over the country, and it is known to hon. members of this House. Those two sums of money are very large when they are put together, and call upon us to hesitate before we assume such a responsibility or commit ourselves. I have no objection whatever to the Province, or the people of Quebec, having their own share of the public expenditure of this country, but I think it has been shown in this House, on previous occasions, that there have been grants made to the people of the Province of Quebec, under pressure, in order to obtain the passage of measures through this House in another direction, which have not been accorded to the people of the other Provinces either east or west. I remember, not many years ago, when the resolutions were before this House with respect to the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way, that it was well understood they could only be secured by large concessions to the Province of Quebec. I remember well, Sir, how for days and weeks "No. 8" held the fort against the Government. We know well, Sir, that it was only by these large concessions which were made at that time to the Province of Quebec, that the measures which the Government had before the House respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway were ultimately agreed to. We remember that on that occasion a resolution was moved by the hon. the leader of the Opposition of that day, calling upon this House to express the opinion that large sums of money should not be voted to the Province of Quebec, without a similar appropriation, under similar circumstances, for the other Provinces of the Dominion, and we remember how that resolution was voted down by hon. gentlemen supporting the Government of that day then also led by the gentleman who now leads the Government in this House. We know well also that the present position of affairs, is somewhat analogous to the position at the date to which I refer. We have pretty good information to lead us to the conclusion, that had it not been that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were coming to this House for further favors, in the nature of the guarantee which it has just passed this House, that it is very probable the Lake St. Peter debt would not be assumed, and the vote which we are now called upon to ratify would not have been before the House to-day. I know, Sir, that it was an arrangement in that way, by which support from one side could be given to secure guarantees or benefits for the other part of this Dominion. And I think there is a general impression throughout this House and the country that that arrangement has gone about far enough. Let us go back a little and trace the history of these earlier transactions. In 1884, when it was necessary to secure the adhesion of the Quebec members to the vote which was at that time before the House, we remember that this House was called on to assume obligations amounting to \$2,394,000. Of this amount \$954,000 was voted for the 159 miles of railway from Quebec to Montreal, forming a connecting link between the Atlantic and the Pacific, as it was stated, and \$1,440,000 for that portion of the road between Montreal and Ottawa, a distance of 120 miles. Then, \$211,000 was voted for the construction of a line from Beauce Junction to the international boundary line; and, in addition, \$960,000 was voted for the extension of the Pacific Railway from its terminus at St. Martin's Junction near Montreal to the harbor at Quebec; and although the whole of that money was not appropriated under the terms of the arrangement, the larger portion of it was. Then, we had a further sum voted, and the larger portion of it spent in the Province of Quebec for a line of railway connecting the cities of Montreal and Quebec with the Harbor of Halifax, called the Short Line Railway; and I believe it is well known that the money that was not spent in Maine was spent in the Province of Quebec. Well, Sir, in 1885 we had a further sum of \$1,500,000 appropriated for the purchase of the North Shore line running between Montreal and Quebec. All these different items make up a very large amount; and while I do not pretend to have any feeling of jealousy towards the people of the Province of Quebec, I think they can hardly come to this House year after year to receive such large grants out of the revenue without themselves affirming the principle that the other Provinces of the Dominion are at least entitled to a *pro rata* appropriation for public works. I think that is a principle that should be admitted and will be admitted by every hon. member of this House. Now, taking those various amounts together, the amounts voted in 1884 for the Pope Line, so-called, and the amount voted in 1885 for the North Shore line, and the amounts now called for by the resolutions before the House, they make up about \$12,000,000 which the Province of Quebec in one form or

another has received since 1884 from this Legislature. Under these circumstances, I think that the discussion which took place here in 1884 may be fairly repeated. At that time the hon. Mr. Blake referring to the policy of the Administration, said:

"They are adopting a very great change in policy; each step, in my opinion, having a tendency against the spirit of our Constitution. Now, a third proposal is made, namely, that there should be payment to a Province in respect of past expenditure on certain of its provincial railways. I maintain that this is a principle now brought forward for the first time, and which, if it is to be applied at all, must have an application more extensive than that proposed to be given to it. I maintain it is not just to apply that principle to one Province and not to the other Provinces. I maintain that the claims and rights of the other Provinces ought to be recognised when this new policy is inaugurated. We know what the truth is in this matter. We know perfectly well, it is quite notorious to us, that the finances of the Province of Quebec are in a distressed condition. The statement has been made by both parties in the Province, by successive First Ministers and successive Treasurers, and it is evidenced in the very memorial which is upon the Table, as it has been evidenced by prior memorials, that further assistance is needed in order to establish equilibrium in the finances of that Province."

Then he goes on to show how the various Provinces have been brought to this condition of affairs, the Province of Quebec probably, by a larger expenditure proportionately than any of the other Provinces. He says:

"It is clear that the Province of Quebec at present, on the statement of its provincial officers, a statement made with authority, vouched upon the statement of the provincial politicians on both sides, is in a condition which demands the serious consideration of the Confederation. But she is not alone in that condition. You will find statements made from the Province of Nova Scotia, for example, and those who have endeavored to analyse, I know with difficulty, with very great aptitude to err for want of information, those who have attempted to analyse the expenditures of that Province will, I think, find that there has not been a very great deal to complain of in the way of extravagance. At least that was the result of such cursory investigation as from time to time I have been able to make into the expenditures of that Province, and I am not singling out any Government from another—there has been alternation of Governments—I do not find that there has been much extravagance, or that the expenditures have been in excess, to a large amount, if at all, of the demands of that Province."

He then cites the position in Nova Scotia, and says:

"I do not suppose my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec will ask more, or those sitting on the other side, though they might view my proposition differently from what I view it, I do not think they will dissent from the spirit in which I now address myself to them, namely, that it is fair and reasonable, under these circumstances, when a new policy of this kind is being proposed, to consider what its real basis is, to consider what the real condition of the other Provinces is, relatively to that basis and otherwise, and see whether what is being proposed as it stands, and without effecting proper remedies for the application generally of the new principle you propose, can be called just. I say, Sir, that for my part I should desire, and it is one of the things which is most important for us to consider, next to the constitutional question—I should desire that we should address ourselves very early and very earnestly to the solution of the question, by the adoption of some plan whereby once for all the question of the provincial subsidies should be placed on a permanent and lasting basis."

He went on further to argue in that same direction; and to show that while the Province of Quebec was undoubtedly in an embarrassed position, owing to its large expenditure on public works, the other Provinces of the Dominion were equally straitened in their financial resources. And he wound a long and very able statement of the whole case by moving a resolution to the following effect:—

"But this House feels bound to express the opinion that Canada, when (as proposed by the said resolution) recouping of the Provinces for part of the past local expenditure on railways, should have regard to the past local expenditure in other Provinces on railways, almost all of which have been declared to be for the general advantage of Canada; and this House regrets that the Government, while proposing a measure of relief to one Province, has not taken steps with a view to a fair and proportionate measure of relief, in respect of local expenditure, in the other Provinces."

The resolution was of course voted down because the Government then as now, had a large majority in the House, and the resolution of my hon. friend did not meet their approval. In order to secure the passage of the Act granting a large amount of money to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Government had to secure the adhesion of Quebec influence; they had to make concessions to the Province of

Quebec, which concessions have been continued up to the present moment, and the last act in the farce is about being played here. We are going now to assume this large expenditure on behalf of Quebec, while the other Provinces of the Dominion have not their just proportion, so far as regards the expenditures which they have made in the public interest. Look at these amounts, which aggregate about \$12,000,000, that have been expended, and apply to that expenditure our proportion in the Province of Nova Scotia. We have public works there, which are as much in the interest of the Dominion at large as those in the city of Quebec, and those railways which run along the St. Lawrence, or those other lines which were subsidised by the Government this year. I have referred to the dry dock. Can any hon. gentleman deny the proposition that the Government ought to assume the amount which the city of Halifax were compelled to guarantee for the construction of a dry dock? Is there any reason why the Government should build a dry dock at British Columbia and assume the debt for the construction of the dry dock and its future management in the city of Quebec, and not relieve Halifax from this obligation of \$10,000 for twenty years, which they have been called on to assume. It was only when the Government refused to place them in the position in which they placed the city of Quebec, it was only when the Government refused to make it a public work, that the citizens of Halifax undertook this obligation, which they had every reason to believe from their intercourse with the hon. the Minister of Finance, the Government would assume. The Government, however, subsequently refused to lend them the money on the same terms as those granted to the Harbor Commissioners of the city of Quebec, and the citizens of Halifax were called on to assess themselves \$10,000 a year for twenty years to obtain this dry dock. I call on the Government to assume that amount. They have as good a right to assume it as they had to assume the debts in the Province of Quebec. Then there are other public works in Nova Scotia. There was a railway built from the deep water terminus at Halifax to Richmond across to Dartmouth, which was the subject of negotiation for a long time, and was finally built when the municipality agreed to guarantee 4 per cent. on \$100,000 a year for twenty years, to enable that line to be constructed. That line has been constructed and in operation for a couple of years, and the interest is steadily growing. I notice lately that the Government have made a demand on the municipality of Dartmouth for \$8,000 for the two years interest, arising under the guarantee for the construction of that line. I ask the Government if this House is to be called on year after year to assume these railways in the Province of Quebec, and all these public works to the extent of \$12,000,000 a year, is there any ground of fair comparison, which will justify the Government asking the municipality of Dartmouth to bear the burden of \$4,000 per year for building a road which is part of the Intercolonial Railway? I think this must have escaped the hon. gentleman's attention when he brought down these resolutions to relieve the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal, and the city of Quebec from such a large expense, or he never would have allowed his own Province to have been put in such an unenviable position; and he would never have allowed the inhabitants of that part of the country I represent to be called on to pay for railway advantages, although the railway in question is part of the Intercolonial Railway system. I can understand that in other Provinces of the Dominion equally strong claims may be made, and I have no doubt we will hear their views before this debate closes. They will have my hearty sympathy in securing a fair proportion, in proportion to the expenditure which has been made under such peculiar and exceptional circumstances. Then again, a few years ago, we required in the city of Halifax a small siding from the Intercolonial Railway, to the cotton factory

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

at Halifax. It is part of the system of the Government to increase traffic from the coal mines at Pictou, and I thought it would be a great advantage to the Intercolonial Railway to have this additional accommodation whereby they could have their coal cars in rear of the city. Here again the Government called upon the people of Halifax, and they had to pay \$9,000 to extend the Intercolonial Railway in this direction. Again, we have very large demands upon us in various parts of the Province for aid to public works which are equally important as those which have received the assistance of this Parliament in the Province of Quebec. A road has been chartered called the Hants Central Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would it not be better to reserve that speech until the railway propositions come before the House?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I prefer making my statement now. We have a road called the Hants Central Railway, running from Truro to Windsor through a fine agricultural section of Nova Scotia. The company required a subsidy of \$200,000 or \$250,000 to pay for a bridge across the Shubenacadie River. I cannot understand why the Government refuse to pay the amount in order to bridge that river under the circumstances, when every little railway in the Province of Quebec receives immediate attention and obtains a large grant. This road would connect the Intercolonial Railway with the western part of the Province, would increase the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, and would be of great advantage to the people of Nova Scotia. Then, again, we have a road running from Musquodoboit to Pictou, which the Minister of Finance in his election campaign, or in interviews with his friends in the city of Halifax, promised to grant a subsidy to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This is the first time that —

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have said so again and again.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman asked me before where he made that statement in a public speech, and I replied that I was not aware that he did so, because the statement was made in interviews, and I venture to say that the hon. gentleman will not deny that, to gentlemen in Halifax belonging to his own political side, he promised that subsidy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say most emphatically that there is not a word of truth in the statement. I say that I never promised a subsidy to the road, but I said to the gentlemen who saw me that I would state their case, as they presented it to me, to the Privy Council, but that I stated that a subsidy would be granted is absolutely untrue.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman's answer in the negative will suit me as well as his answer in the affirmative, because I know that the friends of the hon. gentleman represented that they had his assurance that the road would be built, and they are men who generally have regard for their own utterances and their statements. They are business men and prominent men in the Province; and these men have over and over again, to my knowledge, stated that they had the promise from the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not one of them will make that statement in my presence.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). At all events, they made it in the hon. gentleman's absence, and that is a matter which the hon. gentleman will have to settle with his friends. The statement was made on a very important occasion when the hon. gentleman did us the honor of paying a visit to Halifax. Then, we have another road, which is called the Nictaux and Atlantic road, which is not constructed for lack

of the subsidy which was promised by this Government, but which, because the county of Lunenburg returned an opposition member, has been refused up to this moment. The Minister of Railways—and I regret that he is not here now—wrote a letter to the member for Lunenburg at that time, stating that the Government would bring in a measure at the next Session proposing to subsidise that road; and as, I suppose, the then member for Lunenburg had experience of the value of the promises of the Minister of Railways and of the Government, he was not prepared to receive that promise alone, but he got a letter from him and was not even content by having that letter from the Minister of Railways, but he obtained the endorsement of the First Minister to that effect. That letter was made use of by the hon. gentleman who represented Lunenburg at that time, but, in consequence of the county having returned a member to oppose the present Administration, the Government granted only a small sum, about half the amount that was required and had been promised, and they have refused to go on with the work, and it is lying over at the present time. I say that is a work in the interest of the country, that it is a work which, if Nova Scotia had her fair share of the appropriations which are passed by this House, as the Province of Quebec has, would not compel that Province to come to the Government year after year for assistance, but would enable it to carry on its works without further assistance. Then there is another road which runs from Annapolis to Liverpool and Shelburne. It is about 100 miles long, and for the construction of that road we would require about \$320,000. If we had our share of that appropriation, we should be able to construct that road, and so provide communication with the western part of Nova Scotia, if we did not find that the fair share which we should have is being absorbed in other parts of the Dominion. That road would open up a fine section of the Province, and would give the people on the Atlantic coast the facility to get connection by rail with the Intercolonial Railway, whereas at present they have only connection by water. That is a road of the greatest importance to the Province. There is another road, the Inverness and Richmond Railway, which is connected with the Cape Breton Railway, and would develop a fine part of the Island of Cape Breton, a very valuable agricultural district, which would be connected in that way with the main line. I mention this to show that, if we had our fair share of the distribution of the revenues of the country we should be able to construct all these roads, and our Province would receive the advantage of these roads which would open up new sections of the country which are of great value. Then again, the Province granted about \$600,000 as a subsidy to the Eastern Extension Railway. That railway has been taken over by the Government and forms part at present of the Intercolonial Railway system of the Dominion. Why should the Province of Nova Scotia be called upon to bear the burden of \$600,000 for the construction of a road which is owned by the Dominion at large, and which the Dominion at large has the benefit of? This House has been asked to vote \$2,500,000 in Cape Breton to form a connecting link with this road. The Province of Nova Scotia gave \$600,000 for that road, and, under the policy of the Government, that amount should be returned to the Province. Then again, you have to consider the interests of the counties of Antigonish, Guysboro' and Pictou. They paid for the right of way of this Eastern Extension road which now forms part of the Intercolonial system. I think the taxpayers of those three counties are justly entitled to come to the Government and ask for a return of the money which they were called upon to pay for the construction of the road which now belongs to the Government. In all these cases, if the principle was applied to the Province of Nova Scotia—and I am quite willing it should be applied to the other Provinces as well, because I am here only speaking for my own Province, with branches of the subject

with which I am most familiar—if that principle was applied to Nova Scotia, we should then be able to construct all these public works in the interest of our country, and open it up east and west with railways which the people are so anxious to obtain. It is in this view of the case that I object to the assumption of these debts in the Harbor of Quebec, and assuming control of the dry dock, and the debt for constructing it, and the debt for the tidal dock, and the large amount which that dock represents. Every hon. member of this House feels that we shall never be able to receive one cent from it, either for principal or interest. You may look at the \$3,500,000 expended in the Harbor of Quebec for these tidal docks, as a gift; you might as well write it off your books at once. Hon. gentlemen know that with that \$3,500,000, they may be kept on from year to year, possibly until another deal, or a final deal, is required with another Canadian Pacific Railway Company, when Quebec influence may again prevail, and when that large amount may be assumed by the Government of the Dominion. It is under such circumstances as these that I venture to protest most strongly against the assumption of these large amounts continuously and persistently on behalf of the Province of Quebec, without the other Provinces of the Dominion—and although I am speaking for my own in particular now, I do not wish to limit the principle to my own Province—I say that my own Province and the other Provinces of the Dominion ought to share alike in the public expenditure, as indicated in the resolution of Mr. Blake last year, when these railway propositions were before the House. I venture to appeal not only to the Government, but to this House and to the country, as to the justness of the proposal which we submit. I think it is unfair and unjust that the citizens of Halifax should be called upon to bear \$10,000 a year of annual assessment, when the people of the city and harbor of Quebec have their dry docks assumed and controlled by the Dominion Government as public works. If they had accepted the proposal, if they had given us the money under certain circumstances, on the same conditions which were granted to the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec, we could have constructed our own dock at a much less cost, even if they had refused to make it a public work. But refusing to make it a public work, and refusing to guarantee the money, refusing to put us in the same position in which they put the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec, I repeat is an act of injustice which I think the people of Halifax and the people of Nova Scotia generally will resent. Then, again, with regard to that small piece of the Intercolonial Railway on the Dartmouth line—is it fair that the taxpayers should have to pay \$4,000 a year, a small municipality like that, when you assume a long line of railway, running from here to Quebec, with other lines of railway down through that Province, for no other reason than because the people of Quebec have a more persistent and united influence than the people of Nova Scotia or the people of other Provinces have. They are able to exert that influence in a united manner, as one man, and that one man coming to the Government demands to receive concessions which are withheld from the other Provinces. I protest against this unfairness to the other Provinces, and I call upon the Government to take such a step as will place the public expenditure of this country in a fair and just manner, so that all the various Provinces may receive their fair proportion of the expenditure.

Mr. KENNY. The first clause of the resolution now under the consideration of the House provides that the graving dock built at Levis opposite Quebec, shall become a public work, and that the corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners shall be released and discharged from all obligations connected therewith. That reminds me, Sir, that at the port of Halifax we are now building a graving dock, to

the character and value and importance of which I desire to call the attention of the House. It has been constructed by a joint stock company, and is subsidised by a vote of \$10,000 for 20 years from the city of Halifax, and the same amount from the Imperial Government and the same amount from the Dominion Government. The dock will be completed in 12 months. It will be one of the largest docks in the world, and I think, without exception, the largest dock in America. Owing to the changes in the plan of that dock, which it became necessary for the company to make in consequence of the recommendation of the Dominion engineer, and the engineer of the city of Halifax, owing, also, to the fact that the site which it was supposed would have been obtained for the sum of \$25,000 has cost \$60,000, the outlay has been much greater than it was at first anticipated. The company, under these circumstances, made an appeal to the Imperial Government, and I have it on the best authority that the Imperial Government has made an advance—I do not exactly know in what form—of \$100,000 to enable this company to complete the dock. Since I came to Ottawa, I have asked the Dominion Government to grant the dock company a rebate or refund of the duties which they paid on articles imported whilst that dock was under construction, and I take this opportunity of urging that matter upon the consideration of the Government. It has been stated to me by those connected with the company, that this is very essential to its completion. Having thus placed before the House the value and the importance of the dock, I will contrast it with the Quebec dock. The Quebec dock will no doubt be of value. I hope it will give some return for the outlay which it is now thought, in the public interest, should be made upon it. But it cannot be of the same value as the Halifax dock, owing to the difference in its size. Besides, the Quebec dock can only be used during six months of the year; the Halifax dock, as hon. gentlemen know, can be used during the whole year. Therefore, I think that our dock has a stronger claim upon the consideration of the Dominion Government, and I hope that the Government will relieve the city of Halifax of the outlay which it is making upon that dock. I should be glad if possible, to see it made a public work, and I expect that the Dominion Government will treat the city of Halifax in this matter as considerately as it treats the city of Quebec. All I ask is that in this matter common justice will be accorded to all. So much for the dock. Now, my hon. colleague has referred to other matters which do not exactly pertain to the resolution which is under discussion; and when his attention was called to the digression, he mentioned that he desired, with the permission of the House, to make those remarks, and he continued his speech, and made his annual statement. The hon. gentleman treated us to exactly the same speech last year; at least the tone and style were so familiar that I think I have heard it, if not in this House certainly elsewhere. My hon. colleague has frequently found fault with the Government for its extravagance. Now, he says it is not sufficiently extravagant. His idea of retrenchment is to spend more money. Accusations have been thrown across the House to us by hon. gentlemen opposite that the support which the Dominion Government obtains in the Province of Nova Scotia was gained by promises of railways. It seems that the Government did not promise enough during the elections in Nova Scotia, for I do not think any references were then made to several matters to which my hon. colleague call the attention of the Government. I am quite prepared to say this: that if the Government followed the advice of my hon. friend he would be the first to accuse them of trying to buy the people of Nova Scotia. That will not deter me from supporting him in any claim which I consider a just one which he may make, and I do say that the cotton siding to which he refers, and of which I have a very intimate knowledge, and the Dart-

Mr. KENNY.

mouth railway are matters which deserve the attention of the Dominion Government. As regards the other railways and matters to which the hon. gentleman has referred, they were so fully discussed last year, and answered by the Minister, that I feel it is unnecessary to deal with them further, and I hope that on this dock question, it having been so prominently brought before the notice of the Government, they will recognise the claim which the dock company has for a rebate of the duty paid on articles imported which are essential to the construction of the dock. When the dock is finished I hope the Government will relieve the city of Halifax of all obligation in connection with it, as they are now relieving the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec. As regards the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec I may say that in Halifax we hesitated to put the harbor in commission, because we feared it might impose additional taxation on our shipping; but our friends in Quebec were wiser in their generation than we were, they took the risk and incurred the obligation, and now they come to Parliament and ask to be relieved of it. As regards the claims of Halifax on the consideration of the Dominion Government, I will give a few figures to show its importance and trade. The amount of customs duty which the Minister of Customs received last year from Halifax amounted to about \$1,700,000, as against \$300,000 collected at the port of Quebec. This will show that the value of a public work like the graving dock will be infinitely greater in Halifax than in Quebec, and I hope its value will be recognised by the Government.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has urged the claims of the graving dock at Halifax, which he said would be of greater benefit than the graving dock at Quebec, because the harbor of Halifax is open the year round. Of course the hon. gentleman excepts those periods when the harbor is frozen over. Then there is a graving dock in British Columbia, which, I believe, is also subsidised by the Government. I represent a constituency which has as important a harbor as either Quebec or Halifax and we have this advantage, that I believe it is the only port north of Cape Hatteras which is never encumbered by ice. Our claims as a port in that respect are superior to those of either Halifax or Quebec. While this amount is being paid for the benefit of Quebec Harbor, I claim that a similar expenditure should be made on works of public advantage in other portions of the Dominion. In many respects we are at a disadvantage as compared with the port of Montreal. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has pointed out the large amount of customs collected at his port; I believe a similar amount is collected at St. John, but the hon. gentleman will admit that we indirectly pay a large amount of duty on goods entered at Montreal, because in several lines of trade the merchants are placed at an advantage and are able to send goods to the Lower Provinces and successfully compete, to some extent, with the merchants of Halifax and St. John. The port of St. John was not put into commission for similar reasons to those given in regard to Halifax. The port of St. John is in commission in a certain sense, because under the charter the port is conveyed to the city, and the civic authorities are practically the Harbor Commission, and not only do they control the harbor but it is their property. It has been argued that St. John receives such a large amount for the breakwater the people should be satisfied. Since Confederation, 20 years, we received \$422,000 for the breakwater, and during that period \$58,000 has been expended in dredging. While the breakwater has been useful for the purpose for which it was intended, as a shelter for the small class of vessels navigating the Bay of Fundy, I am very much inclined to believe, but I do not speak with certainty, a large portion of the expense occurred through defects in the plans and faulty construction. Be that as it may, there is

a more important matter connected with the harbor, and that is the work of dredging. We have a just claim on the Dominion Government to see that steps are taken for thoroughly dredging our harbor, as lying at the mouth of a great river running through the alluvial soil of the upper part of New Brunswick, a large amount of debris is brought down by the spring freshets, and this is rapidly destroying our harbor. This is more important because in a short time the city of St. John will be within 24 hours of Montreal, probably 18 hours, and then it will be the first ocean port in the Lower Provinces touched by the Short Line.

Mr. GILLMOR. Except St. Andrew's.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Yes, I admit that St. Andrew's will be reached a little before St. John. We have also a road which has been opened under the assistance of the Dominion and Quebec Governments, running from River du Loup to the boundary of New Brunswick, and which also opens another outlet, which has its termination in St. John. In view of those facts, and in order to carry out the principle on which those roads have been built, it seems to me the harbor should be put in such a position as to enable ships to come there, it being the first outlet of those railways which have been supported by the Government. Such a large amount of shipping comes there that it is of the greatest importance the harbor should accommodate them. From 1868 to 1885, while the number of vessels in Quebec was 14,000, with 13,000,000 of tons, I find that in the port of St. John the number of vessels during the same period was 24,000 with about 8,000,000 of tons. Of course the tonnage was not so large as that in Quebec, but the number of vessels frequenting the port was greater. We have now a large number of steamers, and we think we will be able, with the assistance of the Short Line, to get a share of the trade west. I, therefore, cannot too strongly urge upon the Government, that they should give us the assistance that we are fairly entitled to, for the purpose of putting our harbor in such a position as to accommodate and invite vessels to enter it. I find, on looking over the report of the Minister of Public Works, that for the last fiscal year, 1886 and 1887, there was expended for harbors and piers, \$742,000, of which New Brunswick received only \$33,435, and Quebec, \$196,512. Besides that we find that in Quebec, under a special vote of Parliament for that year, there was expended on the channel between Quebec and Montreal, \$191,000. Quebec harbor works, \$432,472; Levis graving dock, \$20,000, and Three Rivers harbor, \$203. I do not object to any expenditure which will increase the trade of Quebec or any of the other Provinces, but I feel that I have a right to urge the claims of the harbor in the constituency which I have the honor to represent—the commercial capital of the Province of New Brunswick. It was promised us that if we went into Confederation, St. John would become the Liverpool of America, and it was held forward as the great inducement by which her people were asked to join the Union, that great trade would centre in her harbor and city. That has not been realised. We can only hope that the facilities that will be offered to us, if we get that assistance which we are fairly entitled to, as I claim under the federal compact, will give us such assistance as will increase the accommodation for vessels entering our harbor. With regard to the harbor, I may say that in February, 1887, the Government seemed to have awoke to the importance of the place, for the chief engineer of Public Works was sent down to survey the harbor with a view to increasing the accommodation. He spent between the 1st and 22nd of February of that year, very busily attending to that duty, but his engagements have been so great since that we have not heard the result of his labors; and, if I am correctly informed, no report has been made to the Public Works Department, or if it has been made that report has never been made before the House although it

has been asked for. I do not wish to take up any more time at this late period of the Session. I feel that I am only asking for an act of justice towards the constituency of St. John, and I claim that the position in which we are placed, imposes a duty and an obligation on the Dominion to give us that assistance which is afforded to other parts of the Dominion, and which the situation and the importance of our port not only in regard to the Province but in regard to the Dominion entitles us to. I believe that the harbor is of that public character and public importance, that will enable the Government to see their way clear, to give us that just portion of assistance which we are entitled to, and which on behalf of the city I claim is our due.

Mr. ELLIS With regard to the general question involved in both propositions, that is the Montreal proposition and that with respect to the harbor of Quebec, I am unable to draw in my mind any special difference as to the result of the two. It appears to me they both lead to the same thing, and that is that eventually all the harbors of the Dominion will have to be free. In the speech of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) the other night, there was a menace in his tones, and a glitter in his eye, which suggested that this was only the beginning of the demands on the part of Montreal; that these demands would be followed in the future by other demands, and that it was a mere question of time as to when the port of Montreal would be made free. He was backed up in that to a large extent by the suggestions of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who is really a representative of the city of Montreal too, and I observe that the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) was of pretty much the same opinion in regard to the port of Quebec. Their remarks have been followed up in the same direction by the hon. members for Halifax, and for the first time we have found them agreeing to a greater extent than they ever agreed in this House before. Then my hon. colleague from the city and county of St. John (Mr. Weldon) comes forward and makes what seems to be a fair statement, and what is no doubt a fair statement, with regard to the claims of the port of St. John. Every harbor in the Dominion whether it be a lake harbor, or an ocean harbor, is a harbor that accommodates as much trade in the Dominion as comes to it; and if you can get that trade cheaper it is for the benefit of the people to enjoy it. In the end it all means that you are taking off a special tax on one part of the country and putting it on as a general tax on the other. If you do this for Montreal or Quebec, it is only fair and just that the same principle should apply to the whole Dominion over. That is, at any rate, the result of the logic which the hon. the Minister of Finance and the hon. the Minister of Public Works have put before the House. Let me say one or two words with regard to the St. John Harbor. That harbor is owned by the city, inasmuch as all the tolls and revenues from the harbor go to the city, and it is managed with no expense except the expense of a harbor master. A committee of citizens manage it. Notwithstanding the remarks of my hon. friends here, my friend from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) and the other hon. gentleman, who are both Halifax gentlemen on this occasion, I may say that I have seen 40 or 50 square-rigged vessels in the harbor. If you can find 40 or 50 square-rigged vessels in a harbor where there is no water, you will see a sight of a remarkable character indeed.

An hon. MEMBER. That was before Confederation.

Mr. ELLIS. They were there, and the water is there also. There is in St. John a party of citizens who are extremely desirous to have the harbor put in commission, and whenever a harbor improvement agitation is raised in that city, this question for a commission comes to the front. The main argument on which it is based, I do not hesitate to say, and I say it without any fear of contradiction, is this: that if

you put the harbor in commission, you will be able to get a great deal of money out of the Government, because the commission cannot spend their own money or require the city corporation to spend any, and it will be got from the Government. The argument is constantly presented to me as a journalist and a public man that I should forego my own views, because if we would consent to that the Dominion Government would make the expenditure, and we would ultimately get rid of the responsibility of it. I have never been able to adopt that as a view of public morality that I can support. A short time ago some of the representatives of the Province of New Brunswick interviewed the hon. Minister of Public Works, and asked him to give us some assistance. We have never demanded from the Dominion Government that they should construct unnecessary works; all we have asked is that they should help to put the harbor in a position to meet any growing trade that might come there. In addition to managing and controlling the harbor, we, in St. John, have spent something like \$200,000 within a comparatively recent period to build wharves, which have become public wharves. The answer of the hon. Minister of Public Works has suggested that we might get an expenditure if we accepted a harbor commission. But I warn the hon. gentleman of the danger he runs in making that suggestion. I would suggest that he should get the report of his officer who was sent down to St. John before the late election; and if he could give us some assistance, it would be better to do that than put the harbor under a commission, unless he is prepared to place all the harbors of the Dominion under the same system. I dissent entirely from the proposition before the House, with regard to the harbor of Quebec. I dissented from, though I did not speak on, the Montreal proposition. I think it is sufficient for the Dominion to give a certain amount of assistance to those harbor works, as they do to other public works; but to put upon the whole country the cost of local works in particular places, is unjust to the whole country.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) If there is any lesson to be learned at all from the debate which has just taken place, and the vote we are now asked to pass, I think it is the great danger that exists in the initiatory steps that are generally taken on a small scale to impose a burden on this country for the benefit of one particular part of it. In this matter we are called to assume, as I understand, the total cost of construction and interest on the Levis Graving Dock, amounting to \$1,042,454. In addition, we have to assume \$493,706 of the debt for the construction of the tidal dock at the mouth of the St. Charles River; in other words we are asked to vote to the city of Quebec \$1,536,160. If that was all that was included in the vote before the House, it would not, perhaps, be very serious; but it is just as well for us to understand where we stand in this business, and what will be the logical consequence of wiping out this indebtedness. So far as the Levis Graving Dock debt is concerned, it stands on a special basis. The amount required to wipe out the cost of the St. Charles River tidal dock is a mere flea-bite compared with what the hon. gentlemen will have to ask in a year or two. When that work was constructed in 1873 we were told that a guarantee of \$1,200,000 would be amply sufficient for the purpose, and that advance was made on the bonds of the Quebec Harbor Commission; and we were to have provision in the statutes for securing the Government against any possible loss of interest or sinking fund. The provisions were well enough on paper, but as a matter of fact they have proved to be absolutely valueless. The hon. gentleman having got that principle adopted by the House in 1873, he came in 1880 and asked for \$250,000 more to complete the work; and in 1883 he asked for \$375,000 for the construction of a cross-wall. I have watched the debates

Mr. ELLIS.

on the subject, and with the exception of the hon. gentleman, and the hon. Minister of Public Works, and a few others, hardly anybody knew anything about these works. He came back in 1884 and asked for \$300,000 more; in 1886, he asked for \$750,000 more; and in 1887 he asked for \$1,200,000. There has hardly been a year since he first induced Parliament to assume the liability of the construction of these docks that the hon. gentleman has not asked for a half or two-thirds or the whole of a million dollars, and he has always got it; and the same thing has gone on to this day, and we do not know whether we are at the end of these expenditures or not. I have talked with some gentlemen from Quebec on this subject, and they have told me that these docks are really of very little importance—that the large proportion of the money has been expended for political purposes, and that the docks, when finished, will be of very little use to the city of Quebec. Though \$734,000 remains which has not yet been expended, I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will expend that; and judging from the past, he will be here again as sure as the sun rises to-morrow. And suppose they spend all the money, what will it amount to? It will amount to this: that this country will have guaranteed within an ace of \$4,000,000 for the St. Charles Tidal Dock, irrespective of \$1,000,000 which was voted for the Levis Graving Dock. The hon. gentleman knows that he might as well ask Parliament to assume the whole debt at once, as he is certain to do it a year or two hence. The commissioners will never pay the interest, they have never intended to pay it, and Parliament might as well know it; and when Parliament is asked to wipe out one-half of this debt, that is only a stop that will make it certain that Parliament will be asked in a year or two hence to wipe out the balance. We are practically giving the commission \$4,000,000. We have paid the money already, we cannot get it back, and the securities are worth about the paper on which they are written. The commissioners never have paid any interest or sinking fund, not one dollar.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, yes; on the original loan they paid \$750,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Yes, of the \$1,200,000 voted, \$750,000 was taken to pay off outstanding bonds of the Quebec Harbor Commission.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; they are paying the interest of \$36,000, and are paying regularly up to the present time.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I say that of the \$1,200,000 we advanced in 1873, \$750,000 were taken to pay the then outstanding debentures of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners, and the commissioners looked upon this as a real debt on which they ought, morally as well as legally, pay interest. But outside of the interest on that \$750,000, the Quebec Harbor Commissioners never have paid and never intend to pay a dollar of interest. I talked to some gentlemen of Quebec, and they laughed at the very idea of paying any interest on that debt. It is well to ascertain what is the real amount we are assuming. I say it comes to this: Last year we authorised the Government to expend \$1,200,000, of which there is yet \$734,000 unexpended. That will be expended next year, and the total expenditure on the St. Charles wet docks will then amount to \$4,000,000. I think that the mistake was made in the first instance. As soon as the thin end of the wedge is got in by one of these cities, and the Government gives its guarantee for the payment of a large sum of money, to be invested in some local work, the chances are, in nine cases out of ten, that the Government will in the long run have to assume the whole debt. That has been the case with reference to the Quebec Harbor debt. We have already assumed the cost of constructing the St. Charles Dock, which

imposes a charge on the Dominion of \$3,262,000 and we are now assuming by formal resolution another \$500,000, so that we may as well make it a round \$4,000,000, for we will have to pay that in the long run. We are assuming the cost of the Lake St. Peter improvements, \$3,750,000, the St. Charles Tidal Dock at Quebec, \$3,975,000, and the Lévis Graving Dock, \$1,000,000, making nearly \$8,500,000, in all. In the face of this expenditure, the arguments of my hon. friend from the Maritime Provinces must be acknowledged to have some weight. We cannot go on laying out \$8,000,000, or \$9,000,000 of public money in the cities of Quebec and Montreal for harbor improvements, without recognising in some way the necessity of improving the large harbors in the Maritime Provinces. As far as the assumption of the debt for improving Lake St. Peter is concerned, there may be arguments used to justify the Government in assuming that, as the channel is a matter of national importance, but there was nothing to justify the pledging of the credit of the country to the construction of a tidal dock at the mouth of the St. Charles river, Quebec. That is a purely local work with which we should have nothing to do, and a large amount of the money voted for it has been expended in electoral corruption, and to-day Quebec is not much better off from the construction of the dock than she was before, as I am informed by gentlemen who are interested in that city. Having laid out this money in these different works, it is, of course, to be expected that similar claims will be made from the other Provinces. We have St. John and Halifax putting forward their claims, which, having recognised the claim of Quebec and Montreal, the Government will find it hard to resist. What is to become of the Provinces that have no special claims of this kind. I suppose they will have no recognition whatever. We have been going on spending money in subsidising railways and building Government railways in the different Provinces of the Dominion, with the exception of Prince Edward Island. We have expended \$71,000,000 on the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$47,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway, and I am afraid to say how much in subsidising railways in the Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and the little Island of Prince Edward stands alone, although she pays her quota in taxes. The Island should be placed in the same position as Cape Breton, whose railway was built at the general expense. We are building a railway running from New Glasgow to New Oxford, a railway which was not required at all, except for the convenience and political assistance of the Finance Minister and his friends. The Government have built a parallel line of railway to the town of Pictou, which may be of some advantage to that town, but it is a disadvantage to the general interest of the public, because it forms a competing line with the existing line to Fisher's Landing. Railways have been subsidised all through New Brunswick and Quebec, and the one exception to all the Provinces is Prince Edward Island. The Government of that Province have made a demand on this Government that we should be placed on the same footing as the rest of the Dominion, and that our railways should be assumed by the whole Dominion. I am not now going to discuss the matter; but in face of the enormous charge which the Government are now putting upon the public, it will be impossible for them to resist the just claims of the people of Prince Edward Island to consideration.

Mr. WELSH. I did not intend to offer any remarks on this matter, but as it seems the custom in the House that when the senior member for Halifax gets up to speak, he must be replied to by the junior member, so when the hon. member for Queen's addresses the House I will follow him. I quite agree with the remarks of my hon. friend. It appears to me that the Government, in the first place, have spent their money without good security, and that now the Que-

bec Dock Company are bankrupt, and come to us to assume the debt. Instead of being a source of strength to the country, this company are adding to our net debt \$5,000,000. I quite agree with my hon. friend that those large railway expenses, carried on in the Provinces at the general expense are a heavy burden. Well, Prince Edward Island has a railroad, but she has paid for it. I think she has been treated very badly, and that the Government in justice should return to her the \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 that railway cost. The hon. the Minister of Finance told us that when the Supplementary Estimates came down, we would see that the Island was not forgotten.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELSH. I hope that is the case, but I have been waiting quietly for those Estimates a long time, and you know the old saying that hope deferred makes the heart sick. I hope they will give us some satisfaction in these Estimates. While the members from St. John and Halifax are quite right in making their claims, I know that in Prince Edward Island we are in a more difficult position than they are. In Halifax they have their harbor open all the year round, while during the winter we are shut up, and I think we deserve more consideration than they do. I shall reserve what I have to say further on this subject until we are on the Estimates.

Mr. GILLMOR. I would make a suggestion to the hon. gentleman, and that is that our present system is robbing the Provinces of any self-reliance. They all come here for relief, and, if this goes on a little longer, we might as well have had a Legislative Union as a Federal Union, because the Government are taking charge of all public works, as it suits them, in the different Provinces, and the explanation is that they are for the general advantage of Canada, but the expenditure is divided amongst the different Provinces. I do not know where the evil is to end, if it is an evil; but it is certain that the Government cannot meet all the claims which are made upon them at once. We must wait and take our turn. The charge is fixed, and, as years roll by, it is clear that some must inevitably wait longer than others, and of course it must be expected that those who represent opposition constituencies will have to wait longer than those who are more favored. Still, I would bring under the notice of the Government the constituency that I represent, and I would call their attention to what they already know, that the port of St. Andrew's is coming into notoriety very rapidly. It is the highest part of the Atlantic coast to Montreal and to all the west, and, although we have great natural advantages, some little expenditure will be needed to make the harbor accessible to those vessels for which other harbors are clamoring. I think that, from the increase of trade, in all the harbors that have been mentioned and from all the facilities they have to accommodate vessels, they do not need assistance as much as we do. I do not hear of any damage occurring to vessels from want of space in those harbors, and I think the money which is voted to them would be as well in the Treasury and better in the pockets of the people than it would be in expenditure on those harbors. They say that there was a revenue of \$800,000 from the harbor of Quebec, \$1,000,000 from Halifax, and \$1,000,000 from St. John. The revenue was that from St. John twenty years ago, and I think the Government should not be too lavish in their expenditure of public money in regard to certain harbors. Of course, there may be an argument in favor of public expenditure on these works, and, for my part, I think the only expenditure referred to in these resolutions which is justified, is the expenditure for the opening of the St. Peter's channel, as a work to be paid for out of the Dominion Treasury. As to Montreal, St. John, and Halifax, I say that the localities, being the centres of wealth, being placed where they are by nature for their own

advantage, must have the cream of the trade, and you find in those places that their merchant princes are erecting palaces, but it is unfair to the millions of the people of Canada to say that certain work is for the general advantage in those cities. Of course, if I succeeded in running my saw mill, that is in one sense for the general advantage of Canada, because all that constitutes the wealth of the people or of the individuals who form the population of the country is for the general advantage. Still, I think the Government ought to be careful in their expenditure. I must say that I did not enjoy the statement of the Minister of Finance that he thought it was time to cry "halt." I do not want to see "halt" cried before you come to my county. If you have started out on this benevolent mission, I think you must deal out justice to every locality, and you should not stop short in New Brunswick before you have done justice to every part of the Province. There is a railway that runs through my county, 84 miles in length, and I think that railway is as much for the general advantage as any other railway that has been aided, and that railway is suffering under financial depression in regard to building it and to running it. Last year you loaned \$17,000 to a road in Albert County, N.B., it would take twice that amount to pay the claims on the road I have referred to, and I think you are doing a great injustice to Canada with these claims. People flock here with these claims. We cannot take charge of all the works in Canada and pay them out of the Dominion Treasury. If this goes on much further, the Prime Minister's view in favor of Legislative Union would be the best, and then we might dispense with the Local Legislatures and save that expense.

Resolution reported, and concurred in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 135) relating to certain advances made to the Quebec Harbor Commissioners.

Bill read the first and second times, and considered in committee and reported.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 121) to amend Chapter 33 of the Revised Statutes of Canada respecting the Duties of Customs.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You have finally come to the conclusion that it is not necessary to attach to this a schedule showing that the articles heretofore made free, are on the free list?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. The Minister of Justice says there is no doubt.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are now on the free list, and they must stay there till they are taken off.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, quite so.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 126) to amend Chapter 124 of the Revised Statutes of Canada respecting Insurance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But it is not printed or distributed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, but I thought we might take it up, seeing that both sides of the House seemed to be perfectly satisfied with the statement that the effect of this

Mr. GILLMOB.

Bill is simply to place insurance companies having charters from Local Legislatures in the same position as foreign companies, that is, to enable them to do a fire and life insurance business by making the necessary deposits and complying with the requirements of the Dominion Statute. If these chartered companies receive the sanction of the Governor in Council, and make the necessary deposits, they have the same power to do business here that the American companies have.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that affect marine as well as life and fire companies?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now, is there not some risk that these charters may contain provisions more or less at variance with the general Insurance Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will observe that the first thing that is done when an application comes from any one of these parties, is to refer it to the Superintendent of Insurance to report upon, and if there is found to be any defect or any difficulty, they are refused. If they are found to be in conformity with other general enactments and the principles that are adopted here, and the company is one whose security is considered ample, then it is allowed, by making the necessary deposit, to transact business throughout Canada in the same way as foreign companies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is, we give the Government, to a considerable extent, dispensing powers. Now, some of these companies, no doubt respectable companies, will come to the Government, and it will happen occasionally that there will be some variation in their charters, and if these happen to be influentially supported, if gentlemen who have a considerable interest in maintaining the present Government, press strongly upon the hon. Finance Minister of the day that a little trifling deviation should be waved, it appears to me there will be no security at all, but that the Act may be infringed upon, first in one point and then in another, and that we will have considerable trouble in this matter. I think that in addition to requiring a deposit, they should be required to conform to the general provisions of the Insurance Act which was drawn up with a good deal of trouble, and which cannot be departed from without giving rise to a great many complaints on the part of the various companies that do business under it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot answer to what may occur when the hon. gentleman himself is on this side of the House, but I can assure him that while the present Government retain power, there will be no possibility of this Act being abused in the way in which he refers. The hon. gentleman knows how thoroughly we recognise our responsibility to Parliament, and that any action of that kind would expose us to the animadversion of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But I recollect a certain dogma laid down by the hon. gentlemen opposite, which was to the effect that anything that Parliament sanctioned of course became law, that it was no longer illegal. I think the hon. gentlemen should guard against such a possibility as I have referred to. I am quite sure, from my own experience, that application will be made, either to him or to his successors, as the case may be, on the part of some persons interested in these companies, to permit certain deviations which may not in themselves appear to be of very great importance. In that way there would be very considerable fear that our general Act would be set at naught.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest that these words be added to the clause: "The privilege of obtaining

a Dominion license upon making the necessary deposit with the Receiver General, and in other respects complying with the provisions of the Insurance Act."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that would cover it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) may have had some certain companies in his mind. Applications will come from Ontario and Quebec more than from the other Provinces.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My attention was drawn to this question from British Columbia.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Speaking for Nova Scotia, I may say that we are very careful to have our charters correctly drawn, and the conditions are more stringent than in other Provinces. A fire insurance company cannot take risks except to a certain amount, according to the capital and resources of the company. I have no objection to the insertion of the clause, but I can see no difficulty in operating the Act.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose the effect of this clause, with respect to provincial companies making deposits, will be to bring those companies under the jurisdiction of the Dominion with regard to business and inspection.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. EDGAR. Has it been considered what the effect will be in a case of this kind: Take a provincial company in Ontario doing business under the inspection of the Ontario Insurance Department, and it makes a deposit here and becomes entitled to do business throughout the Dominion, under whose jurisdiction will it be?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That point had not occurred to me, and I will take the second reading of the Bill and consider the point, which is an important one.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 127) relating to the interests payable on deposits in the Post Office and Government Savings Banks.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Does the Government contemplate making any reduction in the rate of interest.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is simply an enabling Act, and the question of the reduction of interest will, of course, depend considerably upon the rate at which the Government are able to borrow money. We cannot continue to pay depositors sums very much in excess of what the money cost the Government.

Mr. HESSON. It would be a very unfortunate thing, when we remember that the money in the Post Office Savings Bank is invested there by our own people and is not sent to a foreign country, if we should reduce the rate of interest. A trifling expense may be necessary to manage the savings bank business, but when it is remembered that the depositors belong very largely to the class of farmers, mechanics and working people, I think it would be a great mistake to effect any economy in that direction. I trust no step in that direction will be contemplated by the Government. If it is necessary to obtain loans in the British market, I presume they can be effected without reducing the rate of interest paid on the investments of the working people of Canada in the Post Office and Government Savings Banks.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

176

(In the Committee.)

Mr. SPROULE. It would be a great pity if the necessities of the country should demand that the rate of interest must be lowered upon money that is invested in the Post Office Savings Bank. If we look at the large number of poor people who have small amounts in those banks, I think we will understand the necessity of enabling them to receive the very largest amount of interest the country can afford to pay. They are not in the position to make investments, owing to the small amount of money they command. I have a return of the number of persons having money in those banks, and I find that last year there were 90,159 depositors, the average amount invested by each being \$216. If those people had more money to invest they would be able to realise higher interest, and it is only in consideration of the fact that the security is ample that they invest in these banks. A country can always borrow money on more advantageous terms than private individuals, therefore the rate of interest we pay as a country should be no criterion to govern the rate of interest we should give these poor people, and if a private individual goes to borrow money he is compelled to pay a higher rate than that paid by the Government. I say, therefore, we should endeavor to secure not only the present rate of interest paid to those poor people investing in the Post Office Savings Bank, but endeavor to increase it. I hope the Government will reconsider the matter, and will come to the decision that the interest paid on the deposits in the Government savings banks shall not be decreased.

On section 2,

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I have not seen the provisions of this Bill, but I should like to enquire, whether it is proposed when a reduction of interest takes place in the Post Office Savings Bank, that notice should be given to the depositors, for any particular length of time. Do the Government reserve the right to reduce the interest without notice?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is nothing in this Bill that would oblige us to give another notice. I can assure my hon. friend that the point he raised is an important one, and that due notice shall be given before any action is taken.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About how long?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About two or three months, I suppose.

An hon. MEMBER. A month would be enough.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 122) to amend chapter 34 of the Revised Statutes of Canada respecting the Inland Revenue.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) You add the words "on other products," what does that refer to?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It was felt that it should also cover the product of spirits, the same as it does with regard to tobacco.

On section 5,

Mr. COSTIGAN. This section is in regard to the change we made in the passing of this Act, for the maturing of spirits. Hon. members who took part in the discussion at

that time will remember that when provision was made for the maturing of spirits a good many members of the House thought that it was giving a greater advantage to the distillers; and that the means by which the spirits were to be matured would result in giving the old distillers a monopoly, and it would discourage the start of new distilleries. In order to meet that objection, the section was changed at that time, giving the privilege to new distillers to manufacture one-third of their product and sell it, an advantage that the old distillers would not have. We find that though no undue advantage has been taken of that provision, it is necessary to change it, because it would leave the whole policy of the Government liable to be frustrated if anybody chose to take such an advantage of it. A new distiller might come in and extend his operations so as to manufacture enough for the whole requirements of the Dominion, and send out one-third of the whole product, no matter what that product might be, and in that way supply the whole country with raw spirits. That would be contrary to the policy which has been adopted by this House, that only matured spirits should be sent out for consumption. The rights of the distillers who started under that clause and acted in good faith under it, will be afforded the protection they had before.

On section 7,

Mr. COSTIGAN. Under the law as it now stands, spirits are given in bond to manufacturers of methylated spirits throughout the country. It has been found by evidence brought before the department, that what was intended for the encouragement of the legitimate trade of the country, has to a considerable extent been abused. Therefore, while it is not the object of the Bill to prevent the manufacture of methylated spirits, it would have that effect very likely, because we provide against the manufacture of methylated spirits as they are now manufactured, because no spirits for that purpose will be given in bond free of duty to the manufacturers of that article. The object of giving them free of duty in the past was with the view of furnishing methylated spirits to the other industries of the country at the cheapest possible rate. It is not the intention, nor will it be the effect of the Bill, to prejudice the industries depending on the supply of methylated spirits, because the department will be able to supply a substitute for them without increased cost to the industries requiring them.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Do the Government intend to manufacture them?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We have not been in the habit of doing it in the past. In the United States the Government do not allow methylated spirits to be manufactured from spirits without the duty being paid upon them. I think this whole matter will regulate itself in a year or two, and that it will not be necessary for the Government to manufacture or distribute this article beyond that period.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS, &c.

Bill (No. 119) to amend "The Bank Act," chapter 120 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)

Bill (No. 120) further to amend "The Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act," chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(M. Thompson.)

Bill (No. 118) to amend the Weights and Measures Act, chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, as respects the contents of packages of salt.—(Mr. Costigan.)

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to withdraw Bill (No. 110) further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.
Mr. COSTIGAN.

Act. He said: The House will remember that that was the Bill which I proposed to suit the present circumstances, but it was too late for the term, and the court has adjourned till the 10th June, and, therefore, there is no reason for proceeding with it.

Motion agreed to, Order discharged, and Bill withdrawn.

EXTENSION OF LAWS TO MANITOBA.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 41) respecting the application of certain laws therein mentioned to the Province of Manitoba.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee

(In the Committee.)

Mr. EDGAR. This is a very important Bill. Have the Judges of Manitoba made any representations in regard to it?

Mr. THOMPSON. There have been two or three judgments delivered, which have shown the necessity for this Bill, and on the last occasion, a decision was given by Chief Justice Taylor in which he expressly called attention to the necessity of passing this Act.

Mr. EDGAR. I see that there is another Bill (No. 100) which seems to apply the criminal law of England as it existed in 1867 to the whole of Canada, while this Bill refers only to the 15th July, 1870. It seems to me that if the other Bill becomes law it would be entirely inconsistent with the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will let this Bill stand until I see whether I will go on with Bill No. 100 or not. I see the necessity for making the two Bills harmonise.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 113) to amend the Summary Convictions Act.—(Mr. Thompson.)

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 99) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. The object of the Bill is to give some relief to a class of small vessels which are being used on the minor waters, and most largely on some parts of the St. Lawrence.

On section 2,

Mr. FOSTER. The idea of exempting steam yachts of ten tons and under from inspection arises from the fact that the engines and boilers used in them are important, sometimes being mere steam pipes. The chairman of the Board of Steamboat Inspectors was favorable to having them exempted up to ten tons, but in conversation with one of the inspectors, it was thought best not to go to ten tons. Three tons will take in a class about which there is no danger.

On section 4,

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to substitute the following in place of the 4th clause:—

"The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, upon report of the inspector of boilers and machinery in whose district the steamboat is to run, may grant a permit to a fourth class engineer or other applicant sufficiently

qualified by his knowledge of steam machinery and his experience as engineer, authorising him to act as engineer on a steamboat carrying passengers, and not exceeding 20 tons gross tonnage, and within specified limits in the minor waters of Canada, which limits shall be designated in the permit."

This brings it under the supervision of the local inspector in whose district the steamer is to run.

Mr. EDGAR. The objection which I was going to take to that clause as it stood in the Bill, I think has been removed by the suggested amendment of the hon. Minister. Under the clause as it stood in the Bill, I think it would have been possible to have given this certificate to a person who had merely a theoretical or book knowledge. In the proposed 4th clause there is a provision which I hope is distinct enough, that there must be some practical experience by the person who receives this certificate.

Bill reported.

ADJOURNMENT—FISHERIES PROTECTION.

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

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I desire to ask the Minister of Marine what arrangements will be carried out with respect to the protection of the fisheries; whether the same number of vessels will be employed and the same arrangements made for this year as were made for the past two years?

Mr. FOSTER. The arrangements this year will be much the same as those carried out last year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the same number of vessels be employed?

Mr. FOSTER. About the same number.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then the expense will be about the same as last year?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 14th May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1889; and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 7th May, 1888.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the Message and Estimates be referred to Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. MARSHALL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make an explanation. I find that during the vote the other night on the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions, I was paired by the hon. member for South

Perth (Mr. Trow) with the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Brien), in the presence of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), and I left the House understanding that I was paired with him.

Mr. TROW. I may say, in reference to that, that I met the hon. gentleman at the door as I was coming in. I had heard previously to that from my friend the member for Prince Edward county (Mr. Platt) that the member for Hastings (Mr. Corby) required a pair. My friend the whip on the other side will remember the circumstances of the case. I just passed the gentleman hurriedly and I thought the pair was for Mr. Corby. I said so to the member for Toronto (Mr. Small) afterwards. After that the member for East Middlesex (Mr. Marshall) left the House, and I did not consider it was a pair. I mentioned particularly to him that another gentleman had spoken of Mr. Corby.

MANITOBA RAILWAY LEGISLATION.

Mr. WATSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Government to the importance of having a meeting of the Railways and Canals Committee. There are several Bills of importance affecting Manitoba and the North-West which were asked to stand over until the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions would pass, and it is important those Bills should be called this Session. I would like to know if it is the intention to have a meeting of the Railways and Canals Committee?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was understood at the time that those Bills could not be taken up, until the law about the North-West and Manitoba for disallowance should be passed. Therefore, as the law has not been passed those Bills have to remain, because, in passing them now, it would be against the law as it stands. That is the reason those Bills have been postponed.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved third reading of Bill (No. 89) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, chap. 8 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Mr. BARRON moved, in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same by inserting therein the following as clauses two and three:—

2. In the case of a vacancy happening in the House of Commons by the death of any member, or by a member accepting any office, or by a member resigning his seat, or by reason of the seat of any member being declared void under "The Dominion Controverted Elections Act" (except as in the next succeeding section is provided for), then, and in every such case, the day for the nomination of candidates shall, in the electoral districts of the Province of British Columbia, and in the electoral district of Algoma, in the Province of Ontario, and in those of Gaspé and Chicoutimi and Saguenay, in the Province of Quebec, be within thirty days after the day when the Speaker or any two members shall have, according to law, addressed his or their warrant, as the case may be, to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a new writ to fill the vacancy, and shall, in the other electoral districts of Canada, be with twenty days after the day when the Speaker or any two members shall, as aforesaid, have so addressed his or their warrant.

3. When a new writ for an election has to issue upon the order of the House of Commons, then, and in every such case, the day for the nomination of candidates shall, in the electoral districts of the Province of British Columbia, and in the electoral district of Algoma, in the Province of Ontario, and in those of Gaspé and Chicoutimi and Saguenay, in the Province of Quebec, be within thirty days after the day when the House of Commons shall have ordered the writ so to issue, and in the other electoral districts of Canada shall be within twenty days after the day when the House of Commons shall have so ordered the writ to issue.

He said: As some hon. gentlemen are present to-day who were not here when I spoke the other day, I think perhaps it would be just as well that I should say a few words now in support of this motion. I gave instances the other day to show the necessity, in the interests of the people, of taking away from the Executive the power of bringing on elections just when they please. I gave two very flagrant

cases in which constituencies were kept unrepresented for four or five months. The motion I make, if adopted by the House, would take away that power from the Executive. The main argument of the hon. Minister of Justice against my proposition was that if the law provided for a fixed time within which an election must be brought on, it was quite possible that an election might be declared void by reason of the impossibility of the proceedings being gone through within the statutory period. It seems to me that that argument cannot prevail, because section 15 of the present Act already provides for such a contingency, and that section will still remain law if my motion is carried. Now, Mr. Speaker, the delays, it seems, are not due to any action of yours. The statute provides that just as soon as you are advised of a vacancy having occurred, you shall forthwith direct your warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the delays occur after the warrant reaches him. Singularly enough, although the statute uses the word "forthwith" in regard to your proceedings, no such positive word is used in regard to the proceedings of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I think it would be in the interest of the people generally that we should have some such law as I propose. There can be no doubt that the people believe that the Executive do not bring on elections solely with the interests of the people in view, but that they bring them on sometimes hastily, and sometimes with great delay, in order to gain some party advantage. It cannot be said that that is a right thing to do, and I think the time has come when we should have some such law as is proposed in my motion.

Mr. THOMPSON. I regret I cannot accept the hon. gentleman's amendment, and I am sure he will excuse me from, at this late day, going into further discussion of the matter, as we have had already the debate on it in the Committee of the whole House, and the hon. gentleman's object, I presume, in bringing it to our attention this afternoon is to have a division recorded. I regret I cannot concur with him that the section he has read removes the objections I pointed out before. It applies to the difficulties which may now arise as to the delays which may transpire between the issuing of the writ and its receipt by the returning officer, or any further delays that may arise after it reaches the returning officer in consequence of the inclemencies of the weather or the climate or other difficulties. I pointed out to the House that the amendment would interpose a number of fresh difficulties between the issuing of the warrant and the actual issue of the writ. However, I do not propose to enter into a discussion of these points. I do not mean to say that the principle which the hon. gentleman asks to have introduced into the law, may not with propriety at some future time be adopted, but that would require a careful revision of the Act, and a great deal of further provision as to details than his amendment now involves. His amendment, in several particulars, which I presume he does not expect me to point out, requires careful alteration.

Mr. DAVIN. I agree with the principle of the hon. gentleman's amendment, but I hope that he will not press it now, because really we cannot discuss it.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Barron :

YEs:
Messieurs

Angot,	Flynn,	Mitchell,
Armstrong,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Godbout,	Perry,
Barron,	Guay,	Platt,
Bécharé,	Hale,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Robertson,
Bowman,	Innes,	Rowand,
Brian,	Jones (Halifax),	Ste. Marie,
Burdett,	Kirk,	Scriven,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Landerkin,	Semple,

Mr. BARRON.

Casey,	Lang,	Somerville,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Sutherland,
Choquette,	Lister,	Trow,
Couture,	Livingston,	Turot,
Davies,	Lovitt,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	Macdonald (Huron),	Weldon (St. John),
Edgar,	Mackenzie,	Welsh,
Eisenhauer,	McIntyre,	Wilson (Elgin),
Killis,	McMillan (Huron),	Yeo.—59.
Fisher,	McMullen,	

NATS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Freeman,	Montague,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Montplaisir,
Bergin,	Guillet,	Patterson (Essex),
Bowell,	Haggart,	Parley (Assiniboia),
Boyle,	Hall,	Porter,
Brown,	Henderson,	Putnam,
Bryson,	Hesson,	Robillard,
Burns,	Hickey,	Roome,
Cameron,	Hudspeth,	Ross,
Cargill,	Jamieson,	Royal,
Carling,	Joncas,	Rykert,
Carpenter,	Jones (Digby),	Shanly,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kenney,	Skinner,
Chisholm,	Landry,	Small,
Cimon,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Smith (Ontario),
Cochrane,	Laurier,	Sproule,
Colby,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Taylor,
Costigan,	Macdowall,	Thompson,
Coughlin,	McGulla,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Curran,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tupper (Picton),
Daoust,	McDougald (Pictou),	Tyrwhitt,
Davin,	McDougald (Cape Breton),	Wallace,
Davis,	McKeen,	Ward,
Dawson,	McLellan,	Weldon (Albert),
Denison,	Madill,	White,
Dickinson,	Mara,	Wilmot,
Dupont,	Marshall,	Wood (Westmore'd)—83.
Foster,	Mills (Annapolis),	

Amendment negatived.

Main motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time, and passed.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 135) relating to certain advances made to the Quebec Harbor Commissioners.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

Bill (No. 99) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—(Mr. Foster.)

GAMING IN STOCKS AND MERCHANDISE.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 95) respecting gaming in stocks and merchandise (from the Senate).—(Mr. Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I do not object to the principle of the Bill, but, in view of the conflicting opinions of eminent professional gentlemen, it is very important that it should not interfere with legitimate transactions, and should only remedy the evil complained of.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have considered very carefully the opinions given and the objections raised by some persons who are *bond fide* operators in transactions of merchandise and stocks, and the objections of some who would like to be considered so, but who are precisely of the class the Bill intends to punish. I may say that the Bill has received the endorsement of operators engaged in legitimate business in Montreal and Toronto. A certain portion, however, of the brokers in Montreal engaged in legitimate business, have pressed strongly, chiefly in view of the opinions to which the hon. member for St. John has referred, to have a few words added to the first clause of the Bill; and although my own view is that the words which they desire to have added are nothing more than expressing again in a different form that which is already expressed in the first section, I have no objection, in order to meet the feeling of uneasiness

which prevails among some of them, to comply with their wish; and I am advised that the addition of the following words will meet the objections they raise:—

That the foregoing provisions of this Act shall not apply to cases where the broker of a purchaser shall receive delivery as above of the article sold, notwithstanding that such broker shall retain or pledge the same as security for the advance of the purchase money or any part thereof.

Some of the brokers feel uneasiness on this ground: They say that they make purchases on behalf of clients, and that they expect the vendor to deliver the stocks which they so purchase, but it is necessary for them occasionally, in the interest of their clients, to pledge the stocks which are the subjects of the contract with a bank or with another broker as a guarantee for the purchase money which is to be deposited; and, under these circumstances, they fear that they may fall strictly within the provisions of the Bill, though I do not think they would do so; but, in order to remove any doubts on the subject, I propose to add this clause.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have been spoken to by several of the brokers in Montreal, and I think the Minister of Justice has fairly represented their sentiments on that subject. Of course the regular brokers are against the bucket-shops; they want to see them stopped, but they are afraid that this Bill will stop 90 per cent. of the business of the regular exchange, and the amendment which the Minister proposes is one which, I am told by several of the leading brokers, will ease their minds as to the supposed interference with the regular business.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be so, but it seems to me that, according to that view, we will stop illegitimate gambling and will recognise legitimate gambling, because a great deal of this business is simply legitimate gambling, with a certain amount put up. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) that what we desire to do is to put down the bucket-shops, and the only question which suggests itself to my mind is whether we do not leave a wide door open for the evasion of this Act. I am not sure that it is in the public interest to facilitate the purchase of stocks on small margins in any case, and, if we could do it, I am not sure that it would not be just as much in the public interest to stop that kind of gambling in stocks on margins of 5 or 10 per cent. as to put down the bucket-shops.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The amendment may meet the objections of the brokers of Montreal, but there is another clause which may go further, affecting those who are purchasing an article of commerce on speculation. The Minister will see that questions have been put to certain eminent legal gentlemen, and that the opinion has been given that purchasing grain or iron or any other articles on a margin would come within the meaning of this Act. That is a practice which is so common in the mercantile world that I cannot suppose the Government intend to deal with that as a criminal offence. If the hon. gentleman would state the view of the Government on this matter, it might relieve the minds of those who think that this will interfere with such legitimate operations as I have referred to.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Bill will not interfere with those who purchase or sell iron, grain or other merchandise on speculation, but only with those who neither purchase nor sell these articles, but simply speculate on the rise and fall of the price. It is the intention that there must be a delivery implied in the agreement.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Of course this Bill was introduced in the Senate by a gentleman who is known to possess great ability as a counsel, and it is introduced here by the Minister of Justice. Still, it strikes me that the opinions of counsel should have very great weight, and when there is such a difference of opinion we should be very careful not to pass any Bill which might interfere

with transactions which are legitimate in contradistinction to those which are illegitimate. No doubt the object of the Bill is laudable, so far as it will interfere with a practice which we should properly check, but, as far as I have been able to read its clauses, I am inclined to think that the Bill will have very much the effect which these gentlemen think. Mr. Moss, Mr. Osler and Mr. Blake, all eminent men, have given opinions that this Bill goes beyond what I believe is the intention of the Government who have brought it forward. If that is so, we should be very cautious that we do not pass a measure which might lead to interference with legitimate business or to any confusion in regard to it.

Mr. EDGAR. It seems to me that this amendment meets the objections which have been taken to the Bill. I would go a long way to support the course of the Government in this matter, on account of the very great practical evils which we have seen existing in my own Province of Ontario in consequence of these bucket-shops. In almost every small town in Ontario, there are scores of people who have been ruined, and there are many families that have been left utterly destitute by the gambling in stocks carried on in these institutions, which are operated principally from Toronto and Montreal. I know of one case in Toronto where a bucket-shop expended no less than \$30,000 a year on its private telegraphic messages, and that must represent a proportionate loss to the investors. Nothing but very stringent legislation can possibly put a stop to that, and from all that I can hear the legitimate brokers and bankers are in favor of this Bill. In the third section, however, there is one provision which I think might operate unfairly. I believe it is the custom of the telegraph companies to rent instruments, or "tickers," to anyone who applies for them. They belong to the telegraph companies and are used for legitimate transactions in stocks. I see that, by clause 3, all bucket shops are declared to be common gaming-houses, and the instruments used for the conveyance of messages, in these houses are declared to be implements used in gambling, and are to be forfeited. I think that provision, when it applies to the property of the Great North-Western or the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Company, two responsible companies which do not promote gambling or make their living by gambling, is too severe, and that their property should be protected from the operation of the Act.

Mr. LISTER. I think that provision is just what it ought to be. If you are to suppress the bucket-shops, it is necessary that the methods by which the business is carried on should as far as possible be destroyed. When the telegraph companies know that the business is illegal, and that their instruments will be confiscated if they are used in those bucket-shops, then, if they put them in, they should be confiscated. I know that in Ontario, Cox & Co. opened small offices in nearly every small town in the Province, and we know that the instruments used there were rented from the Great North-Western Telegraph Company for a considerable amount of money. Everyone knew that these transactions were not *bona fide* which took place in those offices. Everyone knew that those offices were places for the assemblage of young men without a dollar of their own, who went there with the hope of getting money in that way; and I know that in my own town this bucket-shop system induced a spirit of gambling such as never had existed before. I believe that these institutions have done enormous injury, and that the Government are doing what is right in grappling with the question. In that they will have the approval of everyone; and if these institutions could not get an arrangement with the telegraph company, their business could not be conducted in the ordinary way, and that would be one of the most effective modes of putting a

stop to this nefarious business, for I can call it by no other term.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is to be regretted that the Bill, which was well considered before it came to us from the Senate, could not have been passed in the shape it came here. I think the complaints against it were not well founded, and that the efforts that have been made to influence members of the House against the Bill, and to enlist the press against it, should be looked upon with a good deal of suspicion. Every channel has been utilised for the purpose of defeating that Bill; yet I think that any person who has given a moment's consideration will admit its importance. The evil aimed at is one of those which are leaching the life-blood out of the people. In every town and city in Canada where these shops have been opened, hundreds, and I think I may say thousands, of people have been brought to ruin by means of them. Not only private individuals, but banks and moneyed institutions, in fact, almost every corporation that has gone down, owes its fall, directly or indirectly, to gambling in stocks. Now, if we can put down this form of gambling I think it would be a great good to the country. I think there is nothing in the Bill, as sent to us from the Senate, that would interfere with what ought to be recognised as legitimate business transactions; therefore I think it is a pity that it does not pass in the shape in which it came to us.

Mr. DAVIN. When I rose a moment ago it was to protest against the method of passing Bills through this House. Hon. gentlemen on the Government side speak so low that we cannot hear them, and hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side speak so low that we cannot hear them, and on both sides hon. gentlemen seem to consider that the House is contained within a narrow circle described around your chair. Now, I may say in regard to this measure, that I shall vote with the Government for this reason—I assume that they have well considered the principle involved in it; and I may also say that my constituents are not at all interested in this question. But I will say that, in a larger sense, this Bill belongs to a class of legislation that I am entirely opposed to. It is trying to advise people to do right. It is like other modes of legislation.

Mr. SCRIVER. It is compelling them to do right.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I entirely object to legislation compelling people to do right. As I say, I shall vote with the Government because I assume that they have considered the question thoroughly, but, on the face of it, I am opposed to this sort of legislation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think it is evident that the object of this Bill, so far as it relates to gambling in stocks, meets with the hearty approval of this House, but so far as it may apply to transactions affecting the general commerce of the country, is another question altogether. Now, I would like to ask the Minister if he is aware of any such law prevailing in any other part of the commercial world; because it appears to me that it is not only arbitrary but inquisitorial. If a person, having some means at his disposal, sees an opportunity of making a speculation—it might be in wheat, it might be in sugar or iron, or any fair article of purchase and sale, and he is induced to make a purchase of that article to make money out of it—I cannot see why the House should step in and restrict the freedom of action between one merchant and another. It appears to me that it will not only be inquisitorial, but it might lead to very disagreeable results. Frequently when a person makes a purchase, whatever it might be, any outsider might say that it was for speculative purposes, and bring him under the operation of this law, and put him to a good deal of inconvenience, and possibly to some expense. I think that in all these cases, strong grounds should be

Mr. LISTER.

given for interfering with the liberty of commerce, and the right of merchants to buy and sell according to their own views and methods, such articles as are usually transferred from one to another, be it on speculation or be it otherwise.

Mr. THOMPSON. We do not propose, by this Bill, to interfere with the freedom of commerce at all, and we exempt from it every transaction which can result in business of a commercial nature. As I said before, every transaction which has for one of its features the delivery of the goods purchased, is exempted from the operation of the Bill. In answer to the hon. gentleman who asks where similar legislation has been had, I may say that among other places I can mention Ohio, and Illinois; and at present an Act almost in the same terms, is being proceeded with in the Legislature of New York, at Albany. I do not think that it will in any way be found to interfere with commerce. It is purely and simply aimed at gaming transactions. I admit that in dealing with that kind of gaming, and the holding of lotteries and everything of that kind, it is necessary to have severe and sweeping legislation. It might be objected, if we were legislating against gaming for the first time, that we were interfering against many transactions which are not considered immoral, by preventing the staking of money on games in private houses, &c.; and if we were introducing legislation to prevent lotteries, it might be contended that it would be oppressive in operation as regards lotteries which are conducted as bazaars for charitable purposes. All legislation of that kind must necessarily be sweeping in its character, and would be oppressive if carried out in the strictest and extreme sense. But if we fall short of that, and endeavor to describe minutely that which appears to us at the moment to be the immorality which we intend to prevent, we shall find it impossible to arrive at legislation which cannot be evaded by those who desire to conduct operations of this kind without being in the nature of commercial transactions. But I cannot imagine that this Bill will operate unfavorably as regards any kind of commercial transactions. I acquiesce fully in one of the opinions that has been expressed, that, if the transaction is one from which delivery would result, as the natural and legal consequence, it is not a transaction that would be interfered with by this Bill; but if the contract is one of which delivery forms no part at all, but which is simply between a pretended purchaser and a pretended seller of certain stocks, as to their rise or fall in a distant market, within a given number of days, these acts are aimed at by this Bill, and I can confirm to the fullest extent what hon. gentlemen opposite have said as regard their evil effects. It is known to every observer that in cities and towns there has been a general spread, within the last two or three years, of gaming establishments of this kind, which are doing far more injury to the country, and are doing a greater business, than many other establishments which are aimed at by our criminal legislation. I know from experience, and from applications which have been before me, that numbers of persons belonging to respectable classes in the community, are in our different penitentiaries now in consequence of bucket-shop transactions, which led them on to embezzlement and frauds of different kinds. It is considered, therefore, in the interest of public morality that legislation of this kind should be adopted, and I do think this can be safely adopted, unless it is exercised in an arbitrary and oppressive manner, which has not been our experience with regard to laws against gaming, against pool-selling and against lotteries and transactions of that description.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether, in his opinion, it would be wrong for a man, if he felt disposed to speculate in wheat, iron or other articles, to put up a margin, say, of 15 or 20 cents. Accord-

ing to the opinion given by these eminent gentlemen, whose names are attached to this document, it will be made a criminal offence. According to my view of commercial transactions, I think it is perfectly legitimate for any merchant or speculator to purchase 10,000 bushels of grain, if, according to his view, the article is going to advance, and put up 10 or 15 cents a bushel. I can hardly see how that can be gambling, because in all parts of the world bulky articles of commerce are bought and sold on advances, with the better information one man possesses over another. If this Bill were adopted it would destroy all competition; it would destroy all speculation, from the value of one man's information over his neighbor's. If, for instance, I collect information in regard to the condition of the crops and the stock of wheat on hand, or the stock of sugar on hand or future prospects, and I form my conclusion that at a certain time there must be an advance. If I go into the market and make purchases in advance and put up a margin, I fail to see the propriety of any legislation like this interfering between the legitimate operations of that nature as between buyer and seller. Still, we are told by these high legal authorities that that will constitute a criminal offence. If that is what the Bill proposes aiming at the hon. gentleman may as well admit it, and the merchants of the country will then be on their guard; but, failing that, I think it is impossible for the hon. gentleman to put down such practices. His course will only lead to inquisitorial actions, because every man who makes a purchase from his neighbor which is to be delivered next week, and such transactions are of every day occurrence, will come within the operation of the Act. I cannot understand the object of proposing such legislation. It is highly reprehensible and it is an interference with the freedom of commerce, and should not be adopted.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Justice, in the course of his remarks in support of the Bill, made an extraordinary statement, viz., that this Bill would affect any case where there is not an actual delivery of goods. In not one case perhaps in 10,000 of actual transactions on the stock exchange is there an actual delivery of goods. The effect of this open market is to cause a speculative feeling in the community, and that is a benefit to all the farmers and to every one engaged in business. One of the reasons why an American city is, perhaps, in advance of a Canadian city is the want of a speculative market and speculative feeling in the people of our community. The law which the hon. gentleman proposes to pass is like a good deal of the legislation of that character during recent years, in the direction of moral restraint; but hon. gentlemen do not consider that when they are trying to do good they may be doing injury. You go into American cities and you see everything sold on margin; money is borrowed on margin; the party does not need to have a friend or a credit at the bank; he has a certain amount of money in his pocket and with that he goes into the stock exchange, deposits his margin and engages in transactions to the extent of his means. That feeling in the community creates a market, creates commerce. We talk about the advantages of the St. Lawrence route to Americans in sending their breadstuffs and products, which have been bought in Chicago, to the seaboard. If the owner sends it by the American route there is a speculative market on the route, while it is in transit to the ocean, and he can sell the produce at any time by dropping $\frac{1}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. If he sends it along the St. Lawrence there is no speculative feeling, and he cannot sell the produce if he desires it, and, of course, he prefers to send it by the route where he can sell it *in transitu*. I know nothing about bucket-shops, and have never before heard of their existence throughout the community, but if they are as wrong as the hon. gentleman describes them to be, surely they can be reached by the

common law. Surely it is not necessary to pass such legislation as is proposed for the purpose of punishing a few persons who transgress the law. You cannot make them act rightly by passing an Act of Parliament like this. You cannot have a speculative feeling in the community without some one making losses; you cannot, to use the Napoleonic phrase, have omelets without smashing the eggs. Someone must go to the wall, some injury must be committed to individuals and parties in the community; but it is questionable whether the injury done to the community as a whole is equal to the benefit done. What is more wanted in this community than anything else is the speculative feeling which exists among the American people, and legislation of this kind is directly against it; it may be in the direction of morals and good government, but it is in the direction of doing a direct injury to the country we live in.

Mr. CURRAN. It must be supposed that the gentlemen who are engaged in the legitimate transactions of brokers really understand something about their own interests. This Bill has been submitted to the careful study of the leading minds in the city of Montreal and elsewhere where brokers do most congregate, and they are most anxious that this Bill should pass. They seem to think, and they no doubt have good reasons for believing, that this legislation will not have any of the injurious effects which the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, stated would be produced by such legislation. I have no doubt that speculation is a good thing, if it be legitimate speculation, but the stock exchange of Montreal, the board of trade, the leading mercantile people of that great centre have not only approved of this Bill but have passed resolutions endorsing it, and most assuredly no such action would have been taken without due deliberation, and if the effect was to be that which has been just mentioned by the hon. gentleman, those resolutions would not have been adopted. I am under the impression, and I have consulted several hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec connected with the legal profession, that there is perhaps one hardship in this Bill so far as our practice is concerned in the Province of Quebec. We find that the proof of good faith in the transaction which takes place must be established by the accused. That is, perhaps, an absolute necessity in view of the legislation we are passing, and the end we desire to attain. I am not going to complain upon that point, and since that rule is being adopted which is contrary to the rule of common law, and that the Government has to some extent provided by this Bill that the negative has to be proved. The practice with us always has been that before a magistrate no other evidence is received than that establishing a *prima facie* case, just as before a grand jury, and under that practice the person accused of this misdemeanor would be brought before a magistrate and sent to the grand jury. That *prima facie* case would be established before a grand jury, and he should have to wait until he reached the petit jury before he should be able to put in any evidence on his own behalf.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). And then he could not be a witness.

Mr. CURRAN. He could not be a witness then. I have been informed that this practice does not obtain in some of the other Provinces, but I know that my experience always has been—and I am borne out by my *confrères* in this House from every section of the Province of Quebec—that that rule has always obtained in the Province of Quebec. Some say it is discretionary with the magistrate, whether he should accept evidence of that kind or not, but I do not believe there is any such discretion. Either the accused has the right, or he has not the right to be heard before the committing magistrate, and to give his testimony to establish his innocence of the charge

brought against him. If there be any doubt whatever on the mind of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, I think that such doubt should be removed, and a clause introduced into this Act which would enable the person accused of this offence to make his proof before the committing magistrate, and to establish the good faith of the transaction. I think that this suggestion will strike my hon. friend as being reasonable. I agree with everything that has been said with regard to the desirability of putting down the practices that have prevailed so much to the detriment of our community. They are more to the detriment of our community than any good that can result from the peculiar transactions which my hon. friend beside me seems to fear are in danger. I desire merely to throw a safeguard around the person of the accused under this law, which is a very severe piece of legislation. I believe it should be carried out in the spirit that would show, that there is not only no desire for oppression, but that there is no door open to any oppression under it.

Mr. LISTER. The Minister of Justice will see that there is nothing in the Act enabling the party accused to give evidence on his own behalf. One can readily understand that in a prosecution of this kind, a *prima facie* case can be made out on the testimony of a person who suspects that those practices take place. The whole crime rests on the evidence of intent, and the only person to give evidence would be the man accused or the person from whom he purchased. I, therefore, think that a broker ought to be a competent witness in his own behalf. In the Province of Ontario the accused can be witnesses on their own behalf, in some cases, notably, for assault or battery. If the charge against the person is simply assault or battery, he is allowed to be a witness in his own behalf, or, if on a trial for a higher offence of the same kind, the court is satisfied that it amounted to nothing more than an assault, the court has power to allow the accused to be a witness. This is the only instance in which I know a person is allowed to be a witness for himself. Where the crime is presumed, as in this case, I think it is only fair that the accused should have the right to go into the witness box and testify on his own behalf.

Mr. BROWN. I am sure that the universal opinion is in favor of legislation which aims at the destruction of those practices which have caused so much misery and ruin in the country. Any legislation of that kind is a good thing, and it will receive the support of the people of Canada. I think, however, there should be some change in the Bill as it now stands with regard to the confiscation of the instruments used. For instance, a legitimate broker in the ordinary prosecution of his work might ultimately become guilty of practices known as "bucket-shop deals." That man may have been a respectable broker when those instruments were placed in his office by the telegraph companies, and it is pretty hard that, if the person becomes guilty of practices under the operation of this law, which he was not guilty of when the instrument was put in, that it should be confiscated. If, of course, there is a regular bucket-shop established, the telegraph companies have no right to put instruments there, because they are doing it with their eyes open, but in the case where it may be eventually found that a respectable broker may afterwards become engaged in bucket-shop transactions, I think it would be unfair to confiscate the instruments. We might as well say that a letter-carrier, who bore a letter inciting to crime of some kind, was guilty of a crime himself. Those instruments are simply placed as records of operations. I do not think they should be allowed into bucket-shops to facilitate gambling, but as my friend the member for Ontario (Mr. Elgar) has stated, they may be given to legitimate brokers who, in the course of their business, may descend to those practices. I hope the Minister of Justice

Mr. CURRAN.

may see his way to eliminate from the Bill the words relating to the confiscation of telegraph instruments.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope, Sir, that the Minister of Justice will not be deterred by the criticisms that have been offered here to-day, from pressing his Bill. I believe that the hon. gentleman has, most clearly, with him in this matter, the moral and religious sense of this country. This is a Bill moving in the right direction, and if there is danger of its trenching on the operations of the regular stock exchange, the greater the extent it trenches on the operations of those, the better, in my opinion, for the country. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), a few moments ago, pointed out to the House the advantages resulting from speculative operations on the stock markets. He made the astounding assertion that those stock operations—gambling operations I would say—were to the benefit of the farmers. Now, if there is a great curse to the farmers of America, it is this practice of gambling in grain. On account of it the law of supply and demand does not bear on the market at all. There may be a great surplus, or there may be a deficiency in the country, but the question as to the price of grain is regulated, not by the law of supply and demand, but by the manipulation of a gang of gamblers called "bulls" and "bears," and they either put up or down the price of commodities as they may be able to manipulate the market. These operations are the curse of America, and they are the curse of every civilised country in Christendom. One of the outcomes of this kind of operation is such a man as Jay Gould, who has accumulated a fortune of \$80,000,000; by a system—and I say it advisedly and designedly—not one particle better, than theft and highway robbery. The plea that an interference with this class of business is a damage to the community is a plea that no man conversant with the operations of the stock exchanges will believe for one moment. Let a man go into the wheat pit of Chicago, or the stock exchange of New York, and he will find a perfect pandemonium; the usual laws of trade have no influence or effect upon the operations conducted there. The system results in damage, not only to the farming community, but to nine out of every ten men who are engaged, directly or indirectly, in these operations. No man ventures into Wall-street, unless he is in the pool, without getting stripped of his money; and the same thing occurs in Chicago. As the hon. Minister of Justice properly says, there are in our penitentiaries to-day men who have been sent there for crimes committed, the first step towards which consisted of the operations of gambling which are fostered by these bucket-shops, and in a still greater degree by the regular stock exchanges. I hope the hon. Minister will not abate one jot of this Bill. It is a measure which has the support of the moral and religious sentiment of this country. It is a step in the right direction.

Mr. THOMPSON. I may say, in reply to the observations of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), that they have misunderstood me. I did not say that every transaction would come under this Bill unless there was an actual delivery; and I think the hon. member for Halifax, in pressing his objections to this Bill, has in view legitimate transactions which would be legitimate under this Bill, but which he fears would be affected by it, because he says it will apply to transactions in respect of which there is a fair amount of security given, and according to the terms of which there may not be delivery for weeks. The hon. gentleman suggests a case like this. He or another gentleman engaged in mercantile business has the advantage of early information in relation to the crops in a distant part of the country, and if he goes into the market and deals in wheat in anticipation of its rise or fall, consequent

on that information he would come under the provisions of this Bill, because delivery might not be possible for months, or perhaps a year to come.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Not at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, if the hon. gentleman states to me a transaction of buying or selling in which there is a stipulation that there shall be no delivery—

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Not a stipulation—a possibility.

Mr. THOMPSON. If there is no stipulation, delivery is a natural result of buying and selling.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman let me explain what I mean? A merchant makes a purchase of goods which are to be delivered at a future date. When the time arrives, it may not be possible to deliver the goods.

Mr. THOMPSON. I can quite imagine that there may be perfectly legitimate transactions of that kind; but the difficulty is that if you made transactions of that kind legitimate, everything which is purely speculative and gambling could be legalised as well. The hon. gentleman will agree with me fully, I think, that it is desirable to suppress operations in bucket-shops, which are pure gambling.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Certainly.

Mr. THOMPSON. And I submit that the only test we can adopt is that which is adopted in this Bill, that is, that delivery either actually follows or is the legal result of the contract made. If delivery is to be dispensed with, and there is simply to be a money forfeit as part of the transaction, then it is purely speculative in its character; and this is no new principle to adopt. The transactions which are of a wagering description are against the common law, and have been prohibited in some of the codes in the United States for upwards of half a century. We know the familiar principle that an insurance policy which is a wager policy is void; and the hon. member for South Lanark would sustain it, I presume, because it encourages a spirit of speculation. But there is a limit beyond which speculation becomes simply vice and profligacy and a temptation to everybody to get riches quickly, even if they do not get them honestly. Now, I may say to the hon. member for Halifax, who I know is perfectly sincere in suggesting the difficulties he has mentioned, that this matter has been very fully considered by those who are far more competent than I am to judge of the effect it will have on ordinary business transactions. I have, for instance, before me, a letter from the secretary of the Board of Trade of Montreal, addressed to Mr. Abbott, who introduced the Bill in the other House, in which he says:

"I beg to inform you that the Council of this Board has instructed me to express to you its hearty endorsement of the principle of the Bill introduced by you in the Senate, intitled: 'An Act respecting gaming in stocks and merchandise,' and also, that the Council would be glad to take any further action in support thereof that may, now or hereafter, to you appear desirable."

I have a letter from Mr. Parent, the secretary of the Montreal Chamber of Commerce, who says:

"At a general meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the district of Montreal, held yesterday, the following resolution was adopted unanimously: 'Moved by Mr. A. G. Hamelin, seconded by Mr. Thomas Gauthier, that this chamber sees with pleasure the initiative taken by the Hon. J. J. O. Abbott, for the abolition of bucket-shops, and recommends fully the passage of the Bill now before the Federal Parliament.'"

A gentleman connected with the Imperial Bank of Canada writes:

"I note with much pleasure that the bucket-shop Bill is being proceeded with satisfactorily in the face of strong opposition. There can be no question with regard to the necessity that exists for legislation on the subject. Hundreds and thousands of Canadians have been taken advantage of in the past by the manipulations of expert and unprincipled manipulators of the 'ticker,' while it is difficult to discover, or to hear of one speculator, who has been successful.

"Quite recently this bank was a sufferer owing to forgery committed by one John K. Herres, of Berlin, Ontario. I am sending you a paper

containing a short account of his crime, in which you will observe that the temptation to commit the crime referred to presented itself owing to his losses incurred through a broker's bucket-shop.

"You and other members of Parliament will, no doubt, have influence brought to bear upon you to drop the Bill now before the Senate, but, in the interests of the country at large, I hope that the firm stand taken by the Government on this question will be maintained."

A member of the New York Stock Exchange, and a prominent banker and broker, writes:

"I am glad to see that you have taken the matter of bucket-shops in hand. Do you clearly understand our mode of doing business? We members of the New York Stock Exchange who do business on margin, receive the certificate for the stock we buy, every share, and pay for it in full. For instance, we buy 100 Western Union Telegraph stock at 80; we receive the certificate, which we may put in our name if we please, and pay \$8,000 in money for it, if it is bought on margin say of \$1,000—for a customer we advance the other \$7,000. This is always done in transactions on the New York Stock Exchange. In bucket-shops it is never done. They pretend to buy of the customer, and sell to him, so to make what the customer loses, and of course it is their interest to have the customer lose. Any legislation to suppress bucket-shops will not, I presume, hurt the legitimate dealings in stocks, whether for speculation, temporary or permanent investment, as practiced in the New York Stock Exchange. I have been a member here 21 years, and think perhaps I am a judge, but the facilities for gambling which these shops offer to everybody, clerk or otherwise, who can furnish \$5, is worse than faro gambling. On the very block where your office is in Montreal is one of the most notorious bucket-shops, but from the sign they pretend to be importers."

Here is another from a New York broker, who is a member of the stock exchange:—

"Kindly accept my thanks for the Bill *in re* the bucket-shops, which I fully and heartily endorse, and had I been aware the Hon. Mr. Abbott had such a measure in view when I was in Ottawa, I would cheerfully have furnished him with a few additional points, which would have strengthened the Bill. We have a similar Bill before the Legislature in Albany, and think there is every likelihood of its becoming a law."

Here is a letter from the secretary of the Board of Trade of Toronto:

"The attention of the council at its meeting held yesterday, was directed to the opposition being offered to your Bill for the suppression of bucket shops, and power was given the president to name a deputation to proceed to Ottawa for the purpose of furthering this measure if you should deem it necessary. Can I obtain any further information for you or in any way assist in bringing about the passage of this most desirable measure? This board is prepared to act promptly the moment you advise of the necessity for action. Awaiting your esteemed favor."

One of these gentlemen in New York sent an extract from a newspaper which contains a brief history of the legislation of this kind, and a full copy of the opinion of the District Attorney, Mr. Fellows, of New York, on this subject. I will only read a short extract from the narrative, and a short extract or two from the letter: The narrative says:

"The Revised Statutes of the State of New York have for more than half a century provided that wager contracts are unlawful, with certain exceptions. The transactions of the bucket-shops are no more nor less than bets on the future price of stocks. They are wager contracts on contingent events, which, by the Revised Statutes, are unlawful. The present Bill aims to add this old provision of the Revised Statutes with certain words of specification to section 343 of the Criminal Code, so that the specific offence of betting on stocks shall be covered distinctly by the Code."

Mr. District Attorney Fellows says:

"The most common kind of bucket-shop is equipped with a telegraph instrument—either a stock-ticker or Morse instrument—from which quotations in stocks or produce are from time to time taken and written on a large blackboard in presence of the customers of the shop. Wagers are then made on the fluctuations in the quotations as they are recorded on the blackboard, and various devices are resorted to by the proprietors and their customers to make the transaction appear a *bond fide* contract for the sale and delivery of stocks or produce, whereas, in fact, none of the parties engaged in such transactions have any intention other than to wager on the quotation that may appear from time to time on the board. Tributary to these blackboard shops are what are known as bucket-shop commission houses. These places, which are scattered all over the city, are provided with a stock ticker and connected with the blackboard shop by a telephone or telegraph instrument. An agent of the main shop receives the money from the person who desires to bet and sends an order to the main house by the instruments referred to."

Further on, he adds:

"The allurements with which customers are drawn to these places, while false and deceitful, are sufficient to attract the multitude of those who hope to make quick profits on small investments. Shop-

keepers with small incomes, young men employed as clerks and salesmen and women who believe they are engaged in legitimate speculation form a large part of their customers. The number of people in this city who have been ruined by dealing in these places is large and constantly increasing, and the cases are not a few of persons acting in a reduciary capacity who have squandered trust estates in one or more bucket-shops in this city. Indeed, instances are multiplying in this office of persons who have been led by these places into the commission of crime."

There is much more to the same effect, which I will not detain the House by reading. With regard to what the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) has said, as to the necessity for allowing the accused to rebut the *prima facie* case before the magistrate, I do not hesitate to say that ought to be the law as regards every charge of crime; and I am equally positive in my view that it is the law with regard to every species of crime, that the magistrate who is asked to commit a prisoner for trial on an indictable offence, is bound to receive any kind of testimony which the accused may offer in his defence.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Not bound; may allow him to do it if he chooses.

Mr. THOMPSON. In view of the authorities which I have always supposed to be law he is absolutely bound, and the commitment may be set aside if he refuses it.

Mr. LISTER. The statute provides that he may take the statement.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, he is bound to take the statement. He is bound to offer the accused an opportunity of making the statement. Irrespective of that statute, if the accused brings a witness, he is bound to take his evidence.

Mr. LAURIER. Do you go to that extent?

Mr. THOMPSON. I do.

Mr. LISTER. He is bound to receive it, not as evidence for the defence, but as the evidence of people cognisant of the fact.

Mr. THOMPSON. Quite so; and with the view of seeing whether there ought to be a commitment or not. It is quite true he is not to put himself in the position of a jury and try the case; and if, after hearing that testimony, it results in a conflict, it is a matter for the jury to decide, and he must commit for trial; but it is not a proper exercise of the power of magistrate at all to refuse to hear the witnesses who are called, and who may give a totally different color to the transaction.

Mr. MITCHELL. I presume there would be no objection to putting a clause in the Bill that the person accused may be permitted to give testimony in explanation of the charge.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am disposed to yield to that suggestion. With regard to telegraph instruments, I see the force of what was stated by the hon. gentleman opposite, and by the hon. member for Hamilton, but I do not think any hardship or oppression can result from keeping those words in. The fact is that the telegraph companies derive enormous profits from these bucket-shops. The prices which they get for supplying messages and receiving messages are enormous, and the instruments, which are liable to confiscation under this Bill, are of a very trifling value, only about \$6. If we can induce the telegraph companies to aid the operation of the law by exercising vigilance as to the kind of establishments in which they allow their instruments to be used, we will have a most efficient means of preventing the violation of the law.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). We are unanimous in feeling that these bucket-shops should be suppressed, as they are a source of great misery, but we have to see that we do not interfere with legitimate transactions. The amendments suggested by my hon. friend will certainly obviate

Mr. THOMPSON.

one of the objections which has been raised by the council, and which is as follows:—

"If A, a grain dealer, telegraphs to B, broker, to buy 10,000 bushels of May wheat, and sends an accepted cheque for ten per cent. margin, his intention being to sell the wheat when the price rises three points but not actually to receive such wheat, and merely making a bargain for the purchase of it, I take it that he is brought within the criminal clauses of the Act and the broker, aware of the intention of the customer, aids and abets in the act and is, therefore, liable."

That is the opinion of Mr. Blake, and it is not merely his opinion, but I find it is the opinion of all the other gentlemen who have given their views, and it seems to me that is a legitimate transaction. That is where the difficulty is. No doubt these bucket-shops, with the blackboards exposed, and so on, should be suppressed, but the legitimate trade should not be interfered with. The Minister of Justice has acceded to the suggestions of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran), which certainly has great weight, in reference to the position in which an innocent party might be placed. Some years ago the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) brought in a Bill in reference to the sale of stocks. The matter was very much discussed at the time, and it was thought then that the Bill might interfere with the regular stock exchange. The result was that the Bill was not passed and did not become law. While I think that the principle of this Bill should be carried out, and that this action is a very proper one, still it should be carefully seen that it does not go beyond bounds and does not become a means of oppression.

Mr. HAGGART. If I did not misunderstand the Minister of Justice, when he said that this Bill would require the delivery of the article, he said, you may make a contract for future delivery and at the time when the contract expires you can settle it in any manner you choose. I cannot understand how any person who enters into any contract for actual or future delivery, and it is future delivery which these bucket-shop men confine themselves to, can be punished at all under this Act. If the law is extended so that it does not require a delivery, so that you can enter into a legal contract for a future delivery, what punishment can you award to anyone who is speculating for a future delivery? All he has to do is to enter into a contract that the article shall be delivered at any future time, and then he can settle it in any way he likes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire of the Minister of Justice whether the object sought to be attained, as set forth in the preamble, would not be reached if he confined himself to dealing in stocks. From what I have seen in reference to the mischievous institutions which are known as bucket-shops, my impression is that they are nothing more or less than hells carried on in the day time, that they are gambling places of the worst kind; but the hon. gentleman is fixing very severe penalties, not only on the keepers of these institutions, who, no doubt, in many cases deserve what he proposes to inflict, but on all persons who are led in to deal in matters of this kind, and that is very far-reaching in its character. My own impression is that if these people were deprived of the right to make transactions in stocks of any incorporated or unincorporated company or undertaking, the hon. gentleman would effect all he desires to effect; and there is ground for fearing that the language of this Act is so wide as to interfere with transactions which are more or less legitimate, and which the Minister does not intend to bring within the purview of the criminal law. I do not myself like to create very severe penalties even for such reprehensible transactions as betting. There are other transactions which probably deserve more punishment than betting. I am very much disposed to put down these bucket-shops, as they are called, but I think that could be done just as well by eliminating

the words to which my hon. friends from Halifax and St. John have taken exception. I am aware that it is quite possible to gamble in pork, and wheat, and other things of that kind, but I do not think any great damage would result to the community from that comparable to that which results from the gambling in stocks which now goes on. I simply make the suggestion for the consideration of the Minister of Justice, who is responsible for this Bill in this House, and I think he would gain his object by confining his provisions to the one class of cases.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would accept the suggestion of the hon. gentleman in a moment if it were not that my information on the subject is entirely different from that of the hon. gentleman. No doubt the speculation in stocks is the principal evil in the United States, but in Canada I believe that the very worst kind of speculation is in articles of merchandise, such as pork, beef, wheat, iron and other articles of that kind. Speculation in stocks is not so popular in Canada, possibly because the people in the United States understand the position of stocks there, while the people who gamble in this way in Canada are not so well acquainted with them, but the class who frequent these establishments in Canada are supposed to be, and no doubt are to a great extent, familiar with those articles of merchandise to which I have referred, and a far greater proportion of the speculation in this country is in relation to the rise and fall of prices in merchandise. Of course I have the greatest respect for the professional authority of the gentlemen who have given their opinions on this subject, but I think, if we had the opportunity of discussing the provisions of this Bill, and the construction to be put upon them, the answers might have been framed somewhat differently. For instance, I find this answer:

"If A, a grain dealer, telegraphs to B, a broker, to buy him 10,00 bushels of May wheat and sends an accepted cheque for 10 per cent. margin, his intention being to sell the wheat when the price rises three points, but not actually to receive such wheat, and merely making a bargain for the purchase of it, I take it that he is brought within the criminal clauses of the Act."

I think the writer has misunderstood the provisions of the Bill, and I think that is apparent from his answer, although I say it with a good deal of deference to the opinion given by these gentlemen. But, when he says that the intention of the dealer was to sell the wheat, it is clear that it would be absolutely impossible that he could sell it if he never received delivery.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Not at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. Absolutely impossible. The hon. gentleman is talking about delivery in its ordinary sense, of coming into the possession of the man who makes the bargain, but, in the construction of an Act of Parliament, we have to take it in its legal sense, and it is as much delivered to him if it is delivered to his agent or his vendee 3,000 miles away as if it were resting in his own cellar or his own barn. So, if a contract is one that results either in delivery to the agent or the vendee of the purchaser, it is a contract which is not within the provisions of this Bill, because it is one from which delivery has resulted or will naturally result.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. Minister will see that the statement here was that the dealer was to sell the wheat again when the price rose three points. He never had the intention to receive the wheat. When he put up his margin, it was with the idea that he should purchase that quantity of wheat on speculation, and that when the wheat rose one, or two, or three points, he would sell it. He would never receive it.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is a perfectly legitimate transaction. The Act says that he must have the ownership of it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). But he never was the owner of it.

Mr. THOMPSON. He must have been the owner when it was his under control so that he could sell it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The broker would never have received it, and there is only a transaction between them to that extent. The communications which have been received by the Minister of Justice were all in regard to what are called bucket-shops. We are all in accord with the hon. gentlemen on that point, but at the time those communications were written, which was about the 12th April, the Bill had just been introduced. Since that time, ample opportunity has been given of studying the effects of the measure, and I suppose at that time the writers did not see the length to which this might go. Consequently, they submitted certain questions to these eminent legal gentlemen, who have answered in the way we have heard.

Mr. THOMPSON. These questions were not submitted by brokers.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No matter who submitted them.

Mr. THOMPSON. The reason I made that suggestion was for the purpose of showing him that although these letters were dated between the 5th and 20th April, these gentlemen have not receded from that position since. The bucket shop people have put these questions with a view of exciting the apprehensions of the legitimate brokers, and the only response they have got from the brokers is a request that we should put in an amendment like this.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It makes no difference from what source the enquiry came. I presume it came from the opponents of the Bill, but that does not affect the question at all. The questions were placed before these legal gentlemen, and they answered in distinct terms that any ordinary transaction with an honest intention to make it a proper and legitimate commercial transaction, might be brought within the scope of this Bill. I will give an illustration. I may own a ship, and I may charter it to a party to arrive two or three months hence. This is a very common occurrence. When she arrives the person who has chartered her, instead of carrying out his charter, may offer to give me a certain compensation and allow me to keep my ship, and I could not receive it under the operation of this Act.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Well, it is a legitimate transaction, and brokers frequently charter ships on speculation, relying on the condition of the market in the future to place her, so that they may secure themselves. The idea of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that speculations in the natural products are offensive to Christian morality and religion, I think, with all due deference to my hon. friend, is very far-fetched. My hon. friend, I think, himself, if he saw a good speculation in the future, would not be the last to avail himself of it, and to put up his margin, like all the rest of the commercial world, in pork, or wheat, or anything else. I repeat that I fear the Bill may go farther than is contemplated. Of course if it was confined to transactions in stocks, that would be perfectly right, but further than that I respectfully submit it should not go.

Mr. SCRIVER. I do not agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) in saying that it is of no consequence from whom these enquiries proceed. I think it is of great consequence. So far as we know, we have reason to believe that these enquiries from legal men have proceeded solely from the proprietors of bucket-shops; and as the Minister of Justice has stated, although a considerable time has elapsed since the communications which he read, were addressed to the Hon. Mr. Abbott, it is also a considerable time since the Bill passed through the Senate; and the leading brokers of the Dominion, in all the principal cities,

have, no doubt, taken communication of this Bill, and have communicated their views in the way the Minister of Justice has said, by suggesting a single amendment. Nor can I agree with my hon. friend in saying that transactions in grain or in provisions may be different, if they are purely betting transactions, from transactions upon stocks. I cannot see any difference between betting that a thousand bushels of wheat will be worth, two weeks hence, ten cents more than it is now, and betting that the stock on a certain railway will be worth ten cents more a share, two weeks hence, than it is now. For myself, so far as the immorality or the result of the transactions is concerned, they are quite analogous.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, when so severe a penalty as five years imprisonment is possible, whether he does not think that the introduction of the words "oral or written" leaves the door open for a put-up job to levy blackmail in certain cases—that is in section c, where a person "makes, or signs, or authorises to be made or signed, any contract or agreement, oral or written." It does appear to me that might leave a man a good deal at the mercy of mischievous scoundrels who might combine together to subject him to prosecution under this Act, in threatening such heavy penalties, that he might be obliged to ransom himself where his intention was perfectly innocent.

On section 4,

Mr. THOMPSON. To meet the suggestion of the hon. member for South Oxford, I propose to add the following:—"In any transaction under this act the person accused shall be a competent witness on his own behalf."

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

TERRITORIES REAL PROPERTY ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 104) further to amend chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes of Canada "The Territories Real Property Act."—(Mr. Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. THOMPSON. The first two sections of the Bill and some we shall meet further on, are rendered necessary by the fact that in the Province of Manitoba it has been decided that an equity of redemption, in real estate which is mortgaged, is not real property transmissible under this Act, and does not follow the procedure referred to in the Territories Real Property Act. It is proposed to state that land means any interest in land, and that the land shall go to the personal representative of the deceased.

On section 5,

Mr. THOMPSON. It has been found very desirable to appoint an inspector of the land offices. There are four registry offices in the North-West Territories, which are, of course, scattered over an immense distance. The duties of the registrars are complicated and difficult under "The Territories Real Property Act," and it is very desirable indeed that there should be uniformity in the practice, and that there should be some authority to whom they can refer. In addition it is necessary there should be a person qualified and authorised to act as a deputy in case of a vacancy taking place in any one of those registrarships. It is not sufficient that the registrars should be in a position to appoint a deputy, but it is further necessary that the person appointed should be a qualified person; and it is therefore proposed that there should be an inspector of the land titles office. The office is not an entirely new one, as when the Act was coming into force I suggested to my

Mr. SCRIVER.

late colleague, the Minister of Interior, the necessity, in introducing so suddenly an Act so elaborate and complicated as this Act, of having some person to visit the different land offices and instruct the registrars in their duties, and he employed a professional gentleman for that purpose. The adoption of this provision of the present Bill will entail a cost of about \$1,500 a year for salary, in addition to a travelling allowance of \$3.50 a day during the days when he will necessarily travel; but, considering the important interests involved, both as regards the property holders themselves and the public who are interested—because we insure every certificate of title we issue—it will not be money thrown away, and I think those hon. gentlemen who represent the Territories more especially will concur with me in thinking that the services of the gentleman who has performed those duties in the past have been practically useful. I propose to strike out of the third line the words "no person shall be appointed inspector of the lands title office unless he is a barrister or attorney, of at least three years' standing, in one of the Provinces or Territories of Canada." I do not think legal qualifications will be absolutely essential. It may be that some person who has been found to be expert in the performance of his duties as a registrar, may be considered to be as competent a person as a gentleman who has had a legal training and the short legal experience called for by this section.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not sure that the last suggestion made by the Minister of Justice is altogether a good one. The system of registration in force in the Territories, which I believe is a very good system, is somewhat complicated, and I quite approve of the suggestion of the Minister of Justice to have an inspector, because, unless those officers are very well kept, they may be the cause of a good deal of confusion and loss to parties interested. It is not only necessary that the offices should be well kept, but that there should be proper superintendence, and I would go still further and exact from the inspector a minute and accurate report as to the state of the offices. Unless it is provided that the holder of the office shall possess special technical knowledge in regard to the registration system, it is doubtful whether he could properly discharge the duties.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has this appointment of inspector arisen out of the working of the Act in the North-West, or otherwise? I do not remember any such system being in force or found to be necessary, although the Act has been in operation and working very well for a great many years.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am not sure that there is an inspector in the Australian colonies, but there is a Registrar General in each of the colonies, who exercises the control which it is proposed the inspector in the North-West shall exercise. In connection with the Torrens Act in Ontario there is a Master of Titles in Toronto. If it is the view of the committee that the legal qualification should be retained, I will not press my point.

Mr. LAURIER. It is the Torrens' system you have adopted in the North-West, but unless the affairs of the offices are accurately regulated, and there is a strict superintendence exercised, most damaging results may happen to parties interested.

Mr. DAVIN. The North-West members would prefer having this qualification in. I think myself our judgment on that subject ought to control.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would, if those gentlemen supplied the money to carry out those things, but they do not.

Mr. EDGAR. Can you give us any idea of the volume of business done? On this would largely depend what the inspector would have to do.

Mr. THOMPSON. The volume of business has not been great. I am aware that questions, even though not of a complicated character, are disposed of differently, in the different offices; the officers are unwilling to change their practice without the controlling authority of some person who has the right to direct them. We think it would secure uniformity to have an inspector visit those offices occasionally.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman intend that this inspector is to be one of the registrars?

Mr. THOMPSON. No; he is to be a different officer from the registrars.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What time will the inspector be engaged?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it will take him about two-thirds of the year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Surely it will not take him that long. When he lays down one rule of uniformity it will have to be carried out by the registrars.

Mr. THOMPSON. It will be his duty to decide difficult questions in different offices. At present a large number of them come to Ottawa, and it is found to be very inconvenient.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman say what salary he will pay?

Mr. THOMPSON. My own opinion is that about \$1,500 a year would secure a competent person. Of course we will allow him travelling expenses.

Mr. LAURIER. Do you require him to report yearly?

Mr. THOMPSON. Oh, yes, more frequently than that; quarterly at least.

Mr. LAURIER. To some extent you give him judicial powers. He should give in his decision and report.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think he should be required to report quarterly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It will be an additional charge, at any rate, on our revenues.

On section 8,

Mr. THOMPSON. An office fee of \$10 is charged to every homesteader when he obtains an entry for a quarter section of land, which is always represented as being the fee necessary to procure him a title to his land in fee simple on the performance of the duties prescribed by the Dominion Lands Act; and it has always been the custom of the department to give to a purchaser of land direct from the Crown letters patent for the same without the payment of any fee or charge whatever other than the price of the land. The object of sub-section 2 of this section is to provide for the issue of such certificate of title free of charge where there are no registered encumbrances affecting the land. Sub-sections 3 and 4 were to render unnecessary the issue of patents to the Hudson's Bay Company for their lands, thereby saving an immense amount of useless work to the Department of the Interior. It is proposed simply to recognise, as a grant from the Crown in the same way as if letters patent were issued, the notification to the company already provided for by the Dominion Lands Act. Sub-section 5 is intended to provide for the conveyance of lands in large areas to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and other railway corporations, entitled to Dominion lands, by notification to the registrar and without the issue of letters patent.

On section 9,

Mr. THOMPSON. The tariff at present in force provides that a person to whom a patent had issued before the Real Property Act came into force may register his Crown deed

upon payment of \$1. The object of this amendment is to make it unnecessary, since there is no risk to the Crown in the registration of such a deed where the lands are not encumbered, that the percentage provided for by clause 133 of the Act, with a view to the creation of an assurance fund, should be paid.

On section 10,

Mr. THOMPSON. Section 94 of the Act makes all the necessary provisions in regard to the delivery to the registrar by the sheriff of a copy of any writ or process affecting land, and the provisions of sub-section "c" of section 46 of that Act are therefore unnecessary. Moreover, they entail an unnecessary expense of at least one dollar to every person bringing his land under the operation of the Act. The law requires that a certificate shall be furnished from the proper officer, showing that there are no taxes in arrear against the land.

On section 11,

Mr. THOMPSON. This is in relation to a release of a mortgage, and provides that a certificate on the back of the mortgage or a copy of it is sufficient to discharge the mortgage.

On section 12,

Mr. THOMPSON. This abolishes the requirement of the mention in the certificate of the intermediate conveyances. I think the registration of the intermediate conveyances on the face of the certificate is undesirable. It may be that, owing to the change of title being accomplished by possession, or by descent, or by a judgment of a court, the mention of the intermediate conveyances would not on its face show the consecutive change of tenure; and besides, there may be objections in law or equity to those conveyances. It is in accordance with the Torrens' system that the certificate should be simple and should result in the transfer of land as quickly as the transfer of a share in a bank.

On section 13,

Mr. THOMPSON. By this amendment it is proposed to make it compulsory for the registrar to enter in his register the memorandum of any process affecting land which may have been delivered to him by the sheriff. If the land has already been brought under the operation of the Act, the entry must be made by the registrar immediately upon the delivery to him of the process affecting the land; but if not, then such entry is to be made as soon as the title has been registered.

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

After Recess.

RELIEF OF ELEANORA ELIZABETH TUDOR.

Mr. SMALL moved second reading of Bill (No. 128) for the relief of Eleonora Elizabeth Tudor (from the Senate).

House divided:

YEAS:
Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),	Hudspeth,	Putnam,
Barron,	Innes,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Robertson,
Bowman,	Jones (Digby),	Roome,
Boyle,	Kirkpatrick,	Ross,
Brien,	Lang,	Rowand,
Brown,	Laurie,	Rykert,
Burdett,	Lister,	Scriven,
Cargill,	Livingston,	Semple,
Carling,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Shaully,
Carpenter,	Macdonald (Huron),	Skinner,
Cochrane,	Macdowall,	Small,
Cockburn,	McOulla,	Smith (Ontario),
Davies,	McDonald (Victoria),	Sproule,

Davis,	McDougald (Picou),	Taylor,
Denison,	McKay,	Temple,
Dickinson,	McKeen,	Trow,
Edgar,	McMillan (Huron),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Ellis,	McNeil,	Tupper (Picou),
Fisher,	Mara,	Tyrwhitt,
Foster,	Mar-hall,	Watson,
Freeman,	Mills (Annapolis),	Weldon (Albert),
Gillmor,	Moncrieff,	Welsh,
Gordon,	Montague,	White,
Hale,	Mulock,	Wilmot,
Hall,	O'Brien,	Wilson (Lennox),
Henderson,	Perley (Assiniboia),	Wood (Brockville), and
Hessom,	Perley (Ottawa),	Wood (Westmoreland).
Hickey,	Porter,	—86.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Dupont,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Armstrong,	Gigault,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Bain (Soulanges),	Grandbois,	Montplaisir,
Béchar,	Guay,	Perry,
Bourassa,	Haggart,	Purcell,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Joncas,	Riafret,
Choquette,	Jones (Halifax),	Ste. Marie,
Simon,	Kirk,	Somerville,
Couture,	Laugévin (Sir Hector),	Thompson,
Curran,	Laurier,	Turcot, and
Dawson,	Lovitt,	Wilson (Elgin).—34.
De St. Georges,		

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were read the second time, on the same division :—

Bill (No. 129) for the relief of Andrew Maxwell Irving (from the Senate).—(Mr. Small).

Bill (No. 130) for the relief of Catharine Morrison (from the Senate).—(Mr. Small).

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think that it is very unfortunate that our system of government requires that these Bills should be brought before this House. We have a law on our statutes preventing the introduction into this country of obscene literature and other works of an improper character; yet, under the sanction of Parliament, such literature is distributed to the members of this House. I do think that the time has arrived when it would be well that these proceedings should be avoided, if possible. I have always consistently and persistently voted against these divorce resolutions, and I voted against them in the interest of society. I do not regard these resolutions in the same way as do some of my hon. friends who vote with me. Looking at the influence these measures have on society at large, looking to the effect that similar measures have had on society across the border, where the marriage tie has frequently become nothing more than licensed adultery, the time has arrived when hon. gentlemen in this House, even those who cannot accept the view which I hold against divorce *per se*, might be brought to consider the proposal whether the time has not arrived when it would be better, in the interests of the country at large, that we should be able to establish a divorce court to dispose of these questions. We have a divorce court in the Lower Provinces, in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, where those unfortunate disclosures, when such questions are submitted to them, are treated in a more private manner. They are not made the subject of public comment, they are not distributed to the members of the Legislatures, they do not reach the employes of the Legislatures, from the oldest to the youngest; and it occurs to me that the time has arrived when gentlemen who hold the same views as I do on the same grounds, and those who hold them on very different grounds, should be brought to consider the propriety of agreeing to the establishment of some court, and thus spare us the exhibitions made here from year to year. I make this statement

Mr. THOMPSON.

to protect my own view, because I believe there is sufficient good, sound, honest feeling in this country at large to protect the public from the distribution of literature in connection with these transactions such as has been distributed during the last three or four weeks.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) very properly exclaims against the distribution of obscene literature. I must say that I have not seen any of it. The hon. gentleman may have. We may remember the story of the lady who said to Dr. Johnson, when his dictionary came out, that she congratulated him very much on his book, particularly because there were no bad words in it. Dr. Johnson said, "Madam, I am afraid you have been looking for them." I am afraid that my hon. friend's experience of this literature may, perhaps, have arisen from the same source. I may say, however, that I am opposed to a divorce court. I think it would be a great misfortune for Canada to have that established, where these cases become a matter of regular daily discussion. The hon. gentleman has said that it would prevent the publication of evidence of this kind, but these courts are open, as they ought to be, and the evidence is taken, and is published, as we can see very easily by looking into any of the English papers. Some of the most disgusting kind of evidence is published in the legal reports and the legal columns of the *Times* and other newspapers. It is only in very exceptional cases that the evidence in Canada is taken except privately, and I may say that that practice is not to be encouraged, because secret tribunals are always objectionable, and between the two evils we should choose the least. That trials affecting the character and the reputation and the property of parties should be left to private tribunals, is, I think, an abuse of our legal system, and is contrary to the liberty of the subject and to a proper check upon the tribunals themselves. Between the two evils of having the evidence published and having secret trials, I would prefer, notwithstanding the objection the hon. gentleman has taken to it, the publication of the evidence, to the institution of secret tribunals. I prefer our system here, which offers very considerable impediments to the granting of divorces, to the systems which prevail elsewhere. We have not very many of these cases. Of course, as our population increases, we have more divorce cases, but they are very few and far between as compared with those which would certainly crowd our court if it were once established. That has been the experience of England, and of those who once strongly supported the establishment of that court, and the transfer of the trial of these divorces from the Legislature to the court, very many have seriously repented their advocacy of that measure, because the number of divorces, the corruption of society and the number of collusive trials are increasing to the annually increasing degradation of the public mind.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I differ with the hon. gentleman. I think the arguments he has used to-night are the strongest I have yet heard in favor of the establishment of a divorce court. We are asked here to grant divorces, as we pass any Act of Parliament, and the hon. gentleman says that we grant these without reading the evidence. Can anything be conceived more pitiable than the fact of this Parliament passing a vote on a serious case of this kind, where the matrimonial bond is to be dissolved, without, as the leader of the Government states, anybody reading the evidence in regard to it.

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

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman suggested that one hon. gentleman who had read the evidence had done something which was improper, and he took credit to himself for voting without reading the evidence. If the

leader of the Government has done that, what may be expected from the rank and file. I was led to the conclusion, which I have expressed, very largely by the discussion in the other Chamber on the case which we have just voted upon. I read the speech of the leader of the Government in the Senate, and I found that he argued that the Senate was not to be bound by any of the rules adopted by the House of Lords before the Divorce Court was established in England; that there was no legal rule guiding their decisions to which any ordinary member could look, or under which he could act *pro* or *con*; that every man could use his own judgment and do what was right in his own eyes; that the decision was to be an arbitrary decision in every case; in fact, that the man or the woman who canvassed the hardest in the lobby was the one who would win. After reading that, I judged that there was no rule guiding the Senate, and I came to the conclusion that a rule should be adopted and that a tribunal should be established which would be guided by fixed principles, in the hands of judges, so that in this very important matter we might know what we are doing. I know that there is a large section, a religious section of our people, who are opposed to the granting of divorces altogether, but it must be evident to them that at present divorces are granted year after year, not because facts show in the greater number of cases that these should be granted, but because the parties on one side or the other have evoked a certain amount of sympathy; that they are granted, not because of the evidence taken, but simply because those who are promoting the Bill are more or less active. I think it would be far better that we should leave these questions to trained judges and trained lawyers. Draw the line as closely as you like, but leave it to these trained men to carry it out. If that system were adopted, we would not see the absurdities which I have seen during the short time that I have been in this House, and which we witness year after year. I venture the assertion now that there are not a dozen gentlemen here who have read the evidence in this case from end to end; I doubt if there are half a dozen; and yet we are voting *pro* and *con* on the question of whether this divorce Bill shall be passed or not. If we had any principle laid down on which a divorce should be granted, if we had it decided that it should be on the ground of adultery or for any other cause, we could vote almost in the dark, because we would be certain that the Bill would not pass the other Chamber without the promoter having established a case; but the leader of the Government in the Senate has laid it down, with the assent of legal lights on both sides, that they are bound by no principles whatever in regard to these matters, that they are a law unto themselves, that they are not bound by the precedents of the House of Lords or of the Divorce Court in England, or by any other precedent, but that they can act just as it strikes them in regard to each case, so that, if the promoter is represented by able counsel, she gains her case, and if she is represented by counsel not quite so able, she loses it. A more lamentable state of affairs cannot be conceived of, and the picture which the hon. gentleman draws of what takes place on the other side of the border is bright compared to what takes place here. The only redeeming feature is, that we have so few of these cases, and I do not think the tribunal before which they come has any reason to congratulate itself on that, because it is due to the morality of our people.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I just want to say one word in explanation. I stated that I was against divorces *per se*, and I do not think that I argued in favor of having any secret tribunal, but I instanced the fact that in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia we had a court which conducted these cases without any publicity being given to them. I agree with the hon. gentleman that nothing of that kind should be carried on in a secret tribunal.

Mr. SCRIVER. I am very sorry to hear the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) make an imputation concerning our neighbors across the line, to which I think he would not have given expression if he had weighed his words a little more carefully. When he spoke of the marriage tie between the people of the United States as licensed adultery, I think he used an expression which is not warranted by the facts. I suppose it is a lamentable fact that divorces in some of the States are procured with great facility; but I do not believe there is an hon. gentleman in this House who would disagree with me when I assert that the great majority of those who are living in the marriage relation in the United States, regard that tie as sacredly as any member of this House.

Mr. MULOCK. I am unable to agree with the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). He objects to the practice which, he says, has prevailed in this House; but I am not aware of any divorces having been granted by the Parliament of Canada under conditions that would not have been recognised by the divorce courts in England. I think when any one doubts the ability of this House to deal with the questions of fact involved in an application for divorce, he is also called upon, if consistent, to condemn the system of trial by jury generally. Surely the House can supply as good a jury as is called together anywhere in the country, to try any question of fact under the judicial system prevailing in the Provinces. The only possible objection, in my mind, that can be advanced—and I do not think it is a sound one—against the present system, is that it is an expensive one. Even if that objection were well founded, it would not altogether justify a departure from this practice. But I maintain that a divorce through this House does not cost more than it would under any ordinary action at law. The expenses are not heavy; therefore, I think the statement that is sometimes made that divorces in Canada are only within reach of the rich, is not well founded. I think the facility with which divorces are granted in England and in other countries, does go a long way to interfere with the sacredness of the marriage tie. But, at all events, in the Province of Ontario, people joining together in the holy bonds of matrimony, feel that it is a life contract, and this makes them careful to do nothing that would justify either of them applying to be relieved from the contract. There is no reason that justifies, in my opinion, the establishment of a divorce court for the Province of Ontario. Divorce courts do exist in certain other of the Provinces. If it is sought to harmonise legislation, that may be a reason for all these cases being brought before Parliament, but it does not supply a reason, I think, for adopting the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Queen's.

REPRESENTATION OF RUSSELL.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the certificate of the Returning Officer at the last election for the Electoral District of the County of Russell, that William Cameron Edwards, Esq., was duly elected for the said Electoral District.

Sir HECTOR LANGENIN moved:

That it be resolved that in admitting William Cameron Edwards, Esq., elected to represent the Electoral District of the County of Russell, to take his seat upon the production of the certificate of the Returning Officer, the House still recommends a strict adherence to the practice of requiring the production of the usual return.

Motion agreed to.

TERRITORIES REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENTS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (104) further to amend Chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, "The Territories Real Property Act."

(In the Committee.)

On section 14,

Mr. THOMPSON. The only change is made in the 38th line of the Bill by the insertion of the words "and the registrar shall thereupon if the title has been registered, or so soon as the title has been registered under the provisions of this Act." The policy of the Act is to enable encumbrances to be recorded prior to bringing the lands under the Act, and it is the duty of the registrar to note the lien so created, and to register against the land.

On section 16,

Mr. THOMPSON. This is a new provision intended to regulate the sub-division of lots. We know that the system of land transfer is based on the rectangular system of survey, and the object of this section is to prevent lots, once placed on the register, from being sub-divided and conveyed by vague descriptions and monuments, maps being deposited drawn on a certain scale showing certain particulars.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In sections where a sale is made they will have to exhibit the map and plan of the whole section.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, and of the manner in which it is to be divided.

On section 17,

Mr. THOMPSON. The alteration there is merely verbal. Sub section 2, is changed in accordance with other amendments that we passed this afternoon.

On section 18,

Mr. THOMPSON. The object is to give an appeal to the Supreme Court of the North-West Territories from the decision of a judge. I mentioned this afternoon that there was a want of uniformity in the administration of the Act, and that want of uniformity has been quite as apparent in regard to the decisions of the judges there, as in the practice of the registrars.

Committee rose and reported.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

William Cameron EDWARDS, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Russell, introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Armstrong.

INSPECTOR OF LAND TITLES OFFICE.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the salary of the inspector of land titles office to be appointed in connection with the carrying into effect of "The Territories Real Property Act."—(Mr. Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the salary of this officer should be fixed, so that we may know what the salary is going to be.

Mr. THOMPSON. When the vote is taken for the North-West I will mention the sum proposed to be fixed, and if that meets with the concurrence of the House the salary will be fixed at that sum.

Committee rose and reported, and resolutions read the first and second time, and concurred in.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 104) further to amend chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, "The Territories Real Property Act."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. member for West Assiniboia has given notice of some amendments. As regards the first I think the amendment by which he proposes to insert the words "or territories" after the words "provinces" is unnecessary, because, by the Interpretation Act, province is declared to include the North-West Territories. As to the other amendments, I have no objection to them.

Committee rose and reported.

THE INSURANCE ACT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 126) to amend chapter 124 of the Revised Statutes respecting Insurance. He said: My hon. friend from West Toronto raised the question as to the position companies would be in, which have Ontario charters and which came under the provisions of this Act. I have looked into that matter, and I find that a remedy is provided in the Ontario Act. Section 3 in the Insurance Act of Ontario, which went into force on the 13th of January, 1887, and is still in force, provides as follows:—

"The provisions of this Act shall not apply to a company licensed by the Dominion of Canada, except as to sections 114 to 120 inclusive, which shall apply to all fire insurance companies transacting business in Ontario."

These relate to the statutory condition of fire policies, which are binding on all fire companies now licensed in the Dominion. Section 43 of the Ontario Act is as follows:—

"A company which has made a deposit under the Act shall be entitled to withdraw the deposit on the sanction of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, whenever it is made to appear to the satisfaction of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council that the company is carrying on its business of insurance under a license of the Dominion of Canada."

As soon, therefore, as a Dominion license is granted to an Ontario fire company, it will cease to be subject to the inspection or to be in any way under the control of the officers of the Ontario Government; and if it has made a deposit with the Ontario Government, it will be at liberty to withdraw it. This removes all difficulty and danger of conflict between the two. The Ontario Act provides that in that case they come under the inspection of the Dominion Government and are entitled to withdraw their deposit from Ontario.

Mr. EDGAR. So the Finance Minister contends that it is optional in each case?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Mr. EDGAR. And, if it is exercised by the Dominion, either by license or in any other way, it takes it out of the control of the Provincial Government?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By the consent of the Provincial authority?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, under the Provincial Act.

Mr. MULLOCK. I have not seen the Bill of the Finance Minister, but, when he introduced it, I understood him to mention that it referred to fire and life insurance companies in the same connection. I do not know whether the Bill proposes to deal with what I have in my mind, but I think it is a very unsound policy to have these two classes of insurance combined, and I think the money which is collected by life insurance companies should not be endangered by being embarked in fire insurance. If the Bill does not deal with that question, I hope the Government will take the matter up, and at some future stage attempt to deal with that subject. There is nothing that we are assuming jurisdiction over, and giving, to some extent, sanction to, which is more important than the matter of life insurance. We

can easily see that the whole maintenance of a man's family might be swept away by the failure of an insurance company, and the two risks of fire and life are so distinct that I do not think there can be any justification for our giving sanction to allowing life insurance funds, which should be placed only on such securities as trustees would be justified in accepting, to be made responsible for fire losses.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The object of this Bill is simply to apply to companies having provincial charters the same provisions which are made in regard to American companies doing business in Canada, that is, to enable them, by making a deposit with the Federal Government, to carry on their business. But the point which my hon. friend has made is a very important one, and will receive attention.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think our present law provides that the funds for these two insurances shall be kept distinct, and I think that a great deal of the duty of the Superintendent of Insurance is to make sure that these two insurances shall be kept distinct and that none of the funds which are received for life insurance shall be applied for fire losses. I speak from recollection, and I think the Minister of Finance stated that this Bill would be subjected to the provisions, in all respects of the general Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is provided in this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As these proceedings are informal in a sense, I suppose it is understood that, if any discussion is required on the third reading, it will proceed as if we were in committee?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Committee reported.

SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 113) to amend the Summary Convictions Act.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULOCK. Would the Minister of Justice explain the object of this Bill?

Mr. THOMPSON. The changes in sections 29 and 30 provide that a constable may serve a subpoena out of the county of the magistrate who issues it. In the second place, that a witness refusing to obey the summons may be arrested and detained before the magistrate until the time of trial, or he must give security that he will appear at the trial. Third, the magistrate has power to fine and imprison a witness so refusing, for contempt, as well as to oblige him to pay costs. These provisions are principally taken from the Speedy Trials Act, and it is proposed to give the same procedure to magistrates.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not object to the change in the 29th section, but I ask the hon. gentleman to consider whether we are doing wisely in passing that 30th section. Now, that 30th section is more far-reaching and more important than hon. members imagine. The magistrate now has power, if his summons is disobeyed, or if he thinks the witness will not obey the summons, in certain circumstances, to issue a warrant and to arrest the man and bring him to court; and we here give him summary power, which generally belongs to courts of record alone, to punish for contempt. But you say that he may summarily determine that there has been contempt, although the summons may not have been personally served; and I would suggest

178

to the hon. gentleman whether he is not giving too great a power to the magistrates.

Mr. THOMPSON. I consent to make the change in accordance with the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. MULOCK. If the magistrates determine to keep the witness in custody, would it not be right to entitle the witness to an immediate examination, and then to be discharged from custody? Once in custody he can be kept in custody after giving his evidence, because the case may be adjourned, and he may still be required as a witness, and his imprisonment goes on until the case is disposed of before the magistrate. Would it not be right to allow an opportunity to purge himself from contempt?

Mr. THOMPSON. I consent to the change.

On section 7,

Mr. THOMPSON. In the section 76 there is this provision:

"Unless it is otherwise provided, any special Act under which a conviction takes place, or an order is made by a justice."

I propose to strike out the following:—

"Or unless some other court of appeal having jurisdiction in the premises, is provided by an Act of the legislature of the Province within which such conviction takes place."

It seems to be clear that the Legislature of a Province cannot make provision for the court of appeal, for this is purely criminal procedure.

Mr. BARRON. There is an important provision in the Ontario Act allowing each party to go into the case *de novo*. This is found to work very well, for by the evidence taken before the magistrate it has sometimes happened that justice has not been done. It would be very desirable to allow parties to go into the case *de novo* before a county court judge.

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand that to be the practice now.

Committee reported, and Bill read the third time and passed.

THE RAILWAY ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 24) to amend and consolidate the Railway Act.

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Mr. EDGAR. Will the Minister explain why this is absolutely necessary?

Mr. THOMPSON. The section is of a corresponding number in the old Act, and it contains substantially the same provisions excepting this: that the portions of the Act which are made applicable to all railways are numbered and that Act is divided into three parts. We have therefore recast the section and we have inserted as new words "offences and penalties." Otherwise the clause is just the same.

Mr. EDGAR. It was called part 3 of the Act before.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes; I may state briefly now that sections 31 to 83 have reference to the organisation of the company, the conduct of directors, the making of calls, and various provisions of that kind.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Are not all railways incorporated under the legislative authority of Canada under the Act?

Mr. THOMPSON. Only since the passing of the Railway Act, I presume.

Mr. EDGAR. This would seem to apply to companies to which these provisions are not applicable—that is provincial companies.

Mr. THOMPSON. Certain of them are. A railway is now under the authority of the Parliament of Canada, by virtue of its having been so declared, or otherwise, but that company would not have under its charter those provisions relating to the organisation, or calls, or conduct of the directors, and so forth. It is to enable the company to get under the operation of those sections.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The second section would appear to do that.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think this section is inconsistent.

Mr. LAURIER. It is evidently the intention that it should be optional, and that certain parties in the land should be subject to the law of the land, if they choose to be so. The law should be made for everybody equally.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is made for everybody equally, who comes under its provisions by getting legislation after the Act has passed. Those companies have now their systems, and we cannot without revising all their charters force them under the provisions of this Act. The object of this is when they so rearrange their economy, that they can apply to come under the Act and ask to be brought under its special provisions.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Would this enable them to supersede any special Act?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 8,

Mr. SHANLY. I should like to see it provided that the Minister of Justice should form one of the quorum. Parties will always be heard by counsel, and when points of law are brought up, I think it right that the judicial mind of the committee should be there. Three members of the Privy Council form the committee, and any two form a quorum. What I would suggest is that of those two the Minister of Justice should always be one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is this objection to that, that in the absence of the Minister of Justice, it might be impossible to obtain a decision on a very simple matter.

Mr. MITCHELL. When questions of law came up the committee would desire to postpone their decision until the Minister of Justice could be present.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If my memory serves me, the committee in former times numbered four. Very extensive powers are given to this Railway Committee, and I think it ought to consist of five with three for a quorum, as I understand their decision is to be final.

Mr. SHANLY. I quite agree with my hon. friend that if their decision is to be final the committee should be increased to five with three as a quorum.

Mr. EDGAR. This Act very largely extends the powers of the Railway Committee; I fancy that is the real object of putting this Act through this Session. The Railway Committee before consisted of at least four members, and now it is reduced to three. I think we should certainly have a larger body or an appeal or both, considering the extraordinary interests involved. It would be retrogressive legislation to place such enlarged powers in the hands of a smaller body without appeal. I agree with the hon. mem-

Mr. WILSON (St. John)

ber for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) that the number should be increased to five, perhaps with an appeal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It does not limit the number to three.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But it leaves the power in the hands of two, and those two may not include the Minister of Justice, and there is no appeal. One could easily conceive cases in which the decision of two members would be rather unsatisfactory.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will make the number four, with a quorum of three.

Mr. SHANLY. I still think it important that the Minister of Justice should always form one of the quorum.

Mr. EDGAR. The difficulty is that there is only one Minister of Justice, and the whole business might be obstructed if he were absent. It would be better to have an appeal, I think.

On section 11,

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Justice will point out to the committee in what particulars the powers of the Railway Committee are increased by this section? Some of them may be additional powers. If they are, we certainly ought to consider them.

Mr. THOMPSON. Sub-section *a* is new, for the reason that this Bill for the first time provides that one company may have right of way through the lands of another company. Sub-section *b* is equivalent to sub-section 16 of section 6 of the former Act. Sub-section *c* is equivalent to sub-section 15 of section 6 of the former Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why do you make it "the construction of branch lines exceeding one quarter of a mile in length." They might require a branch line a little shorter.

Mr. THOMPSON. This is not dealing with the powers of a company, but with the control of the railway company. If the branch line is less than a quarter of a mile, the company can construct it without coming to the Railway Committee.

Mr. EDGAR. I think that companies had the power before of making branch lines six miles in length.

Mr. THOMPSON. No; these powers are subject to the control of the Railway Committee. Sub-section *d* has its equivalent in section 13 of the old Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In what exact respects does sub-section *d* differ from sub-section *a*?

Mr. THOMPSON. Sub-section *d* provides for the crossing of the tracks, and sub-section *a* provides for right of way over lands owned by another railway company, and not the mere intersection of the road-bed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman mean by *a* that the Railway Committee would have power to allow another railway to plant itself immediately adjacent to railway No. 1?

Mr. THOMPSON. No, not to replace it on the track.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But they have got a limit of some 66 feet allowed them. Would that clause *a* allow a railway company to run within 25 or 30 feet of the other track?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On the ground originally granted to the first one.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, and it would enable the company to enter the station ground or the shunting yard of another company which cannot be done now. All that is

based on the principle that we should have some system of enabling one railway to get over the lands of another railway company—not in all cases, but subject to the control of the Railway Committee. If that should not be done, and it cannot be done under the present Act, the obstruction is such that in some cases railways cannot be built. All that is needed to prevent another railway coming into proximity is for the existing railway company to purchase lands alongside in such a way as to obstruct the new railway.

Mr. EDGAR. They can only purchase lands for railway purposes.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is easy for them to make it appear that they are for railway purposes. Sub-section *e* has its equivalent in section 7, sub-section 2 of the old Act. Sub-section *f* is new: "the use by one company of the tracks or station grounds of another company." Sub-section *g*, "the construction of works in navigable waters," has its equivalent in sections 91, 92, 93 and 94 of the old Act. Sub-section *i* is the equivalent of section 48, and *j* is the equivalent of section 74. Sub-sections *k* and *l* have their equivalent in section 16, sub-sections 9, 10, 11, 12. Sub-section *l*, "the adjustment of such tolls and rates between companies," has its equivalent in section 56, sub-sections 1 and 2. Sub-section *m* "running powers or haulage" is new. Sub-section *n*, "traffic arrangement" has its equivalent in section 56, sub-section 2. The other sub-sections are new.

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to these sub-sections *a* and *f*, and also having regard to section 102 of the Act, which also is allowed to stand, it appears that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council have taken powers to themselves without appeal, to do what never could be done in Canada before, namely, to allow one railway company whom they may choose to favor—if they should happen to show any favor—to expropriate the station grounds, the right of way, and in fact all the property of the existing company, without any regard even to compensation under this Act. If there were compensation provided, that would be a little matter compared to the entire destruction of the franchise, which might be worked by the arbitrary exercise of this power. I am speaking of the two clauses of section 11, *a* and *f*, both of which are new, and when those are read in connection with clause 102, there is a complete system devised of destroying the franchises, if the Government were so disposed, of one railway company in favor of another. There is no use disguising the fact that the company which is aimed at by this legislation is the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, it is not.

Mr. EDGAR. That is the company which owns the largest properties from one end of the country to the other, and a new company, the Canadian Pacific Railway, or other companies which are proposing to construct new lines, will be able, if they can persuade the Privy Council Committee to do it, to expropriate the valuable properties of the Grand Trunk Railway all over the country for the benefit of rival railways, and there is no appeal. I will admit that if a proper appeal to some independent tribunal, not influenced by, we will say, political considerations—some judicial tribunal like the Supreme Court—were given, legislation of this kind might, perhaps, be justifiable; but as it is proposed here, it is arbitrary, unprecedented and entirely unjustified.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has only, after all, stated that in taking power to do right, we are taking power to do wrong. All reasonable men admit that power must be conferred, notwithstanding that it may be abused.

Mr. EDGAR. With limitations.

Mr. THOMPSON. In every country where any extensive railway system prevails, it is found necessary to allow that the property rights of one railway company should be at times interfered with by another railway company. This provision is no more aimed at the Grand Trunk Railway than at the Canadian Pacific Railway. It gives no more rights against the Grand Trunk Railway than it gives against the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is simply to prevent obstructions, which would absolutely prohibit the passing of lines of railway across the property of other companies.

Mr. EDGAR. They always could cross.

Mr. THOMPSON. They could cross the track but not the lands, and if, for the mere purpose of obstruction, one railway company may buy an acre of land at a point at which another railway proposes to cross, there is an end of that other railway ever reaching its termination. Is that right or wrong? The hon. gentleman says it is unprecedented. Not only do these powers exist in the United States, not only do they exist in the interstate commission, but they are exercised there without appeal, and they are far wider because they enable, not merely the crossing of a railway, but the absolute expropriation of even the track of a railway in some cases.

Mr. EDGAR. How about England? They cannot be found in England.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am not able to inform the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman will not say that in England one railway company can prevent the construction of another, as it can in this country by buying a piece of land or expropriating it for another purpose. I have heard the solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway along with others, who suggested an amendment to this Bill. The solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway said this Bill was going very far to enable one company to expropriate the property of another, but, he has asked that we should be careful to provide that the ordinary principles of compensation shall be established, and I have agreed to do that.

Mr. EDGAR. What about an appeal?

Mr. THOMPSON. A railway company should have no more appeal than I should have, if my property were taken. We propose in this Bill on every question that comes before the arbitrators to give an appeal, but no more than the ordinary appeal should be had.

Mr. EDGAR. Only on points of law.

Mr. THOMPSON. No. On all questions of compensation which can possibly be reviewed.

Mr. EDGAR. What tribunal.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will explain that as we go along. We are putting railway companies on the same footing as regards compensation as other property owners.

Mr. SHANLY. The Committee of the Privy Council decide what lands should be taken, but you refer the cost to the ordinary means of compensation for the valuation of that land with power of appeal.

Mr. EDGAR. Yes.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not think these powers are any greater than those which are taken in the United States, and in England also. I think that the Railway Commissioners in England have powers quite as extensive as these, but I think we have been reduced to rather a peculiar position in Canada by reason of the fact that we have not followed out the legislation contained in this Bill, as it has been followed out in England and the United States, and have not provided the tribunal necessary to give effect to the legislation; and now we have legislation of this very strong kind, as I think I may call it, committed into the hands of the Privy Council, in other words, committed to

gentlemen who are simply politicians. I think that is a very improper state of affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me that there is an immense power taken by the Government under this Bill. I do not say that it is not necessary that some person should have the authority described in the Bill as vested in the Privy Council. I am not prepared to say, with some of my friends on this side of the House, that one railway company should not have a right to take the lands of another railway company under a great necessity. The Grand Trunk Company, the pioneers of railway enterprise in Canada, may have an entrance to certain cities, to Montreal and to Toronto, and I am not prepared to say that no other railway should have the right to get into those places, which might be the case if the opportunity was previously taken by another railway. I think that is what my hon. friend desires to provide against, and I think it is reasonable that such a provision should be put in the Railway Act. The only thing I regret is that this proposal gives to the Railway Committee of the Government, in which I have no great amount of confidence, the power to grasp by the throat one railway company or the other, because, if they do that in a despotic manner, they may compel them, when a general election comes on, to step out and vote as they dictate. Still, I do not see how we are to get over that. I am afraid we will have to give that power to them, but I have spoken before in regard to the danger which there is to the liberties of the people in leaving such power in the hands of these two great railway corporations which are now dominating the people, and the danger will be intensified by such legislation as this. Still I do not see how we are to get over that. Of course, if we could put in a government which would exercise the power fairly, that would be another thing, but I am afraid that the power proposed to be given is a dangerous one. Yet I do not see how we are to avoid it.

Mr. EDGAR. No matter what Government might be in power, I do not think it should be clothed with such a despotic authority as this amounts to. I think it is just as well to leave questions of this kind to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council as the first tribunal, and, if all parties are satisfied with their decision, and a fair provision is made for compensation, that is all right; but, if they provide unfairly in regard to a matter affecting a vast amount of property, why should they be the only tribunal in Canada from which there is no appeal? In all other matters affecting value there are appeals from the decision of the court of first instance, and why should there not be in this case? Why should it be said that the three members of the Committee of the Privy Council are infallible when the decisions of the judges of the Supreme Court and of all the judges of the land can be appealed from? I contend, and I shall continue to contend, that an appeal should be allowed from the decision of this committee.

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand that the hon. gentleman agrees that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council should decide the matter in the first instance, and that is all which is referred to in this clause, and I therefore, move that it be adopted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But there is another clause.

Mr. THOMPSON. We cannot take two clauses at once.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The same thing would apply to the members of any government whatever. There is no doubt that members of a government are subjected to pressure which cannot be put on any judges in the land, and least of all on the judges of the Supreme Court, and cases have arisen, are always arising, and will continue to arise, when extraordinary pressure may be put on the

Mr. McNEILL.

members of the Committee of the Privy Council in favor of a particular railway. I think that every principle of justice and equity demands that there should be an appeal to the Supreme Court. If the Minister of Justice will concede that, there will be no need of any further discussion on the subject.

Mr. McNEILL. There is a difficulty also as to the appeal, because the judges in England with, I think, one dissentient voice, have declared that they cannot decide on matters of that kind, such as haulage and right of way over tracks and so on. Those are cases in which they have decided that they are not competent to deal with them, and therefore it would be better to have a special tribunal appointed for the purpose. I think it would be better to have an appeal from the tribunal of politicians who have to deal with this matter, but it is unfortunate that we have not a tribunal specially competent to deal with those subjects.

Mr. EDGAR. It is for the Parliament of Canada to say what it is competent for the Supreme Court to deal with.

Mr. McNEILL. It is not a question as to our competence to say what the court has a right to deal with, but as to what they are able to deal with. We may take a horse to the spring but we cannot make him drink. I fancy that it was for the same reason that a special tribunal was provided in the United States.

Mr. EDGAR. So far as that is concerned, in this very Bill, a little further on, in clauses which, I think, have been cast already, it is provided that the Supreme Court shall have cognisance of any matters of law which the Railway Committee think fit to refer to them. It says: "The Supreme Court of Canada shall hear and determine a question or questions of law arising thereon, and remit the matter to the Railway Committee with the opinions of the court thereon." In addition to that clause, it would be necessary to extend that to questions coming under these clauses which provide that the Railway Committee shall adjudicate upon the right of one company to obtain the lands of another, in order to meet the difficulties which have been raised.

Mr. THOMPSON. In due time the hon. gentleman will be asked to take that up and then he can make what proposal he wishes as regards the Bill.

Mr. EDGAR. It is understood these clauses shall be considered as we come to them?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is in the power of the committee to reconsider any clause it has passed.

Mr. LISTER. The other day I spoke to the Minister of Justice about the Bill I introduced respecting the crossing of tracks, streets, drains and water mains. I would ask him whether he has considered the matter, and whether this is not the proper place to insert legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do propose to take up some of the clauses of the hon. gentleman's Bill before we get through.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I would suggest to substitute the following instead of clause *g*: "any highway or street, ditch or sewer, water, gas or other pipes and mains over or through lands owned or occupied by the company."

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no objection to that.

Mr. EDGAR. If by any chance the Government have left out an occasion to bully or worry a railway in the other sections, they have got it into section *g*, because under that they have jurisdiction to decide "any matter, act, or thing which, by this or the special Act, is sanctioned or required to be done or prohibited."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That does not embrace anything that is not already covered by what has been sanc-

tioned, required to be done, or prohibited, by this or the special Act; so that it does not widen it at all.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If Parliament decides to give the Railway Committee these functions, we must expect to give them very large powers.

Mr. SHANLY. I am strongly of opinion that there should be at least an appeal from the Committee of the Privy Council to the whole Council. After the words "final" in section 20, I would be in favor of inserting:

"Provided always that either party may petition the Governor in Council, and the Governor in Council may, in their discretion hear the parties and change or vary any such orders as they, in their judgment, may deem fit and proper."

Section 20 was reconsidered.

Mr. SHANLY moved in amendment the addition of the following words to section 20:—

"Provided always that either party may petition the Governor in Council and the Governor in Council may in their discretion rescind, change, or vary such order as they in their judgment may deem just and proper."

Mr. LAURIER. This is an important clause of the Bill; but I should prefer that the appeal should be taken not to a political body but to a judicial power, say the Supreme Court. It has been stated that the Supreme Court would not be, perhaps, the most competent body to deal with such a question, that the judges would not be so competent as special men. That may be so. But hon. gentlemen will agree also that the judges, being outside of the arena of politics, would be more competent than men actually in politics. The Minister of Justice stated that all powers are liable to be abused, and that is the reason why there is a check on parties vested with authority. We are proposing to give to two men, actually in politics and, therefore, liable to political influences, very great power. It is proposed to take an appeal from their decision to the Privy Council itself; I agree that is an improvement; but the men to whom the appeal is taken are still liable to be influenced and prejudiced by party considerations which might bias their judgment. Would it not, under these circumstances, be wiser to take an appeal to men removed from political influences? We are giving the very greatest power to this committee to deal with powerful corporations, and is it not, therefore, wise to remove the tribunal as far as possible from the arena of politics?

Mr. THOMPSON. If the suggestion of the hon. gentleman were carried out, it would be necessary to completely reorganise the Supreme Court and all its system of procedure.

Mr. LAURIER. Would it not be necessary also to reorganise the Privy Council?

Mr. THOMPSON. No; the Privy Council stands as it has been constituted by Parliament and the people. Until the composition of the body is changed by the body that created it, it is hardly worth while to discuss its composition. I desire to call the attention to the inaptness of a court of appeal for the purpose of reviewing decisions of the Privy Council on a matter like this. The parties are heard in a summary way before the Railway Committee. Witnesses are sometimes not examined. The parties very often agree as to the facts and only disagree as to certain matters of detail and certain questions of value. In some instances it is absolutely necessary that experts should be sent over the ground, in other instances members of the Railway Committee have visited the locality, and from those elements their decision is eventually made. If the matter goes before the Supreme Court there may not be a shred of evidence taken, and it has not by its procedure means of examining witnesses. There would be nothing on which to base a decision in such an event. The Supreme Court would need to be constituted a court of first instance, which it is not now, and its judges

made judges on questions in regard to which experts alone can properly decide. I am generally speaking in favor of appeal, and for that reason I do not object to the proposal of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly); but in no country where there is a tribunal to regulate matters of this kind, is an appeal given to any legal tribunal in the shape of a court of appeal. In the United States all these matters are entrusted to three gentlemen, one being a lawyer, and two of them, and they may not include the lawyer, form a quorum, and their decision is absolutely final, as much so as the statute of the United States. There it has been found absolutely necessary to establish a system like that in order to get promptness. The complaint made, when this question was last discussed, was mainly in regard to delays occurring before the Privy Council. This can only be avoided by having a small quorum and prompt action; but if the matter has to go before a court of appeal on every question of crossing and the placing of gates at crossings, a decision will not be reached for one, two or three years. The adoption of this system would lead to disorganisation of the whole system, and compel us to establish another tribunal, and a very arbitrary one, instead of the present tribunal, which is answerable to Parliament.

Mr. LAURIER. There is force in the answer made by the Minister of Justice to my contention. I am far from asserting or from believing that the Supreme Court of Canada would be the very best tribunal to deal with such questions, but I submit that under our existing system the Supreme Court, with all its imperfections, is the body that would be likely to give most satisfaction. No doubt a special tribunal is more competent to deal with such questions, but until we have such I have no hesitation in saying that if we have to choose between an appeal to the Privy Council and an appeal to the Supreme Court, the balance of reasoning is altogether on the side of the Supreme Court.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would add to what my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, has said, in reply to the leader of the Opposition, that the practice of the past does not support the fear that the hon. gentleman seems to have of the decisions of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I was for many years Minister of Railways and we had a great many very fierce controversies before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. My hon. friend the present Minister of Railways has had also a great many very strong controversies between contending parties, on questions of very great moment and very great importance. I do not remember, at this moment, one decision within the last ten years that has been brought before this Parliament by either the one party or the other. The decisions arrived at, have, I believe, been such as commended themselves to the parties, and in fact they disproved the impression that they were given on political considerations, or any other considerations outside those of justice and fair play. The decisions have always been accepted, and they have not been brought before Parliament as undoubtedly would have been the case, if there had been any reason to suppose that they were not fair and just decisions. When you consider that you have on this committee the Minister of Railways, a gentleman whose mind and attention is given specially to the consideration of those subjects, that you have him assisted by able engineers whose business it is to weigh and consider those questions in all their bearings, and that you have in addition to that, on this committee the Minister of Justice, to see that everything touching the law is kept right, I doubt very much—in addition to the delay by which would almost render it impracticable to go to the courts—if you would obtain more satisfactory results to any of the parties concerned by any other system.

Mr. LAURIER. I might point out that I do not think that what the hon. gentleman has stated is good argument. It reflects great credit and great honor upon the former

Minister of Railways, since he was able to give decisions which were not subject to controversy. But perhaps we will not always have the services of the former Minister of Railways, and perhaps his successor may not be so fortunate in giving such decisions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. For many years my successor has given them.

Mr. LAURIER. If I understand the Minister aright they are taking very new and very extraordinary powers. They are greatly reducing the scope of the Railway Committee, and those two clauses *a* and *f* are deviations from the former practice, and from the former law, and they give powers which would enable the Railway Committee of the Privy Council almost to confiscate one railway for the benefit of another, with a very insufficient compensation in many cases. I do not say that that power will be abused, but this legislation will give them that power.

Mr. THOMPSON. Compensation is a subject of appeal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By what clause?

Mr. THOMPSON. It will be provided for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not in the Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, I am going to provide for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that affect the whole question?

Mr. THOMPSON. The evidence is to be taken in writing and filed with the registrar of the court, so that either party can insert an appeal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me, in some of these cases that it would be nearly possible to confiscate one company by allowing another company to enter in and take possession and use its tracks, stations and station lands.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is a case in which the company ought not to get the right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I know, "ought not," but I think the companies will feel very much more secure if they had an appeal to a judicial body to decide that.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think the difficulties which were suggested by the Minister of Justice in the way of an appeal to the Supreme Court are so great as he seems to fear. No one suggested that there should be an appeal in the case of gates and crossings, and minor matters of that kind, and it was only where one railway corporation was assuming to take the lands and station grounds of any other that appeal is asked for. The Minister of Justice has told us that provision will be made for compensation, with a right of appeal to the courts in the ordinary course in this instance as well as in others. As I understand the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) covers appeals from the Railway Committee to the whole Privy Council, in all matters, large and small.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. EDGAR. I think that is a very important step in advance and I should be glad to support it.

Mr. SHANLY. I beg to ask if it is the practice, if it has been the practice heretofore, and will continue to be the practice, of taking the evidence given before the Privy Council in writing.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is the practice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that evidence taken on oath?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. LISTER. What I have to say now does not come under this section, but I might as well say it as at any other time. Is it the intention of the Government to in-

Mr. LAURIER.

clude in this Bill a section, making it penal on the part of any railway company to give passes to members of the Senate and House of Commons. As a matter of fact a very large number of the members of this House hold passes from the railway companies. If they hold them because those railways have been subsidised by the people of the country then there should be no distinction shown amongst the members, but if they are given to members for the purpose of influencing them in their votes then they should not be allowed to have them. If members are entitled to passes because they are members of the House, all should have the right to travel over the railways free, irrespective of party. I think this is a proper matter to bring before the attention of the Government, and that they should either make it penal for companies to issue passes to members of the Senate or House of Commons, or if it is thought that the country is entitled to this privilege, then every member of both Houses should receive passes.

Mr. EDGAR. I observe that the Royal Commission on Railways had that matter under consideration, and that they recommended that the granting of free passes by railway companies, not only to members of Parliament but to everybody else, should be abolished, saving and excepting the reservations in the United States Interstate Commerce Act, and excepting members of the Federal or Provincial Governments, travelling over federal or provincial railways respectively. As far as I can see, this is one of the recommendations of the Railway Commission with which the Government do not propose to deal in this Bill. If they are dealing with it at all I should say it would be exceedingly appropriate to make it penal for railway companies who are seeking legislation at the hands of this Parliament to offer free passes to the members of this House.

Mr. LISTER. I know one member from the Province of Manitoba who has not received a pass at all, nor has he received a half fare certificate, while other members from that Province have received full free passes. I do not think those companies should place the members of this House in any such position. If the members are entitled to those passes they should receive them, and I will support a measure here making it penal on the part of the company to grant any member of Parliament a pass.

Mr. AMYOT. I think the principle is admitted in many countries that the railways subsidised by the state, should grant free passes to the members of the Legislature. It is in the public interest that every member may go over the country and ascertain for himself in what state are the public works, and in what condition are the railroads and so on. That is in the public interest. In the second place it is in the public interest that those free passes be granted to all so as not to be the means of corruption when the Bills concerning certain railways come before the House. It is no use trying to deceive the public, for all the members are glad to have free passes. We do not go into politics in this country because we are rich. We know very well that some members have given votes, under certain circumstances, with reluctance, I will not say this year, because of the free passes which they had received or which were offered to them. I think it would be better to take a firm stand on the matter, and as all railways which have been declared to be under federal jurisdiction have received subsidies from the state, and as it is in the public interest that members should have the right to travel all over the country, we should say that on the presentation of a certificate stating that they are members of the House of Commons or the Senate they should be entitled to free passes. This is done in France; I think the same thing is understood in England; and in the United States, although there is no law to that effect, it is well understood that all members of Congress should have the right to go over the railroads free. Therefore, I think it

would be right for us to take a bold stand which will avoid corruption. Therefore, I am ready to take the responsibility of proposing a clause, to this effect:

Every member of the Senate or of the House of Commons will be entitled to a free passage upon any railway declared to be under federal jurisdiction upon exhibition of a certificate signed by the Clerk of the Senate or the House of Commons, respectively, establishing the identity of such member.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am not disposed to go as far as my hon. friend; but I think that we all agree that if any free passes are to be given to members of this House over railways controlled by the Government, they should be distributed indiscriminately. That question was before the House last year, and I think it was then well understood that on such occasion as a recess, if passes were to be given they should be given to all the members. At the last Easter recess, when I had occasion to return to Nova Scotia, I was aware that passes were given to members of that Province who would go to the clerks of the department and ask for them. I did not care to put myself in that position; I preferred to go to the ticket office and pay \$25 for my fare to Nova Scotia and return. I thought it was a position a member of this House should not be placed in, and I travelled over the railway with other gentlemen going and coming who had free passes. I only say that if passes are given at all, they should be given to all and not to the few who go to the offices for them.

Mr. THOMPSON. I presume the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) only intends to give notice of his amendment, as it is not pertinent to the clause we are now discussing. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) asked if the evidence is to be taken under oath. There has been hitherto no power to take it under oath, but one of the clauses of this Bill provides for that—sub-section *e* of section 13.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If it is taken under oath, I presume it will be put on record.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 90,

Mr. INNES. I understood that the hon. Minister was to reconsider clauses *g* and *h* of clause 90.

Mr. THOMPSON. I did agree to consider them fully with the view of providing for compensation, and I have made a note to explain the sections, which I think answer that purpose. I will be prepared to show to the hon. gentleman before we finish that I provided amply for his case. The company has, in the first place, to place the road or whatever it may be, in as nearly as possible the same condition after the work is done as that in which it was before. It is provided that they must make compensation.

Mr. INNES. It is sometimes very difficult for a municipality to get compensation. It is more difficult than it is for a private individual.

Mr. THOMPSON. In looking at the clause dealing with compensation, I think I have met the hon. gentleman's wishes fully. It has been asked, in some places, that the municipality should receive compensation, not for the cost of making a new road or anything of that kind, because that has all to be done by the railway company, but for the mere fact of the grade of the road having been changed. It may be necessary to change the highway or to put an overhead bridge where there was formerly a level highway. Under those circumstances, it has been asked, in one instance, that the municipality should be compensated. I do not think that would be a safe principle to introduce. We ought to compel the railway company to restore the road to, as nearly as possible, the same condition in which it was before. We ought to make them pay compensation for all the loss

and expense they have caused, but I do not see that a municipality, township, or city ought to be paid a sum of money by reason of the road being made of a steeper grade than before. With respect to highways, the municipality must be treated as trustees of the general public, and no inconvenience is occasioned except the inconvenience to the general public, to which it has to submit in the carrying out of the public work.

Mr. INNES. The railway might make the grades so that the road would be practically impassable.

Mr. THOMPSON. All that is to be under the control of the Railway Committee.

Mr. LISTER. I have an amendment to propose, which I may as well propose now. I move the following amendment:—

It will not be lawful for a railway company chartered by Parliament to grant any complimentary passes over the road or any part thereof, to any member of the Senate or House of Commons; or if any member of the Senate or House of Commons travels on any such pass over any such road, his seat shall *ipso facto* become vacant, as if he were naturally dead.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. LISTER. I give notice that I will again move that amendment on the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose to insert 20 per cent in the 4th sub-section of section 93. I propose in section 102 instead of "No company shall take possession of," to make it read: "Any company may."

Mr. WELDON. I would suggest that the words "When the public interest require" should be added.

Mr. MULOCK. I propose that an appeal be granted from the exercise of the power under this clause. Under this clause, it is possible for the committee, subject to the appeal referred to, to allow one company to take possession of the railway of another. It is now proposed that a railway company may, with the sanction of the Government, take possession of and use and occupy the lands of any other company. I think these are very extensive powers and that there should be a qualification, and I think that should be:

"So as, however, not to interfere with the working of the senior company."

Mr. THOMPSON. It would not do to frustrate the operation of that clause by allowing one company to assert that the taking of its land by another would interfere with the working of the railway.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think it will be right to vest in the Committee of the Privy Council the power to transfer all the lands of one company to another company, and the words of this section are quite large enough to do this. Of course, that is not aimed at, but I would ask the Minister to provide some safeguard in that case.

Mr. EDGAR. Of course the Minister does not intend to enlarge the provisions of section 11, but only to carry them out.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, to carry them out.

Mr. EDGAR. But these provisions are much larger. I suggest that the clause should be amended by saying that the company may, for the purposes named in sub-section *a* and sub-section *f* of section 11, take possession. Of course that is what is intended.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would suggest that the following words should be inserted after the word "give":

If the lands proposed to be taken are necessary and if the public interest requires them to be so taken.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does not that carry on the face of it the suggestion that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council would enable one company to infringe on the

rights of another without necessity? I think you must assume that this is all subject to the necessities of the case and to the public interest.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). No; this would make the company apply to Parliament and show that there was a public necessity, and it should be clearly shown that it was only in case of public necessity that the lands could be taken by one company from another.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They must show that to the satisfaction of the Railway Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. But why should we give a larger authority to the Government than it is necessary to have exercised?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If these provisions are put in, it will be the Railway Committee who will have to construe them.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know what these words are, for I did not hear them. They may not meet the case, but I do not think the Government should have power absolutely to transfer the property of one company to another company. The Government may make a mistake.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They will not have that power, because the question of compensation is to be a matter of appeal.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the use of arguing against the words? No doubt the Minister thinks that what he says is correct, but this section has a plain meaning, and no wider power could be given to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council than what is contained in it. Subject to appeal, they may give any land belonging to one company to another company, and they should have their power limited, and the company in possession should not have the working of its road impaired by the exercise of these expropriating powers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What would you suggest?

Mr. EDGAR. I proposed a limitation in these clauses *a* and *f* of section 11 which would limit the powers to the station grounds, and places of that kind.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that this clause should stand over. There should be some principle to guide us, and that should be that, if the rights of one company have to defer to the rights of another, the rights of the company in possession should be considered first of all, and the invading company ought not to exercise rights against the interests of the invaded company without reasonable grounds for the interference.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will let the clause stand for the present.

On section 156,

Mr. MULOCK. Have you taken out of this reprinted Bill the power of a railway company to appoint an arbitrator?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it ought to come out. When the Railway Committee selects its arbitrator, and the proprietor has selected his, I do not think that either party should have an advantage. Under the present law the proprietor can give a notice of desistment at any stage if he thinks the award is going against him. He can cancel the whole work up to that moment, and start again. Both ought to be on the same footing.

Mr. THOMPSON. They may ascertain in the meantime that they do not require the property.

Mr. MULOCK. Quite so. If they desist on that ground, well and good; but the company should not be allowed to desist merely to get rid of the arbitrator and to begin again.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. LAURIER. This is giving very large power. If, by some accident, an award is made by the arbitrators, then the sum offered by the company shall be compensation to be paid by the company, and, therefore, the owner of the land is altogether without recourse. He was not satisfied with the sum tendered to him by the company; the matter has been referred to the arbitrators, they fail to make an award, and he is forced to accept the amount. I do not think that is fair.

Mr. THOMPSON. The matter must be ended at some time, and the object of this is to fix a limit. The company, in the first place, makes an offer, the proprietor, being dissatisfied, with that, claims an arbitration. The time is fixed, and unless the award is made by that time, it is equivalent to saying they will not change the offer. They know that before they begin.

Mr. LAURIER. The amount might be deposited in court by the company.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister to go back to clause 158, the desistment clause. I would suggest that the desistment should be only where the company does not desire the lands.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will consider that when we get to it again.

On section 182,

Mr. SHANLY. This clause provides for the Council having power to order swing bridges to be constructed in any particular place; but it does not seem to be fair that bridges that have long been in use, should be subjected to any such change as that. I would suggest that the following be added to this clause:—

"Provided, however, that so much of this clause as relates to the substitution of swing bridges for fixed bridges, shall not apply to any railway bridge heretofore built and now in use."

I know the Committee of the Privy Council do not want to multiply swing bridges; but still it might be very unfair that bridges that have long existed, should now have to be changed.

Mr. THOMPSON. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that swing bridges ought not to be ordered where they can possibly be avoided; but I think that when the public interest of the community, as regards navigation, requires that they shall be ordered, there should be no distinction made between those which exist and those which are to be constructed hereafter.

On section 189,

Mr. SHANLY. I think this clause is rather arbitrary, and I would suggest that we add the words: "it shall not be competent for the Railway Committee to extend the time for the completion of said work, upon proper cause being shown."

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no objection.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Why should there be a longer time for the completion of this work, if the Railway Committee should think it necessary? Certainly the Railway Committee will, in the first place, set the proper time, and then it is the duty of the company to make the necessary repairs, so as to lessen any risk or danger. I think we should leave the clause as it stands, it is better for all parties concerned; the railway company knowing well the necessity of making the repairs at the time suggested by the Railway Committee, will proceed to make those repairs. The clause is better as it is.

Mr. SHANLY. In view of the extensive powers given it is not extending their powers very much to say that under certain circumstances an extension of time may be granted.

Mr. MULOCK. I agree with the reasoning of the member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly); but the Government have exercised powers they did not possess under the Act. For very good reasons the Grand Trunk Railway Company were ordered to erect gates at Simcoe and York streets, Toronto. The work had to be done on 1st January, but it has not been carried out. Those streets lead from the Union station to the centre of the city and are crossed every day by thousands; many trains pass on the different tracks and life is endangered. The member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) called the attention of the Government to the delay at the commencement of the Session, and the Government were unable to advance any reason why the work had not been completed. Did the Government grant an extension of time?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

M. MULOCK. Have the Government taken steps to enforce penalty?

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot answer that question at the moment without making enquiry.

Mr. SHANLY. In section 192 it is provided that every bridge over a railway shall be of a height of not less than seven feet from the top of the cars. The cars belonging to our own railway companies may allow this distance, but refrigerator cars of American roads may reduce it by a foot and a-half. Is the railway subject to a penalty? It would be better to recast the clause and fix the height from the rails.

Mr. THOMPSON. The section is for the protection of workmen on board the cars. It is better to leave it as it is, in view of the provision by which that requirement may be dispensed with in any case where trains are operated with air brakes, or where any protection of that kind is used.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) In regard to section 194 I propose to move an amendment with a view to restore the law to what it was prior to 1868. In 1883 I moved a similar amendment to the one I now propose, and it was carried through this House, but certain changes were made in the Senate which minimised its effect. I move that clause 194 be struck out and the following substituted:

Fences shall be erected and maintained on each side of the railway of the height and strength of an ordinary division fence, with openings or gates or bars or sliding or hurdle gates of sufficient width for the purposes thereof, with proper fastenings at farm crossings of the railway, and also cattle-guards at all highway crossings, suitable and sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals from getting on the railway. 2. A hurdle gate has proper fastenings if it is fifteen inches longer than the opening and is supported at each end by two upright posts.

Mr. THOMPSON. This will oblige every railway company to fence its whole track on both sides of the line for the safety of a single cow.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). No, I think the hon. gentleman is not right in that contention. It compels a company to fence without notice having been given, or to take the consequences whatever they may be of their neglect to fence. I think it is the duty of railway companies, in view of the concessions that are necessarily given to them, to protect their tracks, not only against the destruction of the property of other people but so as to render them as little danger as possible to destruction of life. I do not think that any notice ought to be required to be given as is provided in this Act to the railway company, of what seems to me to be their manifest duty. If a railway company choose to take a risk in not erecting fences, then it will be subject to the penalties for not doing so.

Mr. THOMPSON. It has been the policy of the Government to encourage the building of railways in unsettled portions of the country. In unsettled portions of the country, it has never been considered necessary to construct fences,

excepting in the class of cases mentioned in section 195 of this Bill, where the land is occupied, and the construction that has been put upon that is, that land is occupied, if it is in the possession of the owner, or any person by his consent, even for the purpose of pasturage. The first clause of sections 194 and 195 provide this:

The company shall make and maintain for the accommodation of the owners or occupiers of any section or lot of land adjoining the railway,—
Fences for separating the lands required for the use of the railway from such adjoining section or lot of land, of a height of not less than four feet and of sufficient strength, with openings or gates, or bars, or sliding or hurdle gates, of sufficient width for the purposes thereof, with proper fastenings therein, at farm crossings of the railway;
Cattle guards at all highway crossings, suitable and sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals from getting on the railway;

If the motion of the hon. gentleman from North Renfrew were carried it would mean that a company might have to fence four or five thousand miles of railway in places where cows were most unlikely to get on the track. This amendment would simply give the right of way over the whole country to stray horses and cattle. No matter whether they may be running at large on the highway, or lying down on the railway track to the risk of life and property, in a way that ought to lead the owners to the severest kind of punishment, the owners have no punishment at all, but the railway companies must incur this enormous expense. What provision has the hon. gentleman in the case of cattle coming along the highway? He proposes to allow municipalities to pass by-laws so that cattle can run at large as they please. There is no possibility of fencing on a highway crossing, and that is the place where cattle are most likely to lie down at night, because it is dry and free from insects. The public would have no protection whatever as regards that, and the cattle would be allowed to run at large. I think the provision in this Bill is a very fair one; that whenever the land is occupied or becomes occupied the railway company shall fence. To provide that the company shall fence thousands of miles of railway where the land is unoccupied just because a cow may happen to be abroad that night some miles away, is unjust indeed to the railway company and to the public.

Mr. SHANLY. I quite agree with the hon. the minister of Justice that the first clause in the amendment that my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White) makes here would compel the Canadian Pacific Railway, for instance, to fence all the way round Lake Superior on both sides. It would not only be harsh, but it would be absolutely useless. Again, in the last part of his motion he interferes with the existing law. As I remember the old law, cattle were not allowed to roam at large within half a mile of any road.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). That is a provision in this Act which I do not propose to alter.

Mr. SHANLY. The last clause of my hon. friend's motion would clash with that.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not think so.

Mr. SHANLY. Certainly, because cattle might roam anywhere, and you could not keep them away without some means of fencing.

Mr. LAURIER. I quite agree with the amendment moved by the hon. the member for Renfrew (Mr. White). It is most opportune, and in my judgment there can be no hesitation at all in accepting it. There is no doubt it would involve the railway companies in some hardship. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for instance, were compelled under this to fence 4,000 or 5,000 miles it might be a hardship, but at the same time the hardship would be less upon the railway company, than the possible hardship which may happen to a poor settler who may lose his horse or his cow and has no means of buying another. We encourage the settlement of wild lands, but we must remem-

ber that the settler we send into the wilderness generally comes with scanty means. He has a horse or a cow which is most valuable to him, and that is killed on the railway. He has no recourse against the railway, it is a dead loss to him, and his means are such that he cannot without great inconvenience to himself and his family replace it. I think the hardship is less upon the railway company than on the settler. But I do not believe that the railway company could be compelled to fence so many miles of railway. There is no doubt that under the principle of the law the Canadian Pacific Railway would be compelled to fence around Lake Superior, but they might very well take the risk there of not putting any fences at all and no danger will accrue. When they come to a country where the land is fit for settlement, then they should take the precaution of having those fences put up. It is within the experience of everyone of us that such accidents have taken place, just for want of those very provisions which are contained in the hon. gentleman's amendment. Many a poor man has been injured starting out in life, and has had to endure several years of hardship in consequence of such accidents. This is an amendment which has passed this House already and which I again hope will pass it. After it does pass I hope it will be more fortunate than the last time, and that it will carry in the second Chamber.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). My hon. friend the Minister of Justice calls this *ex post facto* legislation, and says it is a hardship that should not be introduced into our law. If he goes back to the law of 1868 he will see that those propositions are the laws that existed at that time, and they are almost an exact transcript of the law as it existed prior to 1868. Section 195 of this Bill proposes:

The company shall make such fences, gates and cattle guards within the following times, that is to say:

(a). If such adjoining section or lot of land is occupied at the time of the construction of the railway opposite thereto, within three months after such construction;

(b). If such adjoining section or lot of land is not occupied at the time of the construction of the railway opposite thereto, within three months after it is occupied;

Why should a railway company be allowed to run for three months over a man's land without fences?

(c). If the company is required, in writing, by the occupant of any such adjoining section or lot of land so to do, within six months after any part thereof is taken possession of for the use of the railway.

Why should that be granted? What is unreasonable in the proposition?

Until such fences and cattle-guards are duly made and completed, and if after they are so made and completed they are not duly maintained, the company shall be liable for all damages done by its trains and engines to cattle, horses and other animals on the railway.

I would just like to point out to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, when he says that it would be necessary for a railway company to fence the whole extent of their line, that I do not think that is at all necessary. In the 194th section you provide that those fences shall be erected. If the company choose to take the risk as my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) says, of not fencing the track in such portions of the country as they consider would not be necessary, they certainly will not put up the fences there, but where there are cattle in certain portions of the country roaming at large it seems to me that it is the manifest duty of the company to fence. It is because I believe so that I have submitted these propositions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If the Bill should be carried in the shape as introduced by the Minister of Justice, it would mean that all the settlers in the northern part of Central Ontario would have to leave the country, as it would be absolutely impossible for them to make any improvement, or get along if the law is as now suggested. Everybody who knows anything about the country knows that the settlers are of

Mr. LAURIER.

necessity compelled to allow their cattle to run at large. They have no choice; they must either have no cattle at all or let them run at large; and the idea of comparing their hardship to a great company that we have endowed with a great many millions of dollars in doing what simple justice requires them to do, with the injustice and hardship to a settler who may lose his all owing to their negligence, is to make a comparison which I am sure this House will not sustain. We had a fight on this subject before, in which the hon. Minister will remember the sense of the House was very much against him; and I hope he will accept this amendment and save further discussion, because I can assure him that his Bill will not be allowed to pass in its present form.

Mr. EDGAR. The question of the danger to the settler has been pointed out very forcibly by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken; but it appears to me that there is also great danger to the lives of the passengers of the railway in leaving the land unfenced. If the cattle are not fenced in, they will get on the tracks, and be liable to throw off the trains. Therefore I think it is in the interest of the travelling public, as well as of the settlers themselves, that they should be fenced off the tracks.

Mr. THOMPSON. I should look on the insertion of the proposed clause as a very great outrage in the way of railway legislation, and I should think it well to consider very seriously whether it would be worth while to go on with the Bill. I hear hon. gentlemen treat the building of thousands of miles of fence as a matter of not the slightest consideration to a wealthy railway company. I do not know whether these railway companies are wealthy or not; but whether they are or not, I think that we should not take their wealth for the construction of unnecessary fences. The Bill provides that the owners of cattle shall keep them within certain restrictions; but this proposition is to compel the railway company, for the purpose of allowing cattle to run at large in an almost unsettled township, to build fences through the whole of that unsettled country. I think the hardship to the poor settlers is a matter of absolute insignificance in comparison with the enormous burden which this would inflict on the railway companies. The question arises whether it would not be better to insert a clause providing that if the settler gives notice to the company stating how many cattle he has, the company should pay for them. But to require a railway company to build a mile of fencing to save the price of a cow would be paying a very extravagant price to the poor settler.

Mr. LAURIER. I am glad the hon. Minister has made that argument. I think he has given the answer, as there is another alternative to building the fences. If the company choose to dispense with the fence, they can pay for the cows.

Mr. THOMPSON. I should like them to pay for the cows before they get on the track. That alternative is as good as the other.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. Minister of Justice is evidently ignorant of the condition of the country through which the railway is built. There is a stretch of 100 miles of country in which the people must let their cattle run at large; and does the hon. Minister of Justice tell me that because the railway company is not to build a fence, the settlers through 100 miles of country should not allow their cattle to run at large?

Mr. THOMPSON. I say they should not be allowed to run at large within a certain distance of a railway.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It is impossible that they can prevent that. The cattle are one of the means of livelihood which the people must have. As a matter of fact, the railway is fenced, and under this law the company might take their

fences down. In that country there are many lots which are not occupied and will never be occupied; and for the hon. Minister to tell me that the people must keep their cattle in only shows either very little regard for the interest of the settlers or very great ignorance of their condition.

Mr. WATSON. It appears to me that this legislation, like a good deal of other railway legislation that we have had in this House, is entirely in the interest of the railway companies. I know of cases in which the settlers have been injured to such an extent by the railways as to have been almost broken up as farmers. I know of one particular instance in which a farmer who owned seven cattle had them all killed by a railway. He sued the company in the Division Court and got judgment for the whole seven cattle; but the company appealed to a higher court where the man was not able to follow them, and he got nothing. That is only one of many cases that occur in Manitoba; and I think that if the company do not fence their track, they should take the responsibility of paying for the cattle killed on it. With regard to the road allowance, I certainly think the settlers will see that their cattle do not get on it, and the railway companies will not be liable for cattle killed on the public highways. I certainly think the proposition made by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) is a very fair one. It does not provide that the company shall fence every mile of the railway track; it simply provides that if they do not fence it, they shall be responsible for damages.

Mr. SHANLY. It should be remembered that the danger of allowing cattle to run at large is not only to the cattle and the settlers, but to the lives of the travelling public as well.

Mr. MULLOCK. I sympathise very largely with the view taken by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). Anyone at all familiar with the country knows very well that the settlement is very sparse, that many tracts are rocky, and that grazing is only found in patches; and it would be beyond the means of the settlers to fence in, say 200 or 300 acres, simply to get the little patches of pasture. If you carry out to its fullest extent the argument advanced by the hon. member for Muskoka, it means that the settlers must leave the country as soon as the railway comes. I am not prepared to accede to that doctrine. The settlers were there first; they had their rights, and when the railways come in, we must have regard to the existing rights of the settlers. I entirely sympathise with the hon. member for Muskoka, and if the hon. Minister thinks the matter over, I think he will provide a remedy.

Mr. McNEILL. Does it really amount to this, as the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) says, that we are legislating that the settlers shall not allow their cattle to run at large throughout the country? Because, if that is what it comes to, it is well that we should understand it. Some of us represent settlers who are obliged, as my hon. friend for Muskoka has said, to leave their cattle running at large. If this legislation should pass, they will not be allowed to do so, for it will virtually amount, as hon. gentlemen opposite have said, to their having to clear out in order to make way for the railway. So far as the argument is concerned that it is unfair to make a railway company erect miles of fencing where there are only a few cattle, that has been disposed of by the statement of my hon. friend opposite, who says companies need not fence if they think it is not worth their while to do so. But it is right that these settlers who have their cattle destroyed, should have compensation for the destruction of their cattle by the railway company, and that the railway company should not be allowed to run over cattle and human beings as they please. We know it is hard enough for ourselves sometimes, even in settled parts

of the country, to keep clear of the railway, and I thought that all of us must feel that in a case of this kind it is necessary for the sake of poor settlers that the exceptional powers of railway companies should be curtailed, and these corporations should not be allowed to ride rough-shod over the people.

Mr. THOMPSON. The proposition is that the companies shall not be required to fence at all if they are willing to take the risk of killing cows, and the cows are not to be restrained from running at large within any distance of any railway, so that we shall have no restraint to safeguard the lives of the people who pass over the track.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says that cattle should not be allowed to roam within a certain distance of a railway. That is proper; but how is that to be enforced in sections where there are no fences? Will you compel a settler to put up fences so as to prevent his cattle from coming within half-a-mile of the railway?

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the people are prevented from allowing their cattle to run along the highway, in order to save the lives of people who travel on the train, does it not seem a little odd that the companies are to be allowed to construct any kind of fence they please, which cattle can get through from the fields and go on the track.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would make the companies punishable for that, of course.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In many places through Ontario the fences are in total decay, and the animals have no difficulty in getting through. There you allow the companies to make any kind of fence. In most instances you find the accidents arising from cattle getting on the track through the railway company's fences instead of from the highway. Therefore, while you are compelling the settlers to keep their cattle off, you allow the companies to let the cattle on.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not care how stringent the regulation is made to compel the companies to keep up fences, if difficulties arise from keeping the fences in an inefficient condition, the enactment of this provision will not remedy the matter. We must make a stringent provision. As to dispensing with the prohibition against cattle running at large, the duty devolves upon Parliament, irrespective of the farmers or the railway, to see that neither human life nor property is endangered.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. the Minister of Justice has stated that under the amendment the company would have to pay simply the loss of the cattle.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is more than that; I was quoting the argument of other members.

Mr. WATSON. The amendment is far-fetched because the company would be interested in fencing the track for the purpose of saving their own property. They cannot endanger the life of the public without endangering their own property.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). As regards sections 194 and 195, I think the hon. the Minister of Justice must have been arguing for the whole of the 3rd clause.

Mr. THOMPSON. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Because as regards these two clauses, what I propose to provide is simply that the company be compelled to put up fences without notice. As I understand the common law, it requires that the owner of cattle shall occupy the property or land from which the cattle stray. I propose by the 195th section to remedy that, but as regards 194 and 195 they do not affect railway companies at all in the way the hon. Minister

of Justice has described. The 194th section requires the railway company to fence without notice; 195 provides the penalties that will be imposed for not doing so; and the penalty is exactly the same as in the Act we are now considering, except that the words "after the expiry of the said delay" are struck out. The 196th section reads: "If after the expiry of such delay, such fences, gates and cattle guards are not duly made and completed." The two sections, 195 and 194, will not involve the railway company in the difficulties to which the hon. gentleman referred. I propose that railway companies shall not require notice of any kind and shall be required to fence the road according as it is built, and I cannot see why a company should be at liberty to run a railway through a man's land for three months after it is occupied. If I understand the common law a man must be properly occupying his land; and if he owns one hundred acres of forest land and chooses to put his cattle on it for the purpose of grazing, he is properly occupying it. And that it is of no consequence to the railway company whether the land is cultivated or is in forest.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Supposing it is only a wood lot, and the man does not occupy it, but allows his neighbor to go on it?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am not lawyer enough to say whether that would entail upon the company the damages for the loss of the cattle straying on that land and killed there or not.

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand that it has been so held.

Amendment carried: Yeas, 43; nays 9.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew), moved that the following be substituted for section 195:—

(195.) Until such fences and cattle-guards are duly made and completed, and if after they are so made and completed they are not duly maintained, the company shall be liable for all damages done by its trains and engines to cattle, horses and other animals on the railway.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Does that mean that they are to be liable for cattle belonging to anybody?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I propose this section which I have taken from the Railway Act of the old Province of Canada.

Mr. FISHER. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the railways shall not be compelled to make their fences as they build the railway?

Mr. WHITE. No, but until they do they will be liable for any damages.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to go further, at all events in the old settled parts of the country, and to make it law that they shall fence their lands as they lay their track. I know that, when they are constructing their road, and construction trains are running, there has been great hardship caused to farmers whose land they have taken possession of, or bought for railway purposes, because they have not built their fences when they had been running their construction trains, and I do not think it is any hardship that they should be forced to build their fences as they lay their rails. Of course until they do lay their rails there is no danger, but when they lay them the danger to the cattle commences, and I think when any land through which they pass is occupied or cleared, they should be forced to build fences there if not in other places.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think the section which has just been carried provides that they shall be liable for damages.

Mr. FISHER. They are liable for all the damage they create, but in old settled parts of the country that does not meet the difficulty, and they should be compelled to build these fences to protect the people whose cattle they may hurt and the people themselves who may go on the railway.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) I do not see how the hon. gentleman could compel the companies to build the fences unless he took them into court. Of course, if they do not build their fences, they are liable to damages, but how are you to compel them to build? I will give an instance which occurred in my part of the country in order to show how dilatory these railway companies are. An agreement was made between the proprietor of a large tract of land and the railway company that, as soon as they laid the track, they should put up the fences. There was no difficulty between them, but that was a condition when the price of the land was agreed upon. Some four or five years elapsed before they put up their fences. Every year the proprietor said, Why do you not put up the fences? and they replied that they would put them up, but they had to pay damages to the amount of \$400 or \$500. Unless he had gone into court, I do not know how the company could have been made to carry out their agreement.

Mr. FISHER. They could be made to do that just in the same way as in regard to division fences between neighbors. By the law of the Province of Quebec, if I wish to have a fence built between me and my neighbor, I have only to give him legal notice, and, if my neighbor does not build the fence, I have a right to build it and sue him for the cost, and it would be the same way in this matter. This gentleman to whom my hon. friend refers could have built his fence, and just such a fence as he chose to build reasonably, and could have made the company pay for it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think my hon. friend should provide for certain cases. Sometimes a fence is torn down or unintentionally injured, or people put their cattle within the enclosure, and I think there should be some penalty imposed on those who allow their cattle to get inside. I know that in some cases they turn their cattle in or let them inside the enclosure.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am afraid my hon. friend must live in a peculiar community of people. I know that, in my own county, the people are anxious to keep the cattle off the track because in not one case out of fifty have they been able to collect anything from the railway company, though the cattle have actually been killed.

Amendment carried.

Mr. McMILLAN. In the Province of Ontario, there is no necessity for passing a by-law. According to the Municipal Act, all cattle are allowed to run at large until the township passes a by-law to prevent it.

Mr. THOMPSON. This, I take it, would practically do away with that principle of the Act which prevents cattle running at large within a certain distance of the railway. It would put that matter under the control of the municipality. It really does seem to me that the House, even with the strong desire it has shown to protect settlers and farmers, should hesitate to abolish a principle like that, in view of the public interests involved as regards safety. As I said before we have not only to consider the interest of farmers and settlers, not only the interest of the railway companies, but we have to consider that this is a provision adopted exclusively for the benefit of the travelling public. It seems to me that this section is so unreasonable that, although the owner of a property adjoining the railway does not think it worth his while to put side fences along his lot, the railway company is compelled to fence the front of it. That seems to me a very unreasonable proposition, but it is involved in the principle we have adopted, and involved in the 196th section proposed. I think the hon. gentleman had better not press this point.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I draw the attention of the Minister to the provision in 272, which is to the effect that no horse, sheep, swine or other cattle shall be permitted to

be at large upon any highway within half a mile of the intersection of such highway with any railway at railway level. Now, what I pointed out the other night, was this, that in certain portions of my county where, as has been mentioned by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) there are farmers who are not very wealthy, and whose lands are not very fertile, and whose principle dependence is upon their cattle, there is one instance that occurs to my mind at the present moment in which over ten miles of the highway runs parallel with, and at a considerable distance from, the railway, so that cattle might be allowed to run over nine miles of that road without interfering with the provision of the law in section 272. I also drew the attention of the House the other night to the fact that there are two or three highway crossings, in the township to which I refer now, of the railway upon which there are no cattle-guards at all. Now, how is the railway to be compelled to put in those cattle-guards?

Mr. SHANLY. The Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Yes, they have the power, but I am sure the poor farmers of that section of the country are not going to come before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to fight a great railway corporation such as that which owns the railway running through my county. What I propose by this section that I am submitting for the consideration of the House, is that if cattle run at large under the authority of a by-law, or under the authority of the municipality, if they go upon the track, other than from the highway—because they can be impounded if they are found within half a mile of the railway crossing on the highway—the company shall be liable for any damages that may occur.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is to say, even if they go off the owner's lot by his not having put up side fences?

Mr. HALL. It seems to me that this is giving power going far beyond anything that this committee should adopt. I think it should be considered that a fair compromise has been made in the clause we have already adopted, protecting the settler. But this would certainly be an innovation on the ordinary law of the country, open the door to what I am afraid would be a very serious matter for the railway companies, and would really be a danger to the travelling public. I should hope the hon. member would be satisfied with the success he has already had in the two clauses he has secured, and not attempt to introduce a clause which would be so directly in violation of the ordinary law of the country.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not feel clear upon this clause; it certainly will be inconsistent with the other clause to which reference has been made. That clause 172 has never been acted upon in the part of the country where I live, and it could hardly be acted upon practically. It is a clause which has been passed in the interest of the railway companies, but which, under the existing circumstances of the country, has always been, and will continue to be, a dead letter. The railway companies have never attempted to enforce it. I never heard of a railway company putting an animal in pound caught upon the track. I do not myself see much object in the present clause, because certainly cattle ought not to be allowed upon the track, and certainly the company ought not to be liable in that case, if they killed the cattle.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am not quite sure but that this provision is somewhat too drastic, and under the circumstances I will withdraw it.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to move, in amendment, as sub-section to 195, the following:—

If an adjoining section or lot of land through or by which a railway passes, is occupied at the time of the construction of the railway oppo-

site thereto, the company shall make such fences, gates and cattle-guards as they lay their rails.

This is in connection with what I said a few minutes ago, that I do not consider it to be sufficient that the railway companies should simply be liable for the damage. In the thickly settled country through which railways frequently pass farmers who occupy land have their fields frequently cut up by the lines, and they are much inconvenienced by fences being taken down and rails removed when the construction trains commence to run. While it is provided that the railway company should be liable for damages, farmers hesitate to commence proceedings, because their damage is comparatively slight.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am inclined to think that this would prevent a farmer driving his cattle, on a farm crossing, from one part of his land to the other. He would then be within the enclosure of the railway. I should like to hear the opinion of the Minister of Justice on that point.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think it is open to that construction. A farmer has the right to do so and it is the purpose of a farm crossing to enable him to drive his cattle across.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister of Justice has had his attention called to the wording of this section. It seems to me that the penalty imposed is very light, in comparison with the penalty that may possibly come to him. Under the Act only \$20 penalty is imposed for leaving the gate open, but at the same time he is exposed to consequent damages which might amount to \$30,000, or more than he might be worth altogether. I quite understand the penalty should be heavy in the public interest, but it seems to me that the two penalties are inconsistent. If a farmer can be made responsible for the accidental opening of a gate to the extent of more than his worldly goods, on account of contingent accident, it seems to me harsh that such a penalty should be imposed.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The penalty seems to me to be too heavy for the accidental opening of a gate. I suggest that the word "wilfully," who "wilfully leaves a gate open," be inserted.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no objection to that.

On section 216,

Mr. EDGAR. Would the Minister tell us what is new in this section?

Mr. THOMPSON. The section is all new, but the same subject was dealt with in section 85.

On section 220,

Mr. AMYOT. I think these by-laws should be printed in French, in the Province of Quebec, at any rate.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will add words, providing that in the Province of Quebec they shall be in both English and French.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I should like to enquire whether any provision is made in this Bill to regulate the size of the meshes of the covering of smoke stacks to prevent the escape of sparks.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The courts have decided that the company are bound to have proper appliances.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There are several new clauses in the Bill which appear to have been adopted in pursuance of the report of the Railway Commission. I would like the hon. Minister of Justice to state, in a few words, just what improvements have been made in the law by these clauses which have been added. He is aware that there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction in several parts of the country owing to discriminating rates between towns. I presume

that the object of these clauses has been to obviate that difficulty somewhat, and I would like him to state what advantage has been gained in that respect. For instance, would a person in making a shipment from Seaforth, Woodstock or Brantford over any one line of railway be entitled to the same rate per mile as a person shipping from another town for the same distance? I observe that one of the clauses says:

No company, in fixing any toll or rate, shall, under like condition and circumstances, make any unjust or partial discrimination between different localities; but no discrimination between localities which, by reason of competition by water or railway, it is necessary to make to secure traffic, shall be deemed to be unjust or partial.

I suppose that will leave the making of rates to Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and similar places, as much more favorable as the company may decide in their interests than to any inland port or ports that is not a railway centre. Have we really overcome the difficulty in any measure by the new clauses which have been added?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think so; certainly. It is provided:

The tolls fixed for large quantities or long distances may be proportionately less than the tolls fixed for small quantities or short distances, if such tolls are under the same circumstances charged equally to all persons.

That appears to me to cover the case entirely. While it preserves the principle of the long haul and the short haul, it declares that under the same circumstances all persons shall be charged the same rates. I do not think you can have it more explicit than that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand that is from any one town the same rates shall be charged to all persons in that town.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all. It does not say one town.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will the rates be the same to two towns at equal distance?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. McNEILL. What is the meaning of "under the same circumstances," in that section?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The same distance, the same quantity of goods, &c.

Mr. AMYOT moved:

That every member of the Senate or House of Commons shall be entitled to free passage upon any railway under the Federal jurisdiction upon exhibition of a certificate signed by the Clerk of the Senate or of the House of Commons respectively establishing the identity of such member.

This amendment if adopted will prevent railway companies from attempting to corrupt members by the offer of railway passes. Better have a law that will apply to every one, and not have railway companies coming down with offers of tickets to obtain votes. I do not complain on the score of not having free passes, because I get them in any case, but I say that members should not be assailed with offers of free railway tickets; and as the State pays for these roads, the members should have the right of travelling over them and using them at different points.

Mr. MADILL. Any men so weak-minded that they cannot withstand the influence of a pass should not have passes.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman cannot deny that railway companies were offering free tickets to members. That is an insult to Parliament and it should be avoided.

On section 228,

Mr. MULOCK. These sections provide for tolls such as receive the sanction of the General Governor in Council; but where railways have not submitted their tolls, they are
Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

entitled to collect for services rendered as common carriers. They should not be allowed to evade the principle of the law by simply withholding their tariff and then charging excessive rates as common carriers. I propose to add therefore to this section:

Nor shall any company levy or collect any money for services as a common carrier except subject to the provisions of this Act.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will agree to that amendment.

Mr. MULOCK. In section 230, provision is made for certain fixed tolls and I think there is a danger of the interests of the people being overlooked through want of knowledge or inadvertence on the part of the Government in approving of the tolls. When a railway submits its tolls to the Governor in Council, I suppose it sends in a schedule of tolls which involves the supposition that the Government has a knowledge of all the businesses of the country, but there is no one to represent each branch of business or the customers or patrons of the railway, and thus the Government have nothing before them except the schedule of the railway, and the railway representatives themselves. Thus, while the Government may be desirous of approving of only fair tolls, yet, looking into their Orders in Council of the past as I have done, I think they have invariably adopted as a whole the schedules sent in by the railway companies, and in many cases they have adopted schedules which were not only unjust but almost confiscatory. I may say that I have received a letter in reference to this matter from a stockdealer. It is dated 8th May, 1888. He says:

"You are well aware that the farmers and stockdealers are charged for shipping stock on the different roads in some case at a most ridiculous rate."

And then he mentions one case in which he shipped seven sheep from one place to another, only sixty miles distant, and was charged at car rates, \$18. I find that a carload of sheep means 120 or 130 sheep, and this man was charged for seven sheep the same price as it would cost to send 120 or 130 sheep. We know that many single animals are transferred from point to point in the Province for purposes that the Government should encourage. For instance, they are sent to shows and exhibited there, and they are shipped also, not more than one or two animals at a time, for breeding purposes. Ordinary cattle which are sold are sent in carloads, but if cattle are sent for breeding purposes they have as a rule to go alone, but in such a case the shipper may have to pay for half a car. I know a case in point, where a man had to pay for a small calf, because it happened to be a male animal, the same price as he would have had to pay for a 4,000 lb. bull. That is very unjust.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How do you propose to remedy it?

Mr. MULOCK. By an amendment to section 230, as follows:—

Provided always that in the case of any animal shipped to an exhibition for exhibition purposes, and return, and in the case of an animal shipped to any point for breeding purposes, the Railway Committee shall be entitled, notwithstanding any such Order in Council, to reduce the amount of the toll for the carriage of such animal under the circumstances aforesaid, when it appears to the said Committee that the amount fixed by the By-law is unjust or unreasonable, and the amount so taxed by the Committee shall be the only amount which the company shall be entitled to, and the balance shall be retained by the said Committee.

That is that where the amount collected is unreasonable or unjust, the Railway Committee may order its return to the shipper.

Mr. THOMPSON. This law enables us to revise the tolls from time to time, but this amendment proposes to ask us to make special rates for one animal. It will be wholly impossible to make special rates for single animals.

Mr. MULOCK. All stockbreeders are interested in this matter. The amount the railway companies are enabled to collect on the single animals in the aggregate does not

amount to very much to the companies, but it seriously interferes with the breeders.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman proposes that, as the value increases, the cost of carriage should decrease. As I understand, he proposes that the amount for which he would carry a common ox should be much larger than the amount to be charged for an animal which would take a high prize at a show. Take the case of a horse which is used for breeding purposes. Instead of that being charged at a less price, there should be a larger price paid for an animal of that kind than for a common animal. The hon. gentleman is reversing the whole thing.

Mr. MULLOCK. The hon. gentleman has lived so far away from the atmosphere of the Canadian farmer that he has forgotten whatever he knew in reference to farming interests. If he would remain a little more in Canada, he might not be so ignorant of the effect of the proposition which I have made, and he would know that this amendment proposes to deal with the case of individual cattle shipped for exhibition or breeding purposes, because otherwise they go in car loads.

Mr. BOWELL. Not always.

Mr. MULLOCK. Almost always.

Mr. BOWELL. If you want to send a draught horse from one farmer to another, you will send it singly.

Mr. MULLOCK. As a rule, ordinary stock are taken in car loads.

Mr. BOWELL. Any one who has brought a single horse anywhere, as I brought one to this town, must know that he would have to pay in the ordinary way. I had to pay for a car.

Mr. MULLOCK. Perhaps Ministers of the Crown may be able to pay for a car for their horses.

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, we are talking sense just now, and not nonsense.

Mr. MULLOCK. I am talking sense.

Mr. BOWELL. You are trying to insult everyone you speak to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can hardly imagine that the hon. gentleman is serious in the amendment he proposes. Does he suggest that, for every calf which is sent to an exhibition there is to be a special meeting of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and witnesses are to be called and evidence received as to the weight and value of the animal? It is simply trifling with the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there is some force in what the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has said. I know that I brought a horse down to Ottawa at a cost of \$14 and I took him back and paid only \$10. Inside the last couple of months I shipped two head of cattle about 100 miles for which I paid \$20. The trouble is this: Whatever the rate may be, if it was so much per hundred it would be all right; but when they carry an animal that will weigh 300 or 400 pounds and put him down at 2,400 or 4,000 pounds, then the rate becomes unreasonable.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think these hon. gentlemen should remember that in almost every case where a single animal, or two animals, are shipped from one point to another, a car is required to be sent with them, and necessarily the rates for each of these animals would be greater than the rate for each animal were a full car load shipped. Besides, my experience is that the railway companies, in transferring animals to exhibitions or for breeding purposes, have transferred them at much lower rates than for any other purpose, at lower rates even than those fixed by the Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think there is something in this. At one time I purchased a horse, and had him taken a distance of sixty miles, and had to pay for the carriage 2,400 pounds. Now, I think the farmers have some claim to consideration. We buy an animal for breeding purposes, and we wish to transport him, he can be put in the corner of a car along with other freight. It is not fair that we should be charged such enormous sums.

Mr. THOMPSON. We have that power now by the very section you propose to amend. We have the right to revise and lower from time to time.

Mr. MULLOCK. But that does not meet the case, because the charge has been levied. You have approved of a by-law which you propose to revise, but so long as that by-law is in force, the rates collected remain the property of the company.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the true remedy is to amend the law under which that toll is created by lowering the tariff; but having sanctioned the toll, we cannot ask them to give up the tolls they have legally collected.

Mr. MULLOCK. It would be impossible for the committee to approve of a tariff that will be just all round, because they cannot have the knowledge that will enable them to do so. The railway company will get you to approve any tariff that will operate unjustly upon a certain class of people. You have done it over and over again, and you will do it again. All I ask is that when you have sanctioned the collection of a rate which is unjust and unreasonable, you should undo the mischief done thereby.

Mr. THOMPSON. We ought to pay it ourselves, perhaps.

Mr. MULLOCK. I did not ask any such ridiculous thing. The Minister of Justice knows that I have not addressed him in any such spirit. I do not propose such an unfair thing, and if he wants to get this Bill discussed in a proper spirit, I will ask him to be kind enough not to answer me in that spirit. We are trying to prepare a Bill in the common interest of all. If the Minister chooses to sneer at the interest I represent, it is his privilege to do so.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not know why the hon. member loses his temper about it. All I said was, it would be much more reasonable and sensible to say that those who had committed the mistake should pay the toll back than those who had collected it under their law. But the hon. gentleman's proposition strikes me as silly in the extreme, and I cannot see how any one can read that clause and keep a straight face.

Mr. MARSHALL. I can ship cattle now under the old law as cheaply as this will enable me to do. I have shipped cattle and calves altogether by space, and not by weight at all. As the law stands, it is our own fault if the railway takes the advantage of us.

Mr. DENISON. It says here that these regulations shall be changed from time to time by Order in Council, and they can at any time, by representation to the Privy Council, have such changes made without putting them in the Act.

On section 242,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wish to ask a question with reference to recovery. You would ship, we will say, by the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk to deliver to another company, some goods. The goods are damaged by one of the railways at some point, and you make application to the company you shipped by, and they say: We delivered them all right to the next company. The next company says: They were not in proper order when they came to us; and so between the two companies the person is buffeted back-

ward and forward and gets no compensation. What redress is there for him under this railway law? 243, I see, makes the second company that refuses or neglects to receive, convey, or deliver any goods delivered by the first company responsible to the first company, but I cannot see that it makes them liable for any damage that may have occurred to the goods in transit. This has been brought under my notice from a party shipping a car load of apples to Winnipeg. They became damaged *en route*, and he was unable to obtain damages from the railway company.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It has been held that if a company undertook to carry goods to Winnipeg they would be responsible for them no matter what line they passed over.

Mr. MULOCK. In regard to section 245 I cannot bring the point I desire to make more clearly before the committee than by reading an extract from a local journal, the *Newmarket Era*. I do not vouch for the correctness of the statement, as I have had no opportunity of seeing the editor and ascertaining how far he verifies it. The extract is as follows:—

"ANOTHER MAN KILLED.—On Friday night last another lamentable accident occurred on the Northern Railway, near Longford, which resulted in the death of another employé on the road named Thomas Scanlon, nephew of Mrs. P. Kitto, of Newmarket, and brother of Mr. Richard Scanlon, baker, of Aurora. The cause of the accident was the same as that which resulted in the death of the brakeman, only a couple of months ago, who was run over at Holland Landing, and demands a remedy at the hands of the Government. Mr. Scanlon attempted to set the brake on a flat car, when the end of the shaft came out of the socket and he was thrown between the cars. Only the caboose passed over him, but it mangled both legs almost off near his body and he died after 4 hours of suffering. He was about 28 years of age and expected to be married next month. He was a very active, intelligent and obliging man, and a general favorite among those with whom he worked. He had been on the road 5 or 6 years and was the next man to be promoted. His remains were interred by sorrowing relatives some two or three miles above Bradford on Monday last, near his parent's residence."

Apart from the ordinary law, which to some extent limits the liability of employés in some cases, there is a custom requiring employés to contract themselves out of their rights in case of accident. Will the Minister of Justice be prepared to receive an amendment to deal with such a case?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes; but it should not be moved this evening, but submitted only, and I will take it into consideration.

Committee reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2.05 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 15th May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ONTARIO AND SAULT STE. MARIE RAILWAY.

Mr. HDGAR asked, Whether an application has been made to the Government by the Ontario and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company for a subsidy; and whether the Government has yet decided to aid the construction of that line?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Such an application has been made, but I am not in a position to give an answer to the second portion of the question.

THE DREDGE CAPE BRETON.

Mr. TUPPER (Picton) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to provide for a steam dredge in the place of the dredge *Cape Breton* which was lost last fall?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention of the Government to buy another steam dredge, at all events for the present; but most likely the steam dredge that has been lost will be replaced by a hired one.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. CURRAN (for Mr. GIROUARD), asked, Have the Government received an application from the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada for assistance in doubling their line of railway between Montreal and Toronto; and is it the intention of the Government to bring the same before this House during the present Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Such an application has been received, but I am not in a position to answer the second portion of the question.

TUNNEL FROM SARNIA TO PORT HURON.

Mr. HESSON (for Mr. PATTERSON, Essex), asked, Have the Government received an application from the St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company for assistance in the construction of a tunnel for railway purposes from Sarnia to Port Huron, in Michigan; and if so, is it intended to bring the same before this House during the present Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Such an application has been made, but I cannot answer the second portion of the question at present.

EXCISEMAN AT PICTON.

Mr. PLATT asked, What is the gross amount of revenue collected by Mr. A. F. McCuaig, exciseman at Picton, since his appointment? What was Mr. McCuaig's salary when appointed, and what is his salary now? When was the increase made?

Mr. FOSTER. The gross amount of revenue collected by Mr. McCuaig, exciseman at Picton, for 1886-87 was \$5,816; for 1887-88 the returns are not in. His salary at the time of his appointment was \$200. He afterwards claimed the minimum salary of a third class clerk, \$400, and he has received it.

PUBLIC WORKS IN PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY.

Mr. PLATT asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place in the Supplementary Estimates any sum or sums of money for any or all of the following purposes: To construct post office and customs office at Picton; to dredge Picton harbor; to construct harbor of refuge at Wellington; to build bridge across the Bay of Quinté at Belleville?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention of the Government to lay other Supplementary Estimates before the House than those that are now before it.

SUBSIDY TO THE LAKE ST JOHN RAILWAY

Mr. COUTURE. (Translation). Asked whether it is the intention of the Government to grant a subsidy to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company for its branch line from Lake St. John to St. Alphonse?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to inform the hon. member that I am not now in a position to answer his question.

RATIFICATION OF TRANSFER—LAKE ST. JOHN RAILWAY.

Mr. COUTURE (Translation.) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to ratify, during this Session, the transfer made by the Saguenay and Lake St. John Railway Company to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, of the sum of ninety-six thousand dollars voted last Session? If not, why?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to inform the hon. member that question is not yet decided.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Will it be during the Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) It is not decided for the present moment.

BUOYS IN THE RIVER SAGUENAY.

Mr. COUTURE asked, Who received the contract for placing, maintaining and removing the buoys in the River Saguenay, awarded on or about the 5th May, 1888? What is the amount of the said contract? Who were the parties who tendered, and what was the amount of the tender in each case?

Mr. FOSTER. The contract for placing, maintaining and removing the buoys in the River Saguenay, and for receiving, storing and delivering supplies at the light stations, has been awarded to Mr. Ainsworth Sturton, of Chicoutimi. The amount of the contract is \$250 per annum. The other parties who tendered, and the amounts of their tenders, are as follows:—William Warren, \$350; Louis Dufaur, \$600; Thomas Tremblay, \$850; Joseph L. Tremblay, \$950; François St. Pierre, \$1,000; Honoré Savard, \$1,250 for the last year, \$800 for the second year, and \$800 for the third year; Alexander Blair, \$1,300 per annum.

OBSTRUCTIONS TO SHIPPING.

Gen. LAURIE asked, Whether the attention of the Government have been called to the danger and obstructions to shipping stated to have been caused in the West Atlantic Ocean, by the abandonment and subsequent breaking up of the large raft of timber and logs which was taken, in December last, from the Bay of Fundy in tow for New York, and whether it is the intention to prescribe such regulations for any future experiment of this kind as will ensure that such ventures shall not be undertaken in a manner that will constitute a serious danger to the common navigation of the high seas?

Mr. FOSTER. The attention of the Government has not been directly called to the danger of obstructions to the shipping from the causes stated in the hon. gentleman's question. It is the intention of the Government to consider, during the recess, whether any legislation is necessary in order to prevent the going of these rafts to sea. At present we have no law which would cover such a case.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the Government lay before the House the correspondence with regard to two items which I find in the Supplementary Estimates? Item, page 3, construction of dam above and below Dunnville weirs; item 40, page 8, to pay one-half the cost of the construction of a bridge across Grand River, at the village of York, the County Council of Haldimand paying the other half.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will see and have these papers brought down.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the hon. gentleman bring down the papers connected with the items on page 7 of the Supplementary Estimates? The items are: Oakville harbor, \$2,300; Meaford, \$5,000; Thornbury, \$3,000; Collingwood, \$5,000; Penetanguishene, \$10,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. You mean the correspondence that has passed between the Government and those parties?

Mr. MULOCK. Yes; the correspondence and the scheme in each case for expenditure. I presume there are reports from the officers of the department as to the expenditure. I mean whatever papers bear upon the question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think I will be able to bring the papers and give the information the hon. gentleman requires, when we take up these items.

Mr. MULOCK. If they were laid upon the Table beforehand, an examination might render any debate unnecessary, and thus promote the despatch of business.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will try and meet the hon. gentleman's wishes.

THE FISHERY QUESTION.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the First Minister if the Government will be prepared, before Parliament prorogues, to announce what policy they intend pursuing with reference to the Fishery Treaty in the event of the treaty not being accepted by the American Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The House will be informed before prorogation on the subject.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 126) respecting Insurance, chapter 124 of the Revised Statutes.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

Bill (No. 104) to amend chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, "The Territories Real Property Act."—(Mr. Thompson.)

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved second reading of Bill (No. 116) to amend the Civil Service Act, chapter 17 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That clause is now perfectly useless, as it referred to the classification of civil servants who were in the service when the Act came into force. That classification is now complete.

On section 2,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That clause has been rendered necessary by a certain number of fraudulent practices that have happened in the course of the examinations, the detection of which is rendered rather difficult, because the means to detect them are not at the disposal of the examiners. These would probably be repeated if a severe punishment were not imposed upon the offender. This clause is only to punish these frauds, either of personating another, which has happened once or twice, or of getting the papers from other candidates and copying them, or of fraudulently obtaining examination papers before the examination takes place. If there is a case of larceny at all, I think that is one, because a man may be stealing the situation of another, either by personating the other man, or by getting, purchasing or stealing the printed papers or forms of questions prepared for the examination.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not exactly see the point of the last paragraph of clause 2. I can quite understand that, if somebody is on trial for what I agree with my hon. friend is a grievous offence, there should be power to summon anyone to answer, and the party who summons should have the power of a magistrate, but to proceed in that way on mere suspicion would give a very large and dangerous power.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The powers given are only those which are granted to a magistrate when he is preparing an examination, under the Summary Convictions Act. They are not the same powers as are given to a court sitting in trial. I think there is a similarity in the two cases and that a similar remedy should be given, so as to procure the attendance of witnesses and the proper answers when proper questions are put.

Mr. LAURIER. But a magistrate never uses these powers under the Summary Convictions Act unless there is an accused before him, and the object of summoning witnesses is to establish whether the accused is guilty or innocent; but here it appears that there is to be an inquisition to discover whether there has been an offence committed, and, if a person is summoned in that way, he may not be able to answer without criminating himself.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. How can the attendance be obtained? In the case of an investigation by a magistrate, when it is made in regard to a felony or crime, the magistrate has a right to issue a summons, and, if that is not answered, he has the right to punish the offender.

Mr. LAURIER. Under the circumstances, it would be more natural to make this offence a misdemeanor, and to say that the person accused might be brought before the magistrate or the examiner, but it seems to me that it would be very dangerous in practice to allow any inquisition to be made except when there is a person accused.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The offence is practically made a misdemeanor by the Act. In this case it was necessary to make this provision, because there is no accuser. Necessarily the accuser is the examiner, and he cannot give the information himself. This possibly might be added: that he believes that such an offence has been committed, and on that he is to summon such witnesses as he thinks are required to make out the charge. This could not be exactly at the beginning of the proceedings, because there is no other prosecutor than the public prosecutor who is the examiner. I do not see that any harm can result from this provision, and I think the clause is necessary for the enforcement of the Act.

Mr. MULOCK. I would call the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that under the fourth section the party accused is compellable to answer, and, if he refuses to answer any question put to him in relation to any charge, he is liable to be summarily dealt with by the presiding officer by fine and imprisonment, unless he gives to that officer what the officer may deem to be a just excuse.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If it was an answer which would criminate himself, that would be a just excuse.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to know if the presiding officer is to take that view of it, because, although in the other section the penalty, under summary conviction, is liability to imprisonment for six months and so on, I think the crime of personation at an examination is more than a misdemeanor, and really amounts to a forgery. I think a person who personates another has to sign a false declaration, and under our criminal law I think that would be called forgery, and therefore he would be guilty of a felony punishable by imprisonment. If you are to put duress upon a person who is so charged, you practically compel a person who is charged with felony to give evidence or to

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

be committed. Generally speaking, if such a person is to be admitted as a witness under the criminal code, let it be so enacted, but this should not be made an exceptional case. I entirely sympathise with the object of the hon. gentleman to prevent these frauds, but there is no guarantee that the officer who is clothed with this summary power will consider the excuse in the same light as that which the hon. Minister has stated, and he may say, under his summary power, I enforce the penalty against you, and I do not consider the excuse that you might criminate yourself a good excuse, and, therefore, I choose to exercise the power to punish you summarily.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. But is not the fear of criminating one's self a lawful excuse for not answering anywhere an investigation for an offence made? Perhaps we might meet the views of the hon. gentleman by substituting the word "lawful." I have no objection to say "just and lawful excuse." We cannot say that a party who says he will not answer because he might criminate himself, is not making a lawful excuse.

Mr. MULOCK. Quite so, but I wish to impress upon the Minister that the chairman may be absolutely innocent of all knowledge of criminal law. A magistrate is appointed to administer criminal law because of his supposed fitness, but the chairman of an examining committee is not appointed for any such reason. We are attaching to this office of chairman, powers that he may be wholly incapable of exercising, and we cannot expect to find what the Secretary of State says would be a perfectly valid reason for the candidate refusing to answer the question. I think it would be wise that if he should reconsider that before vesting such powers in the chairman, I would prefer, in the case of refusing to answer, what the ordinary machinery of the law be invoked, and if he is then declared to have committed an offence, that he should be punished before a magistrate in the ordinary way.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I quite agree with what has been stated by the hon. gentleman. I suppose it will not be denied that when gentlemen are appointed to the position of justice of the peace, notwithstanding what we have heard on that subject, their general fitness for the position is taken into consideration. It is possible that the chairman may be eminently fitted for the discharge of the duties of examiner, but entirely unfitted to discharge any judicial duties. I think it would be dangerous to clothe the chairman of the examining board with any such powers as is here proposed to be given him.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is a presumption that every magistrate knows the law, and I believe there is a presumption that the chairman of the board of examiners is as well qualified as an ordinary magistrate.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). But this man is not a magistrate.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He is given the power of a magistrate by this Act, and certainly there is a presumption that he knows the law sufficiently to understand whether a lawful excuse is given when a man says that he does not want to answer for fear of criminating himself.

Mr. THOMPSON. The object of this section is to provide machinery for making an examination before any person can be definitely charged before a magistrate. It does seem to me to be proper.

Mr. LAURIER. It is quite proper.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is somewhat inquisitorial, of course; but so are all proceedings which take place before boards, for instance, to examine into the causes of fire. The chairman of the board will not be in a position to refuse any person, but it seems to me that he is fully as competent to hold an investigation of this kind as an

ordinary justice of the peace. If he is not, let us make him a justice of the peace, and then he will be fitted.

Mr. MULOCK. Very well, make him a justice of the peace.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister of Justice has stated the case exactly as it is. You make an offence of a certain act which may be done by a candidate at an examination. So far I quite agree with the principle of the act that it should be made an offence punishable by law; but you go further, and you say that the moment the board is constituted and such an offence has been committed, then they have power to make an inquisition to discover the culprit, to summon witnesses, and compel them to give evidence as to who is the author of the offence. This is altogether repugnant to the spirit of our law, and to the spirit of the British criminal law; and once you make it an offence, I see no reason why you should treat it differently from other offences. In this light, I think the spirit of the act is very objectionable.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think the powers mentioned in this clause should be given. In the first place the power to be exercised by the members of the board are powers that are not permitted to be exercised by any magistrate. A magistrate cannot proceed with a case without having an information laid before him by a complainant; this must be done before he can proceed in the regular way. Under this clause, if a member of the board believes that an offence has been committed, or that some irregularity with regard to the examination has taken place, he has all power in his own hand, and he can immediately summon before him every pupil for examination. The Minister says it would be no good reason for refusing to reply to a question that the person would criminate himself. Suppose a person is under examination and declines to answer on the ground that it would criminate himself; then information might immediately be lodged, and an action brought against him in the ordinary courts.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This examination is reported to the Secretary of State, before any information can be laid regularly before a magistrate. I understand very well the objection raised by the leader of the Opposition, and I fully agree with him that it is a novelty in our law; but I think the novelty is justified by the position of the parties. It is true we hold a preliminary investigation to know whether there is an offence which should be reported afterwards and prosecuted. For this purpose we give to an officer named in the law the powers of a magistrate for the moment. We do not do anything which is very extraordinary. Parliament has the right to grant certain powers to any person, and here we give those powers to persons who are supposed to understand the law, and as well as any magistrate. We give him the power to compel persons to appear before him to give information, in the case under investigation, and if this person refuses to answer, then the magistrate reports the case to the Secretary of State for prosecution, if there is reason to prosecute.

Mr. MULOCK. Would it not be safer that in every case the chairman should be a duly qualified magistrate?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I was thinking of that a moment ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think some little consideration should be given to the class of persons who are likely to be affected by this clause. I suppose the great bulk of the pupils who appear before these examiners are young men from the ages of 16 and 17 to 21 and 22; and the examiners before whom they are to appear are commonly known as college dons. Now, I must say that when I had some experience with college dons, if they had been granted such powers as the hon. gentleman proposes to grant them here, mighty summary justice would have been

administered to the collegians who were brought before them. Speaking from my own recollection, I say that while college dons are, as a general thing, very good examiners, they are very unfit persons to be entrusted with judicial or inquisitorial powers—particularly unfit. For that reason I should object myself to seeing the chairman of a board of examiners clothed with inquisitorial power to examine an oath, and to punish in case of contempt. My experience of that class generally is that they are very respectable, eminently respectable, and all the rest of it, but at the same time they are extremely arbitrary, and disposed to stretch whatever authority is given them to the extreme point. How far the suggestion of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) could be carried out, I do not know, but I think it would greatly hamper the Secretary of State, in the choice of proper examiners.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not think this House can confer this power; it rests with the Local Government.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The power of appointing a justice of the peace is with this Government. I do not think there is much danger in assuming that this Government, in giving a commission of justice of the peace to the chairman of the board of examiners, can make as good a selection as any government. I do not refer particularly to the present Governments. Such officers can be entrusted with the powers of a justice of the peace with full safety to the public and to those interested. The power will not extend to inflicting punishment for offences, but only to make investigations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then what is the meaning of the last words, which say that the chairman, or the acting chairman, shall be invested with all the powers conferred in like cases?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is power to compel witnesses to appear and answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He can commit for contempt.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Quite likely.

On section 3,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose to add at the end of the section these words: "Nothing herein shall affect persons who have been previously promoted to the rank of deputy head."

On section 4,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The only change proposed is this: By the law, as it is now, officers in the lower grades, that is to say, the mail carriers, porters, messengers, and so on, may have had their salaries increased from \$300, at which they commence, to \$450 or \$500, which is the maximum, after a certain number of years service. When those, after having been submitted to a qualifying examination, enter the service, I really think it is a cruel thing to reduce them, when they had rendered four, five, or six years of service.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not understand really what is the meaning of this sub-section:

The optional subjects in the next preceding sub-section mentioned shall be book-keeping, shorthand, translation and type-writing.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There were before six different optional subjects by the regulations, and we reduced it by statute to four, and we name them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does proficiency in each of those subjects entitle a party to \$50 a year extra?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes; \$50 a year extra on their appointment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They may receive \$200 more if they are proficient in all these subjects?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If they are proficient in all these points they would receive \$200 more on appointment.

On section 5,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The 5th section is only to make examinations once a year.

Mr. MULOCK. Would you introduce into the Bill the words "only once a year"?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection.

On section 6,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is only striking out the words "or in both," which had no sense.

Mr. LAURIER. It does seem to me that they had some sense, since, if the candidate passes a good examination in one language, he is qualified, or he might be examined in both languages.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It would exactly mean, if he wants to be examined in translation, that that is an optional subject, and he gets \$50 more for that on his appointment.

On section 8,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That section provides that:

Such examination shall be in such subjects as are determined, from time to time, for each department by the Governor in Council, and in such subjects as, by report of the deputy head of the department in which the promotion is to be made, concurred in by the head of the department, are submitted to the board as best adapted to test the fitness of the candidates for the vacant office.

The regulations provide that an officer is not promoted from one class except to the next following class. That is to say, he cannot be promoted by favor from a third class into a first class. He has to pass through a second class. He would not have the right to be examined for a first class when he was only a third class clerk. The rule is that young fellows arriving from the benches of the school cannot be appointed over men who have been a long time in the service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As we understand it, you omit from the existing law as it now stands, that part of the law which declares that examinations shall be:

"Open to any person who holds a position below that to which the promotion is to be made in either division of the service of the department in which the vacancy to be filled by promotion exists."

It seems reasonable on the face of it, but there must be some reason for the omission.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As I said, it is provided for by the regulations in the Civil Service, and we thought it was not necessary to put it in the Act. A person can be promoted, who passes an examination only from the class below, to the next class superior. The regulations require that those called for promotion examination to a first-class clerkship will be of the second class.

Mr. LAURIER. In other words, you say the regulations provide what the law provides here.

Mr. McNEILL. Is there any other provision in the Act that enables a man to go for promotion when these words are struck out?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Of course there is.

Mr. McNEILL. It is merely to prevent a third class clerk passing to the first class?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, or a second class to a chief clerkship.

Mr. MULOCK. It is provided in this amended section that the promotion examination may be dispensed with, on the report of the deputy head, in the case of certain persons who are supposed to have sufficient training already. Among others are mentioned the graduates of the Royal Military College. I would suggest that the words should be added: "or any university in Canada."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As I understand the law, graduates of the Royal Military College are only exempt from examination when they seek promotion in the line of their profession, as in the Militia Department.

Mr. MULOCK. Although their education in the college may be largely military, it is literary as well. If you look at the curriculum of the military college, you will find that a very large portion of their work is just such as is done in any first class educational institution in Canada, and if you grant this privilege to the graduates of that college, the graduates of every well-conducted university are entitled to the same privilege. It is simply ridiculous, in my opinion, to require the graduates of any Canadian university to submit, as a matter of course, to the promotion examination. This clause does not entitle anyone to an absolute exemption; it must be on a favorable report, and I ask that graduates of the universities should be included in this favored class.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If I understand the law rightly, the exemption, so far as the Royal Military College cadets are concerned, applies to the examination qualifying them to enter into the Civil Service; but there is no exemption under the law from promotion examinations.

Mr. MULOCK. Read the section; there is no doubt it applies to them.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The promotion examination is only dispensed with when the officers are seeking promotion in the line of their profession. In the Department of Customs, for instance, if a military college graduate sought promotion, he would have to be examined.

Mr. MULOCK. I move to add after the words "Royal Military College," the words "or any university in Canada."

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I certainly think those words might be added. Every graduate of a university ought to be as well qualified as any young person who passes the Civil Service examinations, and to include university graduates would be recognising their status.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend is also laboring under a mistake. This only concerns promotion in the line of their profession, and not otherwise.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that if a lawyer is appointed in the Department of Justice, he requires no examination, but if he is appointed in the Department of Militia, or any other department, then he requires to be examined.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Quite so.

Mr. MULOCK. The universities turn out men with technical knowledge. Every well equipped university, for instance, has a faculty of law, the graduates of which might be appointed to the Department of Justice, although not barristers or attorneys. Yet, even when they may be getting promotion in their professional line, you require them to pass an examination.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. To tell the truth, I never understood why this special provision regarding the graduates of the Royal Military College was introduced here, unless it was introduced under the supposition that they would not be required to pass the qualifying examination. I would have no objection to saying that graduates of every university should be exempt from examination for entering the service.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the hon. the Secretary of State will add a clause allowing graduates to enter without examination, and introduce the words I have suggested after the words "Royal Military College."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Graduates of the Royal Military College and of the universities will be exempted from the qualifying examination, because their certificates entitle

them to enter without examination, but this does not apply to promotion in the service.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would suggest that the words "military or civil" be put before engineers, and not after.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The clause as amended reads as follows: Graduates of the Royal Military College and of any university in Canada shall be exempt from qualifying examination. In the case of barristers, attorneys, military or civil engineers, officers of artillery in the Militia Department, architects, draughtsmen, land surveyors, &c., striking out the words "graduate of the Royal Military College."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The 11th section, the 47th, will have to be recast. The second part of it should remain as it is now, that is: that all temporary employes shall not be paid more than at the rate of \$400 a year; but the first part of the clause, as it is in the statute, should be struck out, because there is another clause which refers to the officers who have been employed from 1882.

Mr. LAURIER. You take power to appoint these officers?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, we take power to appoint to the permanent service officers who were employed in the temporary service before 1882. It was by mistake that in the amendment and consolidation of the Civil Service Act, that clause was taken out. It was in the Act before 1885 that temporary clerks who had been employed before 1882 might be transferred without a qualifying examination. By this clause we claim the power to transfer them without examination, and to appoint them at the salary they have been receiving during the last two years of their service. I have taken the average of the two years of their service in order to prevent certain things that might happen. No government is perfect, and some chief of a department might yield to solicitation and increase the salary, in view of an appointment, if this provision were not inserted.

Mr. LAURIER. I think this is very objectionable. It is departing from the principle of the Act, which is that no one should be appointed unless he has proved his ability by an examination. In the case of certain servants who have been employed for six years as temporary clerks but have become permanent clerks, they are now to be put on the permanent list without examination. What reason can there be for that?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend has voted for that before.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think I have voted for it, but I have tolerated many things for which I am very sorry. Because it was done once, I do not think that is any reason why it should be done again, and I think we should continue to uphold the good parts of the Act. There is a double objection here. In the first place, no temporary officers should be kept on the civil list. If those officers are wanted, power should be taken to employ them in the ordinary way.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We are doing that as much as possible.

Mr. LAURIER. I think you are acting too quickly. There are certain officers who you say are required, and you take authority from Parliament and ask for power to appoint them without examination. I cannot see any reason for that.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I already said that they had that right by law from 1882 to 1885, and that it was through an oversight that it was taken away from them. It was not just that it should be taken away from them, and this is only restoring the law as it existed between 1882 and 1885.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the hon. gentleman's oversights are better than his deliberations.

Mr. McNEILL. I quite agree with the principle of the amendment which has now been introduced to this clause, and I should only like to see it carried further. So far as I understand this amendment, it amounts to this: that service and proved fitness will be taken in lieu of examination. These gentlemen are to be allowed to enter the permanent service without examination simply because they have proved themselves to be fit during their tenure of office in the temporary service. I think it would be quite right to extend this principle further, and I propose to add these words to this section 11:

The provisions of the Civil Service Act, so far as they render promotion in the Civil Service contingent in any degree upon examination as provided in the said Act, shall not apply to any civil servant who entered the Civil Service before the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two; and any civil servant who entered the service prior to that date shall be eligible for promotion in every respect as though such provisions as to examination had never been enacted.

I do not think it is necessary to take up the time of the House in pressing the reasons in support of this amendment. I think it must commend itself to the sense and justice of every hon. member. These gentlemen entered the service by reason of certain prospects which were held out to them in the service. They might have entered other walks of life, but, because of certain prospects which were held out to them, they entered the Civil Service. I do not think it is necessary to ask any hon. gentleman to agree with me, because I am sure that everyone will agree with me, when I say that one prospect above all others which was held out to them and led them to adopt the Civil Service in preference to other walks in life, was the prospect of promotion, which would carry with it greater emoluments. These gentlemen who entered the service before 1882 entered it in good faith, believing that, if certain conditions were fulfilled, they would receive these promotions. The conditions were very well understood. There was no misapprehension in regard to the matter that, if a civil servant was diligent, and if he was of good conduct, and if he proved himself efficient in the discharge of the duties of the service, his promotion would follow as a matter of course. The Act which was introduced in 1882 changed all that, and these gentlemen, without any fault of their own, found themselves suddenly debarred from their promotion unless they were able to answer certain curious questions, peculiar questions, strange questions, which were propounded to them by certain inquisitors; unless they could answer these questions in a manner satisfactory to those inquisitors, they were debarred from their promotion. I think it requires no argument to show that this practically amounted to a breach of faith with these men. It does not matter how long a man has served, how efficient he has been, or how good his conduct has been, unless he can pass this newly devised test, he is to be precluded from obtaining the emoluments which were held out to him at the time he entered the service. A good deal more might be said on the subject, but I do not desire to delay the House at this stage of the Session, and I think the amendment will commend itself to the common justice of every hon. member, and I therefore move it.

Mr. DENISON. I desire to say a word on behalf of this motion. I know of a case in Toronto which I think is a very hard one. A man was appointed to the custom house there eighteen or twenty years ago as a tide-waiter, and long ago he received the maximum wages allowed to tide-waiters, of \$600. Now a law is passed which compels him to pass an examination before he can be made a landing waiter, the duties of which he has been performing ever since he was first appointed at the port. Now it seems to me very unfair that a man who is competent to do the duty of a landing waiter, and who has been doing it for 18 years, should not be appointed to the position which he has actually filled because this Act steps in and says that because he was not appointed nominally to that office, he is debarred

from ever rising any higher, or from receiving the salary of a landing waiter, the work of which he has been doing for so many years.

Mr. BROWN. I wish to add my testimony to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has preceded me. It seems to me that great injustice is often done to men who entered the service before these examinations were instituted. I know of many persons in the service who are, perhaps, as efficient public servants, if not more so, than men who have passed the examinations, whereas men are placed over their heads because they have received their certificates, but who positively are not as competent to fill the positions. I speak feelingly on this subject, because I know of men whose services in the Department are of a great value, but who cannot receive promotion under this law, although they are entitled to it.

Mr. CASEY. I have pleasure in endorsing the amendment and the remarks of my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). It is not often that one has an opportunity of endorsing the remarks of an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). You have plenty of opportunities, if you would only embrace them.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree with his contention that it is unfair to those members of the Civil Service who entered before the present Act was passed, to compel them to pass an examination before getting their promotion. There are some departments, of course, such as the Department of Inland Revenue and the corps of surveyors, in which a strictly departmental and technical examination should be permitted, so as to test the fitness of the person asking for promotion. But I agree with my hon. friend in holding that in the rest of the departments, the sort of examination that has been held does not test in any sense the fitness for promotion of the applicant. I do not make any accusations against the Government in regard to the manner in which these examinations have been conducted; I may, perhaps, bring that question up hereafter. At present I may say, however, that I have been informed that parties applying to be admitted to these examinations have been refused permission to go up for examination because they were not in sympathy with the Government of the day, while on the other hand, those who were in sympathy were allowed to go up for examination. This might occur under any government; I do not charge it as a special fault against this Government. I say the power to prevent civil servants from going to these departmental examinations, and consequently to prevent them from getting promotion, should not be vested in the Minister of any department. I would go further even than the hon. member for Bruce, and I would urge that not only in respect to those members of the service who entered before 1882, but in respect to those who have entered since, these examinations should be abolished. I do not believe they are a useful or practical part of the Civil Service Act; I do not believe they show in any degree whether a person applying for promotion is fit for it, and for that reason I should be willing to support an amendment for abolishing all examinations for promotion except in the branches to which I have referred to, the Inland Revenue Department and the corps of surveyors. I believe you might, in those branches, have a departmental examination to test the applicant's fitness for promotion; but in all the other departments I should be glad to see departmental examinations for promotions abolished altogether.

Mr. SHANLY. I hope that the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) will meet with the general acceptance of this House. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Denison) has cited an instance which clearly shows the extreme injustice that may be

Mr. DENISON.

wrought by the present system. I think I could mention scores of similar instances all over this Dominion. I think all over the country civil servants can be found who entered the service with a good education, and who may have been able, at that time, to answer all such questions as are now put to the boys who enter the service. These men have thoroughly learned their business, and have become first-class departmental officers, but in doing so they may have, perhaps, forgotten their school-boy lore; and now a boy who is fresh from school, and who can answer all these fancy questions, is put above the heads of these men who have borne the burden and heat of the day; and, who advancing in years, are told: You must stay where you are, and let this boy go above you. And it should be remembered that this same boy who going in now fresh from school will, while he is learning his business and making himself equally qualified with the man over whose head he is put, in turn forget all his school-boy lore, and his ability to answer the fancy questions required by the examination, by the time he becomes as able as the man over whose head he is placed. I most sincerely hope that this great injustice will be remedied, and that the amendment of the hon. member for North Bruce will be accepted by this House. I think it perfectly proper, however, that on entering the service there should be a strict examination, because, we should know that those who enter the service can at least read, write and figure decently well. I do not agree with my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey), because I think that without the Civil Service Act, the same evil that formerly existed would be perpetuated, and people appointed, for political or some other reasons, who are absolutely deficient in the very rudiments of education, and consequently altogether unfit for their positions.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think too much importance should be attached to remarks of the hon. member, suggesting that a departmental officer has got to go back to his school-boy lore before he can get promotion; because if the provision we passed a short time ago means anything, it means that the deputy heads of departments shall frame such questions as relate to information practically needed in the department. That clause says: "Such examinations shall be in such subjects as are determined from time to time for each department by the Governor General in Council," and they shall be concurred in by the head of the department. Now, I take it, that the deputy head will suggest practical questions in his department, and these are to be concurred in by the head of the department. If the principle holds good you have an equal right to apply it to every man who entered the Civil Service after 1882, and even a greater right, than to those who entered before that time, because we have the guarantee that those who entered afterwards passed the qualifying examination, whereas the other men may not have done so. If the examinations are conducted on the practical work of the department, as the Bill now contemplates, the deputy head would put such questions as would bring out the information needed to prove the candidate's qualification or otherwise, for the place to which he seeks promotion.

Mr. McNEILL. If the examinations are to be confined purely to matters connected with the practical working of the department, there is an examination going on day by day, week by week, and month by month, very much better than any examination which two or three men could institute during one or two hours. I wonder what business man would promote a clerk in his employ, not by what he knows himself of his fitness and ability to perform the duties required of him, but by what persons who came in and asked half a dozen questions in the course of a forenoon, told him. With respect to the remarks of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. White), I, perhaps, may be allowed to read half a dozen lines, and to cite a case of special hardship, as showing how this kind of examination really works in

practice. The letter I hold in my hand is from the post-master at Toronto. He says:

"You are at liberty to state that you have learned from me that the best clerk in the Toronto post office, which is the one in which the most business is now done in the Dominion, is kept back by his inability to conquer the difficulties of fancy arithmetic. He has twice submitted himself to examination in vain, and will not try it again. Mr. Dewé, chief office inspector, would, I am sure, endorse my statement, that he is perhaps the best post office clerk in Canada."

This refers to an examination for promotion; and this is just how this system works in practice. We find some of the very best men in the service, the men who teach those men who subsequently come into the service how to perform their duties are unable to obtain promotion. It is not only so far as those who entered the service prior to 1882 are concerned that this is most unjust, but I will go quite the length of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) and say promotion examinations ought to be abolished, but my amendment does not go so far. You set up an irresponsible machine behind which any officer of the department who desires to keep back a man from promotion can shelter himself, instead of shouldering the responsibility of keeping the man back.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am perfectly sure that the hon. gentleman does not desire to go the length of the amendment he has proposed. It would not only subvert the section or part of the section which he wishes removed, but it would completely subvert the Civil Service Act. We would be glad if the deputy heads of departments were left entirely free to choose their candidates for promotion. The Government, as a Government, cannot object to having all the patronage given to them; but we thought it would be well for the service and for the protection of efficient officers that those officials should be subjected to promotion examinations. Hon. gentlemen have not objected to promotion examinations on subjects connected with the duties of the office, and in that case, after such an examination, the deputy would recommend the candidate he pleased and the Minister would appoint whom he pleased. Complaints have been made, and what have been termed shocking cases have been instanced, where good officers unfortunately could not be promoted because they failed on some points of their examination. I have heard those complaints, and a great many more of them than hon. gentlemen have heard. I have sympathised with those officers, and I have tried to remedy the evil, because there was certainly an evil existing; an excess of good may sometimes be an evil. The subjects in which those officers are examined are part of the ordinary subjects of knowledge, such as history, translation and composition, which are subjects of the qualifying examination. On those subjects one becomes rusty after awhile, and I understand there have been some cases of great hardship in which officers, well qualified otherwise to perform the duties of those offices, have been prevented from obtaining promotion. I should be very much surprised if any one could quote numerous cases in which young men have taken the place of old officers in the public service in consequence of this fact. I know some cases of hardship have occurred, and my sympathies were aroused in favor of the candidates, and a remedy has been applied to the law in this respect by giving subjects connected with the duties of the office, subjects not chosen by the board of examiners, but by the deputy heads of the departments and according to the duties the officer would be required to perform. But we have done more than that. The list of subjects of general knowledge is selected, not by the board of civil examiners—because, in some cases, they are gentlemen accustomed to examinations of school dons, as they have been called by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and they propose questions that may be very easy to them but very difficult to the candidates—but selected by the deputy heads themselves. I have adopted a similar

course in regard to arithmetic, which every one will admit is of great value to civil servants, but on which subject many have failed, because it was not specially required in the branch in which they were employed, and they could not acquire it sufficiently during the few weeks they had to prepare themselves. I have adopted similar measures in regard to composition, in which I know some failures have occurred. Any man, should, however, know how to write a letter before he receives promotion. The hon. gentleman who spoke a moment ago suggested that men should not be examined in arithmetic unless it were required, or in composition unless it were required, and that the subjects should be according to the vacancy to be filled. But in carrying out the regulations care has been taken that no hardships will fall upon deserving officers, and if some mistakes by accident occur in the future I hope they will be very few, and that we will satisfactorily carry out this principle, which is a good one in itself, namely, that of conducting promotion examinations for promotion in the public service. I thought my hon. friend would have limited himself to saying that promotion examination would be only on the subjects connected with the duties of the office. That I would understand, though I would not accept it, because I think that officers who are to be promoted should keep up a certain current knowledge of the subjects upon which they are examined upon. If the hon. gentleman would see now what are the subjects for promotion examination outside the duties of the office, he would not have moved the present amendment. If the House should accept the amendment, the old system will return, that the Government will have the patronage in their hands; and, in the interest of all, we do not desire to have that patronage.

Mr. CASEY. I am very sorry that the hon. the Secretary of State has made this a Government measure. I think that on a question of this nature he might have been content to take the advice of the House and let the House vote without making it a Government question, and without declaring that the Government are distinctly against the amendment of my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill). I think that, with his comparatively short experience in this House and in the management of his office, he might have been content to take the opinion of the House, and not to make it a Government question, by which he compels a certain number of members to vote against the amendment, who, if they followed their own convictions, would vote for it. The hon. the Secretary of State says that the carrying of this amendment would destroy the whole system of the Civil Service as arranged by the Bill of 1882. Long before the hon. gentleman ever paid any attention to the question of Civil Service reform, I discussed the matter in this House and had the opinion of this House upon it. I have the satisfaction of being able to say that the commission appointed by my right hon. friend the Premier in 1880 or 1881, I am not quite sure which year, agreed in all respects with the views that I had laid before this House, and with the views formulated by the committee of which I was chairman. I have the satisfaction of knowing that the commission reported that the recommendations of the committee of the House of which I was chairman, had aided them very much in considering the question, that they agreed with us in all points. Yet the hon. the Secretary of State, coming in as a new member of the House, and not having anything previously to do with the Civil Service, introduced in 1882 a crude and ill-construed Bill, which did not agree in any particular with the recommendations of the commission appointed by the Government of which he had newly become a member. Now the hon. gentleman gets up and tells us that the amendment knocks out the principles of that Bill, and that it would destroy all the safeguards of the Civil Service, and would allow the promotion of men who are not fit to be promoted.

He is quite mistaken in thinking that the House will agree with him in that view. He has already had evidence that some of the most respected members of his own party, who have considered the question, do not agree with him in that view. The hon. gentleman has done wrong to take the stand he has. He says that this promotion is intended to be a check on the exercise of patronage. I do not believe it. If it were a check on the exercise of patronage the hon. Minister would not try to maintain it. Our party have tried, as a party, to abolish patronage altogether, and the hon. gentleman has always voted against us. We have tried vainly, year after year, to impose checks on the exercise of patronage within the service, and the hon. gentleman has opposed us year after year. Whenever we have tried to impose any effectual check on the exercise of patronage the hon. gentleman has opposed us. If he sustains the existing provisions of the law, it is because he finds it is not an effectual check on the exercise of patronage. My outside information exactly agrees with the logical deduction I must draw from the conduct of the hon. gentleman in regard to this question of patronage. That information is, that the existing law is no check at all on the exercise of patronage. In the first place, a man who passes an examination for promotion has no right or claim to be promoted in consequence of having passed that examination. That is the whole object of the provisions of the law as it now stands. A man whom the Minister of any department wants to promote gets promotion whether he passes an examination or not. I have had information from a great number of persons whom I cannot name, because it would subject them to the vengeance of the Minister under whom they serve, and who have told me that they had applied for leave to go before the commissioners and pass this examination, and they had been refused that permission. Can the hon. the Secretary of State stand before this House with any appearance of fair play and urge that this examination is any check at all upon his dealings, or the dealings of any other Minister, with the employés who are under him, when the fact remains (and could be substantiated were it not for the risk of naming certain persons) that men whom they do not wish to promote have been forbidden leave to attend the examinations. This knocks the whole ground from under the contention of the hon. Minister. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says that, in the first place, the hon. the Secretary of State has agreed to leave this matter to the Deputy Minister. He did not tell us that any examinations had been held which were conducted under this rule. The Minister says that if we knew the questions that had been put we would not make so much fuss about those examinations. Why has he not submitted some of those departmental examination papers to us? I venture to say that outside the Department of the Interior, where surveyors are employed, there has not been a single examination paper for promotion submitted to the House since the Bill of 1882 passed. There may have been papers connected with some of the duties of the office, but the examinations have turned on matters not at all connected with the duties of the Department. If the hon. Minister can disprove that statement he has every opportunity of doing so. He has the papers in his own hands, and he can show us them before this Bill is passed through the House. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says the Deputy Ministers would only examine on matters connected with their departments. That is a question of experience, and experience hitherto has shown us that examinations have not been conducted on that basis at all, but that they have been conducted as my hon. friend from South Grenville (Mr. Shanly) says, so that the older members of the service, who naturally ought to be promoted, are at a disadvantage, and that the examination is not conducted on matters which they ought practically to know. The hon. the Secretary of State has urged that the subjects would be optional, that

Mr. CASEY.

the examination would not be tied down to certain lines, and that the deputies would make the examination on what lines they chose. That is one of the very worst points in the whole law. If we do not settle the class of subjects on which these examinations are to be conducted, we leave in the hands of the Minister of any department the power of fixing the examinations, so that his own personal or political friends shall get through and no one else shall get through. The subjects of these examinations, if you are to have them at all, should be absolutely fixed. But I go the whole way with the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), that we should not have these examinations at all. That in regard to all departmental matters the examination is going on from day to day, and that the Deputy Minister or the officer in charge of any particular applicant for promotion, knows better than any examiner you could have the qualifications of the applicant for promotion. Therefore, as a Civil Service reformer, as one who wishes to see the Civil Service made a profession, in which efficiency and industry will lead to promotion and extra pay, I oppose this system of examination *in toto*, and urge the introduction of a system under which the officer directly in charge of the particular applicant for promotion shall be consulted, and his advice followed. For that reason I heartily support the amendment of the hon. member for North Bruce.

Mr. CURRAN. I beg to move in amendment to the amendment:

That all the words after "1882" be struck out, and the following substituted in place thereof: Except in so far as regards the duties of the office to which such civil servant may desire to be promoted.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chapleau proposes:

Sub-section two of section forty-seven is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor:—

2. Temporary clerks employed continuously since the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two, may be appointed permanently, if otherwise qualified, at a salary equal to their average pay during the two years previous to such permanent appointment, but in no case exceeding the maximum salary of a third-class clerk.

Mr. LAURIER. The effect of this amendment is that a temporary clerk employed continuously since 1882 shall be appointed permanently without examination?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I object to that, unless you can show some good reason for it. I object to the principle of the amendment of the hon. member for North Bruce, and I intend to support the hon. Secretary of State; but it appears to me that the hon. Minister accepts so much of the principle of the hon. gentleman's amendment that he will have to accept the whole of it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The reason is that from 1882 to 1885 they were exempted, and when the Act of 1885 was brought in, this clause, by an oversight, was omitted from the Bill, and thus temporary clerks who had been employed since 1882, were subject to examination as new men entering the service.

Mr. CASEY. I think the hon. Secretary of State has really given away the whole principle of this Bill. He is very vigorous in arguing in favor of examinations for promotion; and now he proposes to put on the permanent list, ahead of all those who have passed the qualifying examination since 1882, men who have passed no examination at all. If an examination is useful anywhere, it is for entrance. Yet the hon. gentleman bases his opposition to the amendment of the hon. member for North Bruce on the ground that he believes in the efficacy of examinations as a test of fitness.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the original Bill was passed, this clause formed a portion of it. It was felt that those persons who had been employed in the various departments, not as civil servants, but as temporary clerks, and who for their able performance of their duties

were continued from year to year, ought not to be subjected to an examination. The consequence of such a provision would have been that in some of the departments we would have lost in the lower ranks some most valuable men. This provision, which was adopted in 1882, was continued until the revision of the Act, and it was by the merest accident that the words were omitted. I know temporary clerks in the Department of the Interior who have been there since the time of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and they have been continued because of their valuable services, and it would be a great loss to the department to lose those men, because, although valuable officers, they cannot go through the general educational examination which the Act very properly lays down for those who enter the service afterwards. The insertion of this provision in this Bill is simply to correct the mistake made in the Act of 1885. It is not promotion at all.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that the reasoning of the hon. the First Minister simply shows that there has been an abuse added to another abuse. First of all, it was a mistake that a permanent officer who, as the hon. gentleman says, is a very good officer and whose services are indispensable, should have been kept on the temporary list six or seven years. Power should have been taken to appoint him permanently.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is what this clause does.

Mr. LAURIER. No, you have kept this officer six or seven years, and have never submitted his case. Now, you say these officers must be exempt from examination. The Secretary of State believes they should be appointed permanently without examination, and the hon. member for Bruce says, following this abuse to its logical conclusion: Very well, if you appoint them without examination, you should promote them without examination.

Mr. CURRAN. Those who were there before 1882.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. the Secretary of State is ready to admit them for permanent employment without examination, but he will not promote them without examination. The hon. member for Bruce says, not only should they be appointed without examination, but they should be promoted without examination; and against this conclusion the hon. the Secretary of State rebels. He cannot pursue a bad principle so far as the hon. member for Bruce does. I do not think we should admit the bad principle at all, and my hon. friend has not given a reason why these men should be exempted from the Civil Service examination. The only reason stated by the hon. the First Minister was that by the Act of 1882, they were exempted from the Civil Service examination; and by the Act of 1885, through a mere oversight, that privilege was taken away. But why, in 1882, were these temporary officers not submitted to examination as well as other candidates for permanent employment?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. One reason is that the right acquired by Act of Parliament was taken away from these officers by an oversight. There is another reason. The first examination is to decide whether a man is fit or not to enter the service; but after he has been in the service for years, and has shown, by that practical test, his fitness, there is no necessity in his case for a qualifying examination. Again, he would have, after passing a qualifying examination, to rank as third class clerk, and thus be reduced in rank, even if he had proved his fitness for a higher rank by six years' service. With regard to promotion examinations the case is different. Every officer is on the same footing, and in order to give an equal chance to all those who want to compete, and make a selection among the number of equal good men, they are subjected to this examination.

Mr. McNEILL. The question which my hon. friend the Secretary of State has put is a very pertinent one. What the examination is intended for, is to discover whether a candidate is qualified or not. If we know that he is qualified, there is no need for an examination. The hon. the First Minister has told us that we cannot only tell without examination that he is qualified, but that we can tell that he is a very good officer whose services are indispensable. That sufficiently disposes of the question. If the examination be simply a test to find out whether a man is qualified or not, and if we know, in the case of those who are not permanent, that they are qualified, without examination, so, in reference to those who are permanent, we can tell without examination whether or not they are qualified for promotion. The question as to whether a man should be examined at all or not, to my mind, resolves itself into what the hon. the Secretary of State has said. We have to discover whether he is qualified or not. The examination by books and questions upon paper and *viva voce* is one of the most fallacious tests possible as to qualification.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then eliminate it from the Act altogether.

Mr. McNEILL. Personally I would go that far as to promotion examinations, but not as to entrance examinations, because, although the test is very imperfect, we must have some test, and we take that as the only test we can have. But in the case of promotion, we have a far better test, the one referred to by the hon. the First Minister, who tells us it is absolute.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The promotion examination is not to find out whether a man is a good man, but to find out among a number of good men which is the fittest.

Mr. McNEILL. That is to say, you are going to substitute this absolutely fallacious test, as it is proved to be the world over, a test, which, at all events, is an exceedingly imperfect test, for the best test, which is that of experience. Will hon. gentlemen venture to say that the deputy heads and those who are seeing these men discharge their duties day after day, do not know whether a man is qualified or not, or which, among several, is best qualified?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope we will get on with this Bill or it will disappoint all our hopes of proroguing within reasonable time. The arguments of the hon. member for Bruce are exceedingly fallacious. I explained that before the Civil Service Act was passed, a number of temporary clerks were employed to perform the duties of third class clerks, and that after it was ascertained they could perform these duties, it was considered hard to subject them to examination. But the promotion examination is a different thing. The fact that a man has shown he is fit to be a third class clerk is no proof, and the deputy heads cannot know, that he possesses the qualifications which would enable him to perform satisfactorily the duties of a higher rank in which he has never been employed. The fact that he has for years performed the duties of a third class clerk entitles him to be continued in that position, but the requirements of a second class or first class clerk are altogether different from those of a mere copyist or writer in the third class.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. the Premier has avowed boldly what most of us have only whispered to our own consciences. He says that we should not discuss this Bill, that we should not perform the duties we are sent here to perform, because it might result in postponing prorogation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that. I said we might come to a conclusion.

Mr. CASEY. A great many of us have been allowing matters which should have been discussed to pass through for that reason, but we did not expect that it would be

announced as a principle of action by the leader of the Government. We have always known that it has been the policy of Governments to bring down their measures at a late period of the Session, and then to urge that they should be passed without much discussion because of the approach of prorogation; but I have never before heard that announced as a declared policy in the House by the leader of the Government. He says that, although it might be possible to admit a man to the service on evidence of his fitness, it is necessary, in order that he should discharge the duties of a higher grade, that he should have his fitness tested by an examination. The hon. gentleman has rather given himself away by making that remark, because he is as well aware as any other member of the House, and probably better, that in many cases there is no difference in the duties discharged by a third class clerk and those discharged by a second class clerk.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but we have all known of men being promoted from the third class to, and reaching the maximum of the second class, when they were discharging the same duties, and the only difference was the difference in pay. The Secretary of State draws a distinction without a difference. He says that these temporary clerks of whom he speaks could not be admitted into the service without having passed the examination, and yet, because they may have been in the service for six years back, they should be appointed permanent clerks. That is where the hon. gentleman misrepresents the question. These temporary clerks have never been in the service. They are not members of the Civil Service, and these temporary clerks whom he proposes to admit are exactly in the same position as any new applicant of 16 or 17 years of age, who asks to be admitted now. They have never been in the Civil Service, and yet, because they have been outside employés, he proposes to admit them as permanent clerks. He is simply taking the power to admit men who have been temporary clerks and not members of the service at all, without examination, to the disadvantage of those who have passed the examination.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It seems that we are discussing two clauses at the same time.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to retain the floor till I get through, I shall be obliged to him. We are discussing the proposition to admit members of the Civil Service without an entrance examination, thus knocking away, as the Secretary of State said in reference to the amendment of the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), the real basis of the, his own, Civil Service Act, and the only safeguard which it provides in regard to the service; and, at the same time, we are discussing the proposal of my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) to knock away the artificial and pretended and useless safeguard against the promotion of members of the Civil Service after they have entered the service. I think the two matters are cognate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sault Ste. Marie Canal \$997,650

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that the appropriation in 1887-88 was \$1,000,000, and the expense from July 1 to December 1, 1887, was \$2,350; the revote, Mr. CASEY.

consequently, is \$997,650. It was understood that amount would be required to carry on the Sault Ste. Marie canal. The expenditure thus far has been made in a preliminary examination, because the surveys were made some years ago, as the House will recollect, and this preliminary examination is to verify the surveys and to prepare for pushing on this work vigorously, as it is intended to do by this vote.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Is this part of any general scheme to deepen the St. Lawrence canals?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, the Sault Ste. Marie canal has no connection with the St. Lawrence canals. As my hon. friend from Queen's, P. E. I., is aware at present we have no communication with Lake Superior except through a canal which belongs to the United States, and I may say that the traffic through that canal is greater to-day than it is through the Suez canal. The traffic has enormously increased recently, and from past appearances, with the continuous development of the North-West, and the absolute necessity for bringing the products of the North-West down to the sea by water from Prince Arthur's Landing and Fort William, it is considered absolutely necessary that there should be additional canal communication. My own impression is that at an early day we will have all the traffic it will be possible for both of these canals to accommodate.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You expect it will pay then?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; I think it will give an ample return, although probably that will depend altogether upon the policy that the Government adopts with reference to charges. My hon. friend from Halifax no doubt is aware that the Sault Ste. Marie canal is a free canal, and consequently it would be, perhaps, not so easy to collect tolls as it would be if the usual charges were made in the Sault Ste. Marie canal.

Mr. MITCHELL. If I recollect aright, when this vote was taken, one of the great objects we had in view was to have an independent line of communication over our own territory. I think that was very desirable at that time, as it is now, no matter how friendly may be the relations between this country and the United States.

Mr. COOK. Will the hon. gentleman state what depth it will be on the mitre sill?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We expect 16 feet on the mitre sill, and the locks to be 540 feet in length.

Mr. BARRON. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the Americans are also going to enlarge their canal in anticipation of a large trade?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that so impressed are our American neighbors, that they have begun the construction of a second canal. I met with a gentleman who was specially engaged in promoting the construction of a second canal and he said he hoped nothing would induce us to slacken our measures for constructing our canal, as he was quite satisfied there would be abundant traffic for all at no distant day.

Mr. COOK. Do I understand this sum will be sufficient to complete the work?

Mr. DAWSON. I may mention that I have just received a return showing the amount of traffic that passed through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal last summer.

Mr. COOK. What will be the length of the canal from the river up to Lake Superior?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About two miles, I think, is the length.

Mr. DAWSON. I am glad to see so much interest being taken in this great work, which is to connect the two great

seas of Lake Huron and Lake Superior, both in the district which I have the honor to represent. The Americans are now constructing a second canal on their side to take the place of the old canal, so that they have really only one canal on the American side at present, and it is quite insufficient for the traffic. The canal does not allow vessels

to pass through so fast as there is need. Last summer, in one day, as many as 801 vessels, representing over 30,000 tons, passed through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. The traffic through the canal is very clearly shown by the following statement:—

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT of the amount and value of the Commerce through St. Mary's Falls Canal, Michigan, for the calendar years 1886 and 1887.

Items.	Units.	Quantity.		Increase.		Decrease.		Price per unit.	Total Valuation.	
		1886.	1887.	Amount.	p.c.	Amount.	p.c.		1886.	1887.
				\$		\$			\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Vessels.....	Number	7,424	9,355	1,931	26					
Lookages.....	do	3,593	4,165	572	16					
Tonnage registered.....	Tons....	4,219,397	4,897,598	678,201	16					
do freight.....	do....	4,527,759	5,494,649	966,890	21					
Passengers.....	Number	27,088	32,668	5,580	21					
Coal.....	Net tons	1,809,999	1,352,987	342,988	34			3 50	3,534,996 00	4,725,454 50
Flour.....	Barrels..	1,759,365	1,577,735			186,630	11	5 00	8,796,825 00	7,863,675 00
Grain.....	Bushels..	19,706,867	23,871,686	4,164,819	21			0 98	19,317,720 84	23,394,242 28
Manufactured and pig iron.....	Net tons	115,208	74,919			40,289	35	50 00	5,366,950 00	3,035,750 00
Salt.....	Barrels..	158,677	204,908	46,231	29			17 00	133,773 00	241,468 00
Copper.....	Net tons	38,627	34,886			3,741	10	200 00	7,725,400 00	6,977,260 00
Iron ore.....	do	2,087,809	2,497,713	409,904	20			3 50	7,307,331 50	8,741,995 50
Lumber.....	Ft. E.M.	138,689,000	165,226,000	26,538,000	19			0 018	2,496,384 00	2,974,088 00
Silver ore.....	Net tons	2,009	350			1,659	83	153 79	308,964 11	53,828 50
Building stone.....	do	9,449	12,401	3,952	42			10 00	94,480 00	134,010 00
Unclassified freight.....	do	230,726	344,586	113,860	49			60 00	13,843,560 00	20,675,160 00
									69,080,071 95	79,031,757 78

Canal was open to navigation 224 days in 1886.
Canal was open to navigation 216 days in 1887.

Valuation based on estimate of 1885.
Valuation for 1885, \$53,413,472.13.

I am very happy to hear this work is to go on. This canal should have been built twenty years ago; it is more than thirty years since it was surveyed; but from what we have heard to-night the work is now to be gone on with and prosecuted to completion, a result which will give great satisfaction to the shipping interest throughout the Dominion.

Mr. LISTER. So far as this canal is concerned and the statement of the hon. gentleman that the commerce of the country requires another canal constructed, I have to say that from all information I have been able to gather, and I have had ample means of information from shippers and others, there is no necessity whatever for the construction of a canal on the Canadian side. The hon. gentleman has stated that the tonnage passing through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal was equal to the tonnage passing through the Suez Canal. As regards that statement, I have referred to the Statistical Abstract Record for last year, and I find that the number of tons passing through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal was 4,219,000 and through the Suez Canal 6,000,000 tons. The hon. Minister has not informed the House as to how much of the tonnage passing through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal is American tonnage and how much Canadian tonnage. When the hon. gentleman says that the canal may be profitable, he states what is absolutely not the fact. The American canal gives the same facility to Canadian as to American vessels under the arrangement entered into between Canada and the United States. No charge whatever is made for Canadian vessels passing through it, nor is any charge made to Canadian vessels, and so if a canal was constructed on the Canadian side we could not possibly obtain a revenue from it. As to the contention that such a canal was necessary for defensive purposes, that could not be supported by any reasoning whatever. If there was any trouble between Americans

and Canadians it would be utterly impossible for the Canadian Government to hold a Sault Ste. Marie canal if constructed by them. It would necessarily follow that the Canadian canal would be closed, and perhaps the American canal would be closed also; but the hon. gentleman owes it to the House to show that the commercial necessities require that another canal should be constructed in the face of the fact that we have had no complaints from shippers that the conveniences of the American canal are insufficient for the wants of the country, and the further fact that the American Government are constructing another lock through which Canadian vessels will have the right to pass on the same terms as American vessels. The Government are asking Parliament to vote \$997,650 for this work, and I venture to say that that amount will no more than half pay for the construction of the proposed canal. The Government are undertaking a work that will cost at least double what they are asking Parliament to vote; they are undertaking a work not demanded by the commercial necessities of this country; they are undertaking a work when the bill is already filled by the American Government and when we have a right to use the American canal; and the Finance Minister has shown no reason, especially in view of the financial condition of the country, in the face of a deficit next year of a million dollars, why this country should undertake the construction of the proposed canal at the present time. So long as we own the Welland Canal we know we shall have the right to exact terms from the United States Government that will permit our vessels to pass through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, and the second canal that will be constructed hereafter. The Welland Canal is as important to them as the Sault Ste. Marie Canal is important to us, and for the use of the one they give us the use of the other. There is no more necessity for the construction of this canal than there is for a jug to have two handles, except for the purpose of spending the money of

an overtaxed people. I protest against this expenditure, as far as I can protest, and I repeat that the Government have no justification whatever for undertaking this work, except for the purpose of securing a seat for the hon. member for Algoma. There can be no other reason; it is not wanted, it is not required for any necessities of commerce, it has not been shown here to-day that our shipping is delayed on account of the canal being overworked, and I have been told by men who pass through the canal every two or three weeks that a canal on the Canadian side is not required; and yet in the face of the present financial condition of the country the Government are undertaking a work which will cost from \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000. The Government have not informed the committee that they have taken the precaution to have this ground examined carefully by engineers and ascertain whether the canal be practicable, and whether they have ascertained approximately the cost of the proposed work based upon estimates made by engineers. The committee is asked blindly to vote \$1,000,000 for a work that is not wanted in this country, for a work from which we will derive no advantage whatever, nor is it one that commercial necessity requires.

Mr. DAWSON. I think the hon. gentleman who censures the Government for going on with the work has given the very best reason why they should go on with it. He has pointed to the other side and said the Americans are building another canal. Why are they building another canal? Because it is required, as one canal is not equal to the traffic. But I must tell the hon. gentleman that they are doing more than that, they have projected a third canal in another locality, such is the enormous increase of traffic which they anticipate. The trade has risen from 1,000,000 tons three or four years ago to 6,000,000 tons of freight now, and no canal in the world can accommodate that traffic in the six months of summer. So the Americans are now building another canal, and they have already laid out the ground and projected a third canal. In order to keep up with the Americans we must build a canal on our side of the river. The hon. gentleman said the canal was going to be built in order that the member for Algoma may have a seat. The member for Algoma had a seat long before the hon. gentleman and long before any canal was proposed, and I think he will probably have a seat in this House when the hon. gentleman is not here.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has told us that the American Government are now constructing another canal, and that it is their intention to construct still another lock. In the face of those facts how can it be necessary for the Canadian Government to proceed with the construction of a fourth lock? The hon. gentleman has told us that this canal was not promised for the purpose of keeping him in his seat. I ask him if he did not, from one end of Algoma to the other, during the last election, hold out the promise that the Government would construct another canal if they were successful in the election? And was it not in view of the election that they placed \$1,000,000 in the Estimates, which they dropped out last year, it was supposed forever, at least for years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We did not drop it.

Mr. LISTER. Was it not stated during the recess that the Sault Ste. Marie Canal was not to go on?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. LISTER. It was stated again and again during the recess that this canal was not to go on; and I say that the hon. member for Algoma held it out as an inducement to the electors to sustain him, that they would get this canal if the present Administration were sustained in office. I can tell the hon. gentleman, furthermore, that although I have

Mr. LISTER.

not had the honor of a seat in this House as long as he has, if I live I think I shall have, because I do not think all the power of this Government could put me out. During the last election the hon. Minister of Justice, and the late lamented Hon. Thomas White came into my county for the purpose of defeating me, and they increased my majority by 240.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken in supposing that the Sault Ste. Marie Canal was made an issue in the last election in Algoma, or that any promises were made in connection with it. The Sault Ste. Marie Canal has been contemplated for the last thirty years in Algoma, and last year it was barely mentioned.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. Minister should answer the pertinent question put to him by my hon. friend at my right (Mr. Lister)—a question in which the whole House is interested. Before we enter into this enormous contract, the hon. gentleman should state if he can what the work is likely to cost. Anybody who takes the trouble to read the report of the Minister of Public Works as to the cost of canals in this country can form some conception as to what this one is likely to cost. I do not think the hon. gentleman should ask us to vote \$1,000,000 even if he can justify the construction of the work, unless he can show that proper surveys have been made, and that that sum will complete it. If the Government are going to ask the House to blindly vote \$1,000,000 for a work which may cost two or three times that sum, then they must have lost their heads; and we have had enough experience in voting enormous sums of public money in this House without proper information. Hon. gentlemen talk about the immense traffic that is going to pass through this canal. I have no doubt that it is very great; but what difference can it make to those whose vessels pass through the canal there, whether it is built by American or by Canadian money? If the Americans have spent a large amount of money in building canals at that point, there is no need of our building a fourth one. The new American canal to be built there, with a length of 800 feet, a width of 100 feet, and with 21 feet of water on the sills, is estimated to cost \$1,700,000; and my hon. friend tells me that it is only a lock. We all know that the estimate will be exceeded. In these large public works the estimates are always exceeded; and if the American lock is going to cost that amount of money, ours is likely to cost quite as much. Although the traffic at that point is very great, the traffic of vessels owned by Canada is very small. The report of the Minister of Public Works states that of 38,742 vessels that passed through the canals there, but 6,000 were Canadian vessels. That is the proportion which the shipping of Canada bears to the shipping of the United States. I, for one, feel that we should be doing wrong to ourselves and the country if we voted this \$1,000,000 blindly. I do not think the hon. Minister has taken us sufficiently into his confidence, or that he has even done himself justice, in asking us to vote this money without giving us more information as to the surveys, the reports from engineers, and the probable cost of the work. This country is not in a position to go on expending money to the same extent that it has done during the past five years; I think the better minds on both sides have come to the conclusion that it is time to call a halt; and I think that we should satisfy ourselves that these great public works are essential before we undertake them. I can see no reason at all why we should incur this enormous expenditure merely to have a canal on the Canadian side when sufficient accommodation is given on the American side. The Americans did not build another Welland Canal, and the fact that they use, and must use, that is a sufficient guarantee evidence that we shall have the use of their canals.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think it is evident that the House is not in possession of sufficient information to vote this amount of money to-night. Before asking this House to pledge the credit of the country to the construction of such an important public work, the hon. Minister should have submitted to us a plan and some authentic estimates as to its ultimate cost. I am informed, on good authority, that the American canal will accommodate more than five times the traffic passing there now. I am told that it is the finest and largest canal in the world, that it will take three steamers in the lock at one time. As to the cost of the work, there is no doubt that this vote is but a commencement. If the Government are placing the sum in the Estimates, as they did on a former occasion, merely to satisfy the promises made by the hon. member for Algoma, it would not, perhaps, be attended with very serious results; but I am informed that although the lock is not very long, its approaches on each side are very shallow, with a rocky bottom, and it will take an immense expenditure to blast out those shallows before the canal can be used. I am told that, at certain seasons of the year, there is not more than five feet of water. This work will probably involve an ultimate expenditure of not one, but four or five millions; and I think the hon. gentleman should hesitate before he asks the House to commit itself to such an expenditure if he is not in possession of information as to its probable cost. If he is in possession of this information, he should take the House into his confidence and let us know the extent of the obligation he is asking us to assume. As the canals there at present are sufficient for the traffic, I think this is a most unjustifiable appropriation of public money under our present circumstances. In the present condition of the country it does appear to me from the best information I have been able to obtain, that the Government should not ask this House to vote such a large sum of money, which will probably not be near the cost of this great undertaking. Hon. gentlemen have conceded that the approaches to the canal would cost a great deal more than the canal itself. I have been told that when surveys were made there for the construction of a bridge, that after two feet of digging they came to solid rock. All that rock will therefore have to be removed, and it will involve an immense outlay. From reliable information which I have, I believe that the canal will cost not less than \$4,000,000.

Mr. SHANLY. I would ask the hon. gentleman where he gets his information as to the shallowness of the water in the approaches? It may be just as the hon. gentleman has said, but I wish to know where he obtained the information, as I was not aware there were such shallow approaches.

Mr. PURCELL. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has got some of his information from me, and what I said to him is correct. I do not suppose there is an hon. gentleman in this House who knows more about that part of the country than I do. I have had a great deal of work to do there, and I have taken a great deal of supplies through that place, and know it thoroughly. I should be very sorry to give any wrong information on the subject, and I have merely stated what I know to be facts in regard to the canal there. The American canal is on a softer bottom than the Canadian canal, and the former lies on the side of the river where it is easily cut through. Our canal, if it is built on the other side of the river, has to be cut through a rocky bottom. I know this from my experience, as I tested that place when we were about to tender for the construction of a bridge there; and as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) said we did not go more than about four feet when we struck the hard rock; on the Canadian side of the river it is hard rock within about four feet from the surface. I believe that it will cost more than a million dollars to build that canal. As long as I have been

acquainted with this country I never knew the case of an appropriation being made, where the first appropriation ever carried out the work and finished it. Speaking honestly, I do not think that three times the amount now asked for will complete this undertaking. The sum might complete the locks, but, from what I know of the place, I think there would be a mile on one side and more than half a mile on the other side to be excavated, before you can get water deep enough to float the vessels after you build the lock. The excavation is not very hard there, but it could not be taken out with dredges, and would have to be done in the ordinary way by putting in coffer-dams. The cost of the approaches on both sides would, in my opinion, be far more than the cost of the locks themselves. I may say that the canal which is built there now is a most expensive canal, and is one of the best canals in the world. I have seen three steamers locked in it at once, and I must say that I do not think the canal that is there has more than three times the capacity of what is required. Unless the Government wants that we should have a canal apart from the American canal, and that we should have a canal of our own independent of the Americans, it is the only reason why I see that this undertaking can be necessary. If you consider it necessary that we should have a canal of our own, as we have railroads of our own, it is the only reason why this work should be undertaken. I presume the Government intend to build this canal, and if they do intend they will probably carry it out, but if we live for four or five years we will see whether \$3,000,000 will build that canal or not. I think the approaches to the canal, to get the deep water that is required, will cost more than double the cost of the locks. If I am not mistaken there are 27 feet of water in the American canal, and to make this canal perfect it ought to be able to accommodate ships which can cross the Atlantic Ocean.

A hon. MEMBER. How many feet in the approaches?

Mr. PURCELL. I think there is nearly a mile on one side, although I never measured the distance exactly. I saw it sounded myself when we were building the bridges and we tested the depth of the ground over the lock.

An hon. MEMBER. How many feet have to be taken out?

Mr. PURCELL. There would be an average between 16, 18 and 20 feet. I think that the excavation to the lock would cost more than the lock itself. We took the first locomotives through this place that ever were taken across Lake Superior.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has been completely misinformed as to the freshets and as to the water. There are no freshets in Lake Superior, and there is no high and no low water, as there is in other places. The high water does not differ from the low water more than 6 inches, and at the extreme more than 9 inches, so that the height of the water and the depth of the water are always uniform. Immediately at the entrance of this canal there is a bay where schooners from the American side used to come over and lay up for the winter. The water is deep there down to within a very short distance of the entrance of the canal. It is deep also at the outlet of where the canal will be. Surveys have been made and soundings taken there, and I have no doubt that, on reference to the Department of Railways and Canals, all the plans and soundings can be seen. There is, therefore, no use making conjectures in this House on what has been established by actual fact and actual measurement. There is one little circumstance which I will draw attention to with regard to this canal. It has been said that the canals on the other side are more than sufficient for the traffic, but the Americans themselves do not consider so. I know that the big lock on the American side takes three

steamers at a time, and I have seen four steamers in that lock, but whether that is an advantage or not, or whether time is gained by putting four steamers in the lock, is a question for people accustomed to canals to settle. Very eminent engineers have given their opinion that it is not. We must remember a former occasion when a canal would have been of advantage, and when the existence of the country might have depended upon it, that the American canal was shut against us. The locks on the American side were shut down then, and we were told that no Canadian vessel could be allowed to go through those locks. When a military expedition was going through to the North-West long ago, it had to land on the Canadian side and the supplies had to be taken by waggon over the old portage road. There they engaged steamers drawing twelve feet of water, and just at the point where the entrance to the lock is to be put, a little wharf was built up, and those steamers had no difficulty in coming in and loading to their full capacity. It was long and tedious work to get the supplies and military stores over that portage road, and not until the work was about completed did the Americans come over and say to us: You can use the canal now. Their intention, however, was at first evidently to block that expedition. I think it is but reasonable that a canal should be constructed by this country between these two great inland seas.

Mr. PURCELL. In regard to the possible stoppage of our traffic by the Americans, I take no stock in that, for I know nothing about it, and in that I am satisfied to agree with my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson). I am only stating the circumstances in regard to the work which has been done there.

Mr. COOK. I did not suppose that any hon. gentleman would attempt to defend this scheme on the ground of any difficulty that might arise with the United States. It was one of the great cries of the Government, when they were building the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior, that it would be used largely for military purposes. If any difficulty should arise between the United States and Canada, this canal would be of no use whatever. In the event of war between the United States and Canada, our vessels could not approach the canal, and we would have to fall back on the Canadian Pacific Railway if we wanted to take supplies west of Lake Superior. I do not rise to speak against this project so much as against the manner in which it has been brought before the House. We have had instances in the past where schemes of this nature have been brought to the attention of the House, and large sums of money have been put in the Estimates, and money has been expended, and no very great object has been obtained. We have the instance of the Trent Valley Canal, for which our friends opposite asked for a vote of this House, and the money was expended, which did some good in the way of navigation in the interior, but they have never yet brought down an estimate to Parliament of the total cost of that work. This will be of the same nature. Then, we have had the celebrated projected Baie Verte canal. We had a sum of several millions of dollars for that in the Estimates for years, and then abandoned. If the Government follow that example in this case, I hope, at all events, they will expend the money on the works. If they are going to build the canal, let them say so; let them be frank and fair, and furnish the House and the country with the plans and specifications and the estimated cost of the work, and let the House and the country know what they are about. To ask us to vote blindfold, to vote like children, is, I think, treating the members of this House with a great deal of contempt. I hope, if this does pass, as no doubt it will, it will not pass without a division.

Mr. CHARLTON. In discussing this project of building a second canal at Sault Ste. Marie, two points have always

Mr. DAWSON,

struck me as requiring to be taken into consideration by the Government and as being points which should weigh very heavily against the proposal. The first point is that the canal is not necessary in times of peace, because the present canal is amply sufficient for all the commerce there.

Mr. SHANLY. Not the present canal.

Mr. CHARLTON. The canal which is now being constructed will be ample for all the commerce of that lake. The second point is that, in case of war, if we build a canal of our own, either we will control both canals or the Americans will control both canals, for whichever controls the canal on one side will control the canal on both sides. Therefore, this is not necessary either in time of peace or in time of war, because whichever power controls one side of the river will control both sides of the river, and therefore the expenditure of this money is useless. In regard to the use of this for any possible North-West rebellion, we will never again have any such use for it, because we now have a military railroad which we could use in case of another rebellion, if we were sending troops and munitions of war to the North-West for any purpose whatever. I think that, especially in view of the present state of finances, there is not sufficient necessity for the construction of that canal to warrant the expenditure of this large sum of money.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The House has been placed in possession of information in regard to this canal from two sources. The first was from the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), who I presume is not a practical man, who is not practically acquainted with this work. I presume that, like most of us, he has a theoretical knowledge of the subject, and that, desiring to have a canal built in his district, he is anxious to persuade the House and the Government that it is a laudable thing to do, but I presume that he has not a technical or professional knowledge of the subject which would commend his opinion to the favorable consideration of the House. I do not say that with any disrespect to the views of the hon. gentleman, but we know that members of this House, when they are advocating the schemes in which their constituents are interested, are inclined, and very naturally so, to give as favorable a view as possible. On the other side we had the practical man on this subject. I suppose, if you went throughout the whole Dominion, you could not get the opinion of a person more competent to give a reliable professional opinion and a practical opinion on such a matter as this than the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell), who has given his views here to-night; and he tells us that the construction of the lock would be the smallest item of the expenditure. He has told us that for a mile on one side, or for a mile or a mile and a half on the other side, to make the entrances, you would have to blast out or remove rocks to a depth probably of 16 feet. I think this House should pause in the face of such a statement as that before committing the country to an expenditure which the hon. gentleman stated, with his knowledge and belief and his practical experience, will amount to three or four millions of dollars. I think the House should pay heed to such an opinion as that. I do not myself place any further value on any opinion of that kind than to say that, if we have a canal there, which I have been assured is capable of accommodating all the trade of that section, we should not from a merely sentimental view, when the finances of the country are in the position they are to-day, further burden the taxpayers with such an unnecessary expenditure; but, from the views which have been expressed by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell), although hon. gentlemen opposite may sustain the proposition of the Government, I think they must feel a conscientious conviction that the statement which he has made is likely to be realised, and that, if we enter upon this

work, we are entering upon an expenditure which will be enormous before the work is completed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This House has voted this money several times. Long ago the question of the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal was brought before the House, and the House promptly provided the necessary means. A year ago there was a vote passed by the House. Where have the hon. gentlemen got their new information from? This vote was not opposed a year ago, why should it be opposed now?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). They did not understand it properly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then the hon. gentleman has got his inspiration within half an hour.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes, I admit that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And he undertakes to stand up here and talk learnedly to this House about the construction of a canal upon information that he has obtained within half an hour! Does he not know that years ago, the first canal engineer of this country made an elaborate survey of this work, and made calculations and plans and everything connected with it, estimating the cost of this work at less than three-fourths of a million dollars? It is true, this proposal embraces the extension of that work, it embraces a deeper canal, and therefore the expenditure is necessarily increased. The Government are not going blindly into the question at all. The Government took it up years ago, after careful and exhaustive surveys had been made under the direction of one of the ablest canal engineers, not only in Canada, but in the world, for I have no hesitation in saying that John Page's name stands, throughout the world, wherever canal navigation or works of this character are involved, as one of the first authorities to be found in any country. He had the confidence of the leader of the late Government, who was Minister of Public Works, and under whom he served, as he has served under me when I was Minister of Public Works and Minister of Railways and Canals. Therefore, I say, for hon. gentlemen who only got their promptings half an hour ago, to stand up here and undertake to discuss this question, after years of examination and investigation by Mr. Page, is, I think, a little presumptuous. Why, Sir, Canada has the greatest system of inland navigation in the civilised world. Where will you find in any country on the globe, anything to compare with the inland navigation from the Straits of Belle Isle to Prince Arthur's Landing; and yet, Sir, on the whole of that great line of inland navigation, at that little point of Sault Ste. Marie, you are liable at any moment to be stopped and to be told: Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther. Notwithstanding all our enormous expenditure on our canal communication, on the River St. Lawrence, on the canals from Lachine up to the foot of the Welland, you are liable at any moment to be told by a foreign country: You cannot enter the great Lake Superior in a vessel; you must stop here, because this canal is ours. Is it a mere imaginary idea that such a thing shall occur? No, Sir, every member of the House knows that on a most momentous occasion when we considered it of vital consequence to go through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, we were told we could not go. I have no idea that such a thing is likely to occur again, but even if it does not, a canal at Sault Ste. Marie is required as an independent line of communication from the Straits of Belle Isle to Prince Arthur's Landing. With the enormous resources of that great North-West pouring down upon us, I say the time has come, at this comparatively small expense, when we should not be in the humiliating position in which we found ourselves before, and in which we are liable to find ourselves to-morrow. I believe, under these circumstances, the House will be pre-

pared, and the country will be prepared, to approve of an expenditure to remove the difficulty which we encountered on a former occasion, and to make it impossible that such a contingency shall occur again. I am not very much surprised at the statement of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell). Everybody knows that the moment a contract is scented in the air, contractors are the last men in the world to minify the cost of constructing the work. Everybody knows that the hon. member for Glengarry, by his ability and his sagacity as a contractor, has made a great fortune, and it is not at all unlikely that if a contract were let he would be one of the first men to tender for this work, and the last thing in the world he would be inclined to do, would be to minify the difficulty connected with it, or to intimate to the people that it was a very small affair, and an easy thing to construct this work which probably he, or parties connected with him, would tender for to-morrow if the contract was offered. I want to know whether it is not quite as likely that the hon. gentleman sees difficulties that cautious contractors always see. The hon. member for Halifax sneers at the information of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson). Sir, if he had lived up at the head of Lake Superior, if he had the deep and personal interest, and the means of informing himself on this subject, that the hon. member for Algoma has had, he would not talk so flippantly here about three or four millions, or try to throw contempt upon the estimates of one of the first engineers in the world, upon whose estimates these appropriations are based. I have stated that after Mr. Page had made a careful examination and a thorough survey of this work, he reported the cost at less than \$750,000, and that estimate is increased because it is proposed to build a larger and a more useful work. The hon. gentleman says that the present canal accommodation will do three times the present traffic that is done now. I want to know why our American neighbors, who are so astute, think it necessary to waste money in building a second canal in the same locality, if there is not traffic enough for the one which they have already got. Why, Sir, it is because they are wise in their generation, it is because they see that mighty North-West, and they see the products that are pouring down to the east through this canal; and looking at the enormously rapid and increasing development of the traffic, they come to the conclusion that to provide for the near future, it is absolutely necessary to have additional canal communication. I trust, Sir, that it is not necessary at this late period in the Session, to weary the House by statements of this kind upon a question that has been before the House again and again. More than ten years ago money was voted for the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, it was voted again last year, and it is now placed in the Estimates with the view of taking the work up and carrying it forward.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The warmth exhibited by the hon. the Minister of Finance is proof that he finds he has a bad case in hand. I have had a long political experience with the hon. gentleman, and I have always observed that when he finds himself hard pressed, when he finds that he cannot answer a fair argument from a political opponent, he always adopts the principle of the boy who got a thrashing from his captain, and who turned round and abused him. The hon. gentleman says that I only obtained my information with respect to this canal very recently. That is quite correct. But, Sir, if the hon. gentleman had a case in court, would he not prove it by bringing in a witness, and if that witness was a reliable one, would not the judge and jury be guided by the evidence which he gave? Now, we have the evidence of a gentleman here, whom the hon. gentleman himself admits is most familiar with the public works of this country, and who, he says, scents a contract from afar. Sir, the hon. gentleman has

been connected—I will not say connected himself—but the hon. gentleman is quite familiar with all these contracts which are scented from afar, and the House has had ample experience of the way the hon. gentleman and his department have dealt with the Onderdonk, and other contracts of that kind, which have been a scandal to this country. The hon. gentleman says I “presume” to speak on a subject like this. Why, Sir, it is presumption on the part of this hon. gentleman to attempt to lecture any hon. gentleman in this House. The hon. gentleman has not disputed one statement made by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell); he has not been able to say that the Government have information to bring down as to the cost of the canal. The whole thing is a sham from beginning to end. Look at the appropriation! The hon. gentleman puts down \$997,650 in order to convey the impression to the House and the country that the Government have made an estimate so accurate that they will be able to complete the work for that sum.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will excuse me if I draw his attention to the fact that this sum is a revote of the amount remaining of \$1,000,000 which was voted last year.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It does not make the least odds whether it was so or not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I say no.

An hon. MEMBER. You are putting your foot into it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman will put both feet into it, and I want to keep his feet out of it; he does not open his mouth without putting his foot into it. I say the hon. Finance Minister has been unable to disprove one statement made by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell), he has not been able to show that the canal can be built for the sum of money placed in the Estimates, while we have here the evidence of a practical man as to the ultimate cost of the work. And when the hon. gentleman rises to lecture me and say I was speaking persiflage I roll back such an accusation. I have a right to speak on public questions as much as the hon. gentleman has, and he has no right to lecture me or any other hon. gentleman when we are discussing public questions. It is simply because he finds himself in a position which he cannot defend, when such testimony is brought forward which he cannot refute or explain away, he is driven to the expediency of endeavoring to overcome it in another way. I believe hon. gentlemen believe with me that we are entering upon a huge expenditure, that we are commencing an undertaking which the hon. gentleman has distinctly described as of very large proportions. The hon. gentleman says I sneered at the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson). I made use of no language towards that hon. gentleman which was disrespectful or such as I would not desire to use towards any hon. member of the House. I said distinctly that one would not suppose the hon. gentleman to have those professional qualifications which would enable him to judge accurately in regard to this work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is just what the hon. gentleman has.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I say this, that the committee have before them the evidence of a man who knows all about this matter, who knows the locality well, and the country will prefer to accept such evidence in the place of the statements made by the hon. gentleman. Why does not the hon. gentleman submit statements which he professes to have? The Government are asking the committee to vote a large sum without any estimate or surveys, but merely on the

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

statement coming from the hon. gentleman, which like many statements made on previous occasions regarding public expenditures will be received with very grave suspicion.

Mr. SHANLY. May I ask the hon. gentleman why he has said so positively that the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) has no practical and professional knowledge on such a matter as this? I have had the pleasure of knowing that gentleman for a great number of years, and I have always considered him a very eminent practical engineer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Finance Minister rose in his place to give the committee information in regard to the money that was asked, and how has he treated the committee? He has told the committee that there were accurate surveys made with regard to the canal some years ago by a very eminent engineer, and that the estimates submitted by the engineer had been brought down the preceding year. He asks the committee to vote the money without submitting plans or estimates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman ever hear of plans for any public work being submitted to the House?

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

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What were they?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A number of them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What were they?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is only trifling with the committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name one.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hon. members on the back benches had better wait till they hear what I have to say. When the hon. gentleman asks us to vote such a large sum and refuses to submit the estimates signed by Mr. Page showing how much he thought this canal would cost, the hon. gentleman knows—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has not asked for the estimates signed by Mr. Page.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have never heard of it till to-night.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did you not vote the one million of money last year?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not vote it, it slipped through like many other millions. How are the members treated? If they rise to obtain information there is a sneer and a laugh, and a remark is made that it is towards the end of the Session and we had better get the business through. If they do not rise they are met next Session with the statement that they did not object and they were estopped. We have a right to have information as to the estimated cost of this great public work, for which we are now asked to vote \$1,000,000 to begin with. Our constituents will expect it; the over-burdened taxpayers look to the Opposition to get information before they allow these large sums in the Estimates to pass. What did the hon. gentleman say? He said the survey was made years ago. He says that Mr. Page thought it was desirable to have a canal. But to-day we have gone into an expenditure of millions to build the Canadian Pacific Railway around Lake Superior, and the reasons which prompted hon. members to support the construction of the canal a year ago, do not exist now. The hon. gentleman himself in answer to a statement made here, took up the argument that we were in times past at the mercy of the United States in regard to using their canal; but he has changed his position, and he has the manliness and honesty to tell us that he does not anticipate a renewal of that state of affairs. He does not anticipate our being prevented from using the American canal, and yet that is the argument

used to-night. But the hon. gentleman has cut the ground from under the feet of those who used the argument, by stating, in a frank way, that we will not be stopped by the United States from the use of their canal. That argument is gone, and the other argument, that the estimate has been made and not produced, is answered by the fact that the hon. gentleman dare not bring down the estimate, and has not brought it down. A few years ago Parliament voted \$1,000,000 to construct the tidal dock at St. Charles River; over \$3,000,000 have been expended on it, and it is proposed to expend \$1,000,000 more. The hon. gentleman knows that is the way we have been going on year after year, till we are on the verge of bankruptcy in this Dominion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I say yes; this has gone on until we had a debt which if we had been told ten years ago we would owe that amount now, the people would have stood aghast at it. We have gone on rolling it up, and we of the Opposition think it is time to halt, and we are determined we will not vote these sums without at least obtaining reasonable information as to the estimated cost, so that we shall know what we are doing. We have only the information given by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell), who has a perfect knowledge of the surroundings there. He has told us that the construction of the canal may be completed for one million. To make that canal of any use, and to deepen the shallow waters at the mouth of it, will cost you \$2,000,000 more. Is the House going to vote that blindly? Hon. members on the back benches and the member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) notably, seemed to be very anxious to shut off discussion and to vote this sum without our knowing what it is for. I say that the hon. gentleman is forgetting himself when he asks this side of the House to vote blindly this large sum of money, and when he calls on gentlemen to sit down, when they ask for that legitimate information without which no member of the committee should vote. I myself will take the responsibility of dividing the House on this question unless the hon. Minister gives us the necessary information. I say that he is insulting the committee and insulting members on both sides of the House by withholding it. It is all very fine for him to play with the common sense of the House, and to talk in the way he has done now, about this great public work. He knows very well that the reasons which induced many men to support that canal years ago do not exist now. You spent millions of money in building the Canadian Pacific Railway road around Lake Superior, and you do not anticipate to be deprived of the use of the canal there in the future. It seems to me to be throwing away millions of money for nothing.

Mr. HESSON. As the hon. member for North Perth has been alluded to I wish to say a few words. I did not intend to take any part in the discussion whatever, but I may point out that the discussion has largely been contributed to by gentlemen from the eastern portions of the Province who know very little, or nothing at all about the locality. We from the western portion of the Dominion have listened with patience, and I am sure with great respect to the hon. gentlemen when they were dealing with matters appertaining to their own Provinces, and we presumed that they knew more about the interests of their own Provinces than we did. The hon. gentlemen from the Lower Provinces are undertaking now to dictate to members from the west as to what we require, and sneer at gentlemen on the back benches who happen to dissent from the opinions of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side. We are now referred to as sitting on the back benches, but if we have not the position on the front benches which my hon. friend has, it is because we have not so much cheek, and that we do not uselessly occupy the time of the House, although we re-

present just as good and as important constituencies as the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat. If that hon. gentleman thinks we are voting blindly on this side of the House, he is very much mistaken, for he is probably measuring us by his own friends. Every gentleman in this House who was here last year knew that this sum was in the Estimates, and if he voted in ignorance it was the fault of the hon. gentlemen opposite. He must have seen it himself last year, and I do not think he will ask us to furnish him with eyes to see and ears to hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Tell us what you know about the estimate.

Mr. HESSON. It is exactly what was in the estimate formerly. There was a vote of a million before; part of that was spent, and we are now asked for a revote of the balance. This great work may cost more or it may cost less. The hon. gentleman asked that the Minister should present to this House to-night the estimate prepared by the engineer. Why did he not ask for that years ago? He was in the House and he did not discharge his duty if he let it pass unchallenged.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Read the debate and you will see.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman must have looked over this matter in silence for a number of years. I believe that on this side of the House we have the interests of the country at heart as much at least as hon. gentlemen opposite and we are just as likely to be called upon to pay our portion of the taxes as they are. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I have as good a right to speak for my constituents as he has for his. I am satisfied that there is not a single constituency in the west which would have the slightest hesitation in agreeing to this vote, and which would not say that the Government would be recreant of their duty if they failed for one million or two millions or three millions to construct that great national work. As a Canadian proud of my country I would not again have the insult thrown upon Canada that was hurled at us on a former occasion, when we had to go on our hands and knees for the right to go through those American canals. I believe it would be a disgrace to the Canadian people if they did not undertake the responsibility to construct a work of this kind for ourselves. We have no better evidence of the fact that it is necessary for us to build this canal, than what has been stated by gentlemen on the opposite side. If the Americans, keen and far seeing as they are, and anxious for the development of that great country in the future, should find it necessary to construct that great public work, why should gentlemen on the other side of the House who have never been up there, and who do not know an inch of the ground, say that there is sufficient accommodation there at present. If gentlemen on that side of the House choose to dictate to the Americans as to the necessity for such a canal, they are taking too much responsibility on themselves. I for one as a Canadian, am prepared to take my full measure of responsibility to carry out this work, and if \$1,000,000 is not sufficient I have no hesitation in saying that the Canadians are satisfied they will have that work accomplished. Whether it is this year or next year the canal will be built. The hon. member from Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) did not hear me complain when the Government put in the Estimates \$150,000 to give a steamer to the island he represents. Year by year the hon. gentleman stood in this House and complained of the way in which that island was neglected. I have never chosen to say a single word about the expenditures on the great harbors of the Eastern Provinces. I presume that if this great work is carried out the harbors of the lower provinces will all share in the great benefits it will confer on the country at large, and I think that Canadians may be allowed to know what Canada wants, once in

a while, and not be made to feel that they are not able to protect their own interests. I, as a Canadian, protest against any such course. If I am forced to sit on the back benches I am not ashamed of it, but I do not wish to be referred to in an insulting way as a member from the back benches, by a gentleman who has more cheek than brains.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I shall not imitate the conduct of the hon. gentleman, nor shall I use the insulting language he has used. The reference I made was because of the fact, that when my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) was on his feet addressing himself to the important matter before the House, the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) indulged in the conduct which he generally indulges in, and with other members kept up a running fire of insulting expressions, shouting "sit down," and using language which no gentleman should use. The hon. member acknowledges he does not know what he is voting for. He acknowledges he will vote one million, two millions, three millions or any other number of millions for this work, irrespective of consequences.

Mr. HESSON. You are misrepresenting me.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). He is the last man in the House who should use insulting expressions to us on this side when we are trying to get information on a matter of great importance to the country. I asked him if he knew what the estimate is and he does not know. I asked him if he read the debate of last year, and if he had read the debate he would have seen that the Government said they were considering the question, and that the Opposition, therefore, left the matter in their hands then. The only reference I made to the hon. gentleman as occupying the seat he does on the back benches, was that while he was writing his letters, and while another gentleman was discussing the matter he kept up a fire of unseemly and ungentlemanly interruptions and I was determined that this conduct should not go unreprimanded.

Mr. HESSON. As to the interruption which the hon. gentleman refers to, I may say that he had been four or five times speaking on the question, and he did not present to this House any reason why this vote should not be passed. He seemed to think that the experience of a gentleman in this House, who is a contractor, was more to be relied on than that of the most eminent engineer in the country.

An hon. MEMBER. He never said that.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman said so, and members on that side of the House repeated it over and over again, that because a contractor in this House chooses to say that that work would be an expensive work and would cost more than the estimate, it is not a work that should be proceeded with. We on this side of the House prefer to believe the opinions of eminent gentlemen who are entrusted with carrying out that work. We have here gentlemen who have experience as engineers in the country, and who are not contractors in the sense my friend is on the other side of the House, and we prefer to take their opinions to his.

The CHAIRMAN. Hon. gentlemen would do well to return to the discussion of the question.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Although I am a member from the Eastern Provinces and open to the objection made by the member for Perth (Mr. Hesson), yet I think we would be derelict in our duty if we should allow money belonging to this Dominion to be expended in any part of Canada without having the proper information as regards the work on which it is to be expended. It is not only the duty of the members of the Opposition to ask for that information, but it is the duty of the members who support the Government as well, and before they vote they should know what they are voting for. What information have

Mr. HESSON.

we got on this subject? The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) has given us the same speech as he gave us last year, but he has not ventured to tell what the canal would cost. He has not ventured to impugn the statement of the member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell), who is a practical man, but who is sneered at by the member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), because he is a contractor. The member for Glengarry has stated in practical terms what he knows of this place, and he does not indulge in strong language and use high-falutin terms about Canadians going it blind and spending any amount of money, but tells us exactly what he has seen and knows by practical experience, and his statement has not been impugned in the slightest degree. The hon. member for Perth asks why we did not ask for returns. But it is the duty of the Government to give the information which every hon. member is bound to have before being asked to vote away the public money of the country. Last year the vote was granted on the statement of the hon. member for Algoma, and what passed in concurrence when the hon. Minister of Finance was asked to explain the vote? The following is the report in *Hansard* :—

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have tenders been asked for this work?"

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not yet."

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have any reports of engineers been received?"

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Elaborate reports were made some time ago, on two occasions, and Mr. Page is now considering the whole question. Very full plans and estimates are in the department, and Mr. Page is considering the whole matter."

If Mr. Page has been considering the whole thing since last Session, we have the right when asked to vote this amount, to know what his views are, and his estimates of the probable cost. The hon. member for North Perth says he is prepared to vote this money or even \$2,000,000. He is prepared to go it blind, placing implicit faith in the Government; but all I have to say is that his duty to his constituents rather was to see that before he gives any vote, he should have that information by which he can justify that vote to them.

Mr. COCKBURN. I regret that in the heat of the debate, some hon. gentlemen are apt to forget the words they uttered a few minutes before. I observe that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) told us that last year this matter slipped through without his observing it, and that if he had only known it was before the House, he would have most violently opposed it. A few minutes afterwards he tells us that he had studied this debate, and twitted the hon. member for Perth with not having done so, and alluded to some points which had taken place in the debate last year, of which he had just assured us he was totally ignorant. I do not wish to refresh an hon. member's mind so shortly after he has spoken, but, at the same time, I must object to the doleful position in which we are constantly placed before the country. We are told this evening that the country is on the verge of bankruptcy; yet only this evening I have read that our 3½ per cents were quoted at 109. When the brokers, and moneyed men of Paris, London, Antwerp and Vienna, give 9 per cent. premium for our 3½ per cent. securities, I think that hon. gentlemen opposite rather allow their party feeling to carry them too far when they represent this country as being on the verge of ruin and unable to complete the connection of the grandest water system the world has ever known. I have noticed in the debate that the ground taken for the change of opinion this year is that we have built the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that there is no fear whatever of the Americans ever preventing us from utilising and completing our grand water system. Now, as far as I recollect, it is only a few months ago when we were threatened with this very same calamity, because it must be

fresh in the minds of hon. members opposite that had it not been for the prudence of the President of the United States we might simply have been in the position of being stopped at the entrance of the Sault Canal by the execution of the non-intercourse bill. I wish to point out to hon. members that there is a necessity for this vote for the construction of this great work, independent altogether of the consideration that we have no other means of making water connection with the great North-West. I think that if the hon. members on the other side, especially those from the Maritime Provinces, had visited this district and studied it as carefully as they have their own, they would appreciate the absolute necessity which exists for completing the canal; and when we have a responsible Minister of the Crown telling us that minute estimates have been made of this work, and we are confronted only by the estimate given by a gentleman whose business it is to undertake contracts, and who, I say it in all humility, is not very exact in his figures, if I may judge by the returns he made with reference to election expenses, I think we ought to accept the statement of the Minister. It is not fair to confront a haphazard expression, given perhaps an hour before, with the regular detailed statement handed to the Government by an authorised engineer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where is that?

Mr. COCKBURN. Hon. gentlemen opposite have never asked for that statement until this night. The vote has been on the book for the last nine or ten years. It was last year \$1,000,000, and all that has been expended is about \$200,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where is it for the last nine or ten years?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was voted in 1871.

Mr. LISTER. There was an election in 1872.

Mr. COCKBURN. That had nothing to do with it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We do not expect one next year.

Mr. COCKBURN. With the growth of the great western country, this canal that we saw was a growing necessity in 1871, has now become an absolute necessity, and it behooves us to proceed at once with the work, and not to try and delay a work of this kind on the mere opinion given by a gentleman who tells us he has been at the canal and sounded it here and there and looked around it, and has come to the conclusion that he would not build it under \$4,000,000.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the hon. the Minister of Finance will allow me to make a suggestion which if adopted would very much facilitate the business of the Estimates, I would ask him to allow this item to stand and bring the information asked for to-morrow. That is the best and the proper way of dealing with an important subject like this before Parliament. I may also say that I have already expressed my opinion on this Sault Canal. I am in favor of completing it even if it should cost \$2,000,000. I am in favor of completing it for this reason, that we know there stands on the Statute-book of the United States a statute giving the President authority at any time he likes to stop the transit of our vessels, and to stop communication with our north-west country. A condition of things may arise which, while not an actual state of war, might be such an interruption of commerce as would seriously interfere with the prosecution of our trade with the North-West. We are squandering money most recklessly in other ways, and I think the expenditure of whatever may be necessary, to a reasonable extent, within our resources, to make the connection of our great water system we are bound to expend.

It is one of the things which, if perhaps not strictly agreed to in the British North America Act, was in contemplation when we agreed to build the Intercolonial Railway; it was then contemplated that in due course the improvement and extension of the canals to the westward should be carried out. It is for that reason and because it is in the interests of the country, that we should have an independent system of our own and not be in a position in which the Americans might threaten us with the closing of our canals. I may say that I do not think the hon. Minister of Finance has been prudent in his manner towards hon. gentlemen on this side. He has chosen to speak to them in a dictatorial way, which was uncalled for, because they were simply performing their duty. The hon. gentleman may think I am lecturing him. I am not. I am here as an independent man, not voting from party grounds, but voting in such a way as my sense and judgment and conscience tell me is right. The hon. gentleman knows I am in favor of this canal, because I gave my assent to it and supported it years ago, and I am prepared to continue to support it now. The hon. gentleman must not take the ground, at all events, so far as I am concerned, that because a vote passes once and lies unused, therefore hon. gentlemen must be expected to vote the same thing over again. I have heard the hon. gentleman take that ground before on a very recent occasion, and he has taken it again to-night. I protest against that being an answer to the reasonable or the unreasonable grounds of opposition taken by the gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate. Sir, we are entitled, when an important question like this is under the consideration of the House, to every information which it is in the power of the Government to give us; and we are not to be foreclosed because we have not moved for papers in connection with it. The Government are the servants of Parliament, and the people will hold us responsible if we do not question, and closely question, the correctness of every vote submitted to Parliament. I think, after the statements which have been made by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell) and the hon. member for Algoma, (Mr. Dawson), so diverse in their character, the hon. gentleman will see the propriety, as a matter of policy, of allowing the vote to stand over until to-morrow or until we next go into Supply, and then coming down with the detailed information which is asked by the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If I had the slightest idea that this vote would have been questioned, I would have called on the Department of Canals for detailed information respecting it. The House is aware that in consequence of the absence of my friend, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, who is prevented from discharging this duty himself by illness, it has necessarily and unexpectedly been thrown upon myself. But the vote having passed a year ago, after a very full statement by my hon. friend from Algoma, he being an eminent engineer himself—and there being no indication that the vote would be opposed by any hon. member, I did not take the precaution which I would otherwise have taken to have obtained the fullest statements from the Chief Engineer of Canals. I have no hesitation in adopting the suggestion made to allow the item to stand until I can obtain the fullest information regarding it, which I know every hon. gentleman is entitled to on a question of this kind, and which would have been anticipated if I had thought there was going to be the slightest objection to it.

Mr. WELSH. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) brought up the subject of \$150,000 for a steamer for Prince Edward Island.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to speak about that when we come to that subject.

Mr. WELSH. Well, the hon. member for North Perth should not have brought it up, because he knew very well that that should have been voted ten or twelve years ago; and a deputation went to London because that money was not voted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend allow me to say that the hon. member for North Perth only brought it up to express his approval of it.

Mr. WELSH. I will not allow the hon. member for North Perth to bring up a matter like that, which he ought to have been ashamed to mention, because he knows there has been considerable trouble between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of Prince Edward Island about it. I think it was bad taste in him to bring it up. But as the hon. Minister of Finance says there will be a time to make further remarks on that subject, I will not say any more now.

Mr. DAWSON. I wish to read—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope the hon. member for Algoma will not pursue this question just now, as we have postponed the item.

Mr. DAWSON. I wish simply to read a short extract.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Postpone the reading until the item comes up again.

Lachine Canal..... \$88,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state, just once for all, whether this involves the deepening of the whole system, and what these different votes are required for?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a part of the system. The hon. gentleman is aware that it would take a very large sum of money to deepen the St. Lawrence Canals to the depth to which the Lachine canal has already been deepened. But that work is being gradually prosecuted on a system to enable vessels drawing 12 feet of water to go from the harbor of Montreal to the upper lakes. This is a revote, and it is required to complete this work, which is estimated to be done by the 1st July, 1889. The total expenditure chargeable to capital, to 30th June, 1886, was \$6,254,670; the expenditure for 1886-87 was \$28,772.52, and from the 1st July, 1887, to the 31st December, \$9,884; making a total expenditure of \$6,293,327. The estimate, as revised by Mr. Page, for the entire work of the enlargement of the Lachine Canal, was \$7,550,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman did not quite catch what I wanted to know. There is a scheme for the enlargement of all of the St. Lawrence canals to a depth of 14 feet, and I suppose the Estimates show what the total cost of carrying out that scheme will be.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About \$11,500,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are there not serious obstructions in the St. Lawrence at certain points, which will have to be removed before you can obtain 14 feet of water?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; but their removal is all included in the same estimate.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). At one time I think it was the policy of this country to deepen the canals to 14 feet, with the expectation that the commerce of the country would extend up to the lakes; but I understood that there was a change in public opinion in that respect, and that it was considered that 12 feet would be sufficient above Montreal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The proposal is to make it 12 feet first, but with the mitre sills so arranged that at any time the two additional feet can be obtained.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is there not a change of opinion upon that subject? I have conversed with several parties, eminently well qualified to form an opinion on that subject, who have told me that the views which at one time were held as to the policy of deepening the canal are not in favor to-day to the same extent that they were some years ago, and that it was now held to be a better policy to limit the canals to 12 feet, in order to avoid the heavy expenditure which must arise in deepening the various channels of the river itself as well as enlarging the canals and making Montreal the headquarters of navigation. They say that 12 feet of water is considered ample for that purpose, because it was not considered that shipping to a large extent would ever require to use these canals.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that the first intention was to deepen to 12 feet, but in such a way that we can obtain the 2 additional feet if found desirable afterwards. As I have stated, there is a deduction in this work of \$550,000, which would be required to deepen it to 14 feet, or 2 feet beyond the 12 feet. But that is proposed to be deferred.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Unless the Government have a settled policy on this subject and look to deepening the channel of the St. Lawrence as well, it would appear to me that it is rather a waste of money to increase the depth of the canals beyond their present capacity. If it is the settled policy of the country to have a depth of water extending from Montreal up, that will take 14 feet, then I can understand the vote, but in the meantime, unless the Government have arrived at such a decision, it would be waste of money to deepen the canals to 14 feet, when the other channels will not carry a vessel over 12 feet.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have endeavored to explain to the hon. gentleman that the proposal is to deepen to 12 feet, but to make the locks and mitre sills in such a way that the 2 additional feet can be obtained, provided it is found desirable to extend them to 14 feet.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman asks us to vote a sum of money for the Welland Canal to deepen it to 14 feet.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Welland Canal is already finished at 14 feet.

Mr. COOK. Is the work going on at Blue Rapids?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will come to that in due course. If we do not, my hon. friend can ask me afterwards and I will take a note and obtain the information.

Cornwall Canal..... \$724,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The vote for 1888-89 is brought from 1886-87. The appropriation for 1887-88 was \$273,000. The amount available for 1887-88 is \$273,000. The expenditure from 1st July, 1887, to 31st December, 1887, was \$49,061. There is a revote of \$224,000, and that leaves from the original amount available for this work \$224,000, and a new vote of \$500,000, making a total vote of \$724,000 required to complete to 1st July, 1889.

Mr. MITCHELL. In connection with that vote, I may say that I have heard very serious complaints on the part of the people engaged in the navigation of Cornwall Canal that the amount of water which is allowed to be drawn off the canal for manufacturing purposes, materially interferes with the depth of water that is necessary for the vessels, both steamers and barges passing through. I would like to know whether the Government will take a note of this, and see that it is not continued?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Page is now engaged investigating that very subject.

Williamsburg—Towards enlarging the Farran's Point Division \$100,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The chief engineer's estimate was \$500,000 for a depth of 14 feet. The construction of a new lift lock and enlargement of the prism of the canal at Farran's Points cost \$500,000; at the Rapide Plat Division the expenditure was \$1,250,000 to obtain 14 feet navigation, and at the Galops Division, \$900,000; making a total of \$2,650,000. The total expenditure on the Williamsburg Canal, chargeable to enlargement on the 1st January, 1888, was \$421,901.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is the proposed expenditure for the 14 feet?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$2,650,000 including Farran's Point, Rapide Plat and the Galops Division.

St. Lawrence River and Canals \$300,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The chief engineer's estimate for 12 feet draught, lowering the bed of the river through the flat rock shoals above the head of the Galops Canal, lights, buoys, &c., \$512,000; dredging and removing boulders at Willard's Shoal between Rapide Plat and Farran's Point Canals, \$13,000; Lake St. Francis, dredging at three different places, including lights, beacons, buoys, &c., \$45,000; deepening and enlarging the channel at the head of Beauharnois Canal, \$430,000; deepening and improving the channel through Lake St. Louis, \$520,000; total estimate for 12 feet depth, \$1,520,000; additional for 14 feet depth, \$1,480,000. The estimated cost for 14 feet navigation will be \$3,000,000. The expenditure up to the 30th June, 1886, was \$603,781.57; for the year 1886-87 it was \$71,437.31, from the 1st July, 1887, to the 31st December of that year, \$37,996, making a total expenditure to the 31st December, 1887, of \$716,214.88. The estimated expenditure from 1st January, 1888, to 30th June of this year is \$18,004, making a total of \$734,000. That leaves an amount required to complete of \$2,266,000. The appropriation for 1887-88 is \$40,000; expenditure 1st July to 31st December, 1887, \$37,996; expenditure from 1st January to 30th June, 1888, \$18,004, making a total of \$55,000. New vote, 1888-89, \$30,000. This gives the information as to what the total cost will be, but the committee will see that the work is proceeding gradually and we are taking a comparatively small appropriation, though we are proceeding steadily with the work.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am afraid I could not derive much information from the statement of the Minister, probably because it was given too much in detail.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that I propose to reduce the next vote from \$100,000 to \$30,000.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thought the maintenance of lights and buoys was always in the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is connected with the work of deepening the canal.

St. Lawrence River—Lake St. Louis \$100,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to reduce that to \$30,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understand that these amounts are on works which are estimated to cost \$5,000,000 in the future for reducing the depth to 14 feet. What would be the cost at 12 feet?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was estimated that to deepen the channel to twelve feet draught, would cost \$1,520,000. For the two feet additional, it would cost \$1,480,000 more, or \$3,000,000 in all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was the estimate which the hon. gentleman gave for the completion of the St. Lawrence

Canals, at \$12,000,000, for a depth of twelve feet or fourteen feet?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Fourteen feet.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the estimate if you keep it at 12 feet?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That would reduce it very largely. I cannot state exactly the difference at present, but I will give the hon. gentleman the amounts at the two depths.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Does that include the deepening of the river?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, it is all embraced in the same surveys.

Murray Canal, towards completing the present works. \$75,000

Mr. PLATT. When does the hon. gentleman expect that that work will be completed, and at what cost?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The total expenditure up to the 31st December, 1887, was \$181,166.22. The new vote of \$75,000 is required to be expended towards the construction of this canal. A further sum of about \$360,000 will be required to complete the work.

Mr. PLATT. When do you expect the contract to be completed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The estimated expenditure from 1st January to 30th June, 1888, is \$40,000, making a total expenditure to that date of \$27,166, and the total estimated cost of the work is \$1,260,645, which leaves \$433,459 to complete.

Mr. PLATT. Is it likely that that amount will complete the work? It does not look like it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman can judge from the amounts which have been expended. The amount expended up to the 1st July of this year will be \$27,000 and the balance required to complete is \$433,000. That is in the light of the work that has been done and the estimates which the chief engineer has made, showing that about two-thirds of the work is done.

Mr. PLATT. This is outside of building the approaches. Is there not a separate contract for that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I think this expenditure covers everything.

Mr. COOK. Have the Government any statistics as to the number of vessels that have passed through this canal? I believe it has been in operation.

Mr. LISTER. It is not a quarter finished.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. According to the engineer's estimate, it must be about two-thirds finished.

Welland Canal (revote) \$34,400

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This revote is required to complete the aqueduct under contract with Mr. Beemer, and to settle with the contractors for section 34.

Deepening Welland Canal to 14 feet throughout (revote) \$190,000

Mr. BARRON. I understood the Finance Minister to say that the Welland Canal was already deepened to 14 feet, and I see that is stated in the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, page 86.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The expenditure for the deepening of the Welland Canal to 14 feet throughout up to the 31st December, 1887, was \$1,126,229.18. The hon. gentleman is aware that at first there was 12 feet of navigation obtained, and then that the Government proposed to

obtain the 14 feet, and for that there was a vote, of which this is a revote to the extent of \$190,000. This revote is required for deepening to 14 feet, and to settle with the contractors. The work is principally done.

Trent River navigation—for construction of locks,
and the improvement of navigation between
Lakefield and Balsam Lake..... \$88,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of this sum, \$23,000 is a revote. This amount is required to complete the work now under contract between Lakefield and Balsam Lake. There was expended on that work in all, up to the end of December, 1887, \$599,861.16. The estimated cost of the whole work of the Trent River navigation was \$688,000, all of which was spent except \$8,138 to complete, which is the amount now asked for.

Mr. LISTER. Does this \$88,000 complete the work? This Trent River navigation canal has been going on ever since I can remember.

Mr. BARRON. Will the hon. gentleman state where these improvements have been made?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On the Fenelon Falls Canal there has been paid \$106,500; the Buckhorn canal, amount paid \$81,500; the Burleigh and Lovesick Canal, \$226,200; lock gates for these canals, \$4,000; Young's Point dam, \$12,600; Lakefield dam, \$18,000; lock gates at Fenelon Falls, \$9,600; road bridges at Buckhorn and Fenelon Falls, \$13,200.

Mr. PLATT. What is the estimated cost of the whole Trent Valley works?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The estimated cost of the whole system undertaken is \$688,000.

Mr. LISTER. But these works will not complete the undertaking.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course, the hon. gentleman knows that the Trent River navigation is a very expensive undertaking. All that has been undertaken are the works I have mentioned, but of course they will not procure a through line of navigation.

Mr. COOK. Is it the intention of the Government to have a through line of navigation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think, if I remember aright, that a commission was appointed for the purpose of examining that whole line and reporting. I think that was the decision arrived at when I was here a year ago; and I do not think that report has yet been completed.

Mr. COOK. Surveys were made some time ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, long ago.

Mr. COOK. Just before the last election surveys were made through the county of East Simcoe.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I imagine that was the commission appointed to report upon the whole question.

Mr. COOK. I have heard a good deal about the political complexion of this Trent Valley Canal in years past, but it never reached East Simcoe until the last general elections; I had a little taste of it then.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Has the canal got to East Simcoe?

Mr. COOK. No, but the forerunner, the engineer, the political part got there, and they boomed it for all it was worth. Now, I would like to call upon the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby) to speak. He is a new member, and his constituency is largely interested in this enterprise. So are the people in the constituency of North Hastings. All the constituencies on the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

line have been carried by this question for a number of years back, but in the last election the people got their eyes open, and they returned some Liberals. I do not see the hon. member for West Peterboro, (Mr. Stevenson) in his place; he is deeply interested in this matter. The Minister of Customs is deeply interested in this matter, or his constituency is, and I do not see him in his place. I am surprised at the smallness of the vote of \$88,000. I suppose the Finance Minister has not forgotten the deputations that waited upon the Government in times past in reference to this matter. He surely does not forget the deputation of 150 gentlemen that he entertained with a speech in the Railway Committee room. He has not forgotten the promises that were made to these gentlemen that a through route would be built as expeditiously as possible. I think it is treating the constituencies along the line of this route badly, to vote such a small sum. Only an increase of \$50,000. Last year \$90,000, of which \$28,000 was expended. I thought at least the Government would give \$250,000 to expend this year. I believe this is a work that should be completed. I believe that if they ever intended this canal for the purposes which they pretended it was for, they should have completed it at once. They should have put more money in the Estimates and kept at it, but I fear we young men will grow old and grey before we will have the benefit of this communication to send down our produce. I remember that at every election for the last nine years, since 1873, when they defeated the Mackenzie Government, these hon. gentlemen told the people in the front counties of the great blessings which the opening up of these navigable waters was going to give them. They have only done a very small portion of the work, and are not giving them an outlet at all, as promised. I am surprised at the Government endeavoring to traffic with the people in this way. I told my constituents last year that the Government were not sincere in their attempt to build that road, that it was nothing but a political dodge, and all along the line wherever that canal was to go, I am glad to say the people were not hoodwinked. My constituents were not hoodwinked; they gave me a better vote than they ever did before. They saw through the thin mask of hon. gentlemen opposite. Even in North Simcoe the cry was used at a distance of 60 miles from this route, in the town of Barrie, where the hon. member from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) stated to his constituents that it would go right up there, and that they were coming down the Nottawassaga River, instead of the surveyed route from Lake Simcoe to Mottchedosh Bay *via* Orillia. I must enter my solemn protest against the conduct of the Government with reference to the construction of this canal, by not putting a larger sum in the Estimates than they have done.

Mr. BARRON. I have heard the explanations of the Finance Minister as to how the \$88,000 is made up. That expenditure will be absolutely wasted unless the Government excavate the waters of Cameron Lake north of Fenelon Falls. I drew the attention of the Minister of Public Works at the beginning of the Session to this fact, in order that a sum might be placed in the Estimates to make the necessary excavation, because it is utterly impossible for the lakes along the Trent waters to be used unless that portion of the navigation is excavated. Cameron Lake is like a basin. At one edge it goes into Fenelon River, and except in cases of freshets it is utterly impossible for a vessel, steamboat or barge of any draft to get into Cameron Lake; and hon. gentlemen will see that the whole line of water communication will be absolutely useless unless proper excavations are made there. It is at this place that the railway bridge crosses the river, which forms another impediment. So all this money will be wasted unless something is done; this is absolutely necessary for the purpose of

making the entire system of waters navigable. As regards the commission: I desire to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to this fact, that although the commissioners are appointed for the purpose of taking evidence in this matter, they appear to have no power whatever. It is true they can summon witnesses; but they have not the power to pay those witnesses, and at the present time they do not seem to understand exactly what they are doing. So much is that the case that private individuals have to go to the expense of obtaining expert evidence on the subject of the Trent Valley Canal. A few gentlemen have combined together and, at their own expense, with assistance obtained from municipalities, have summoned witnesses for the purpose of giving evidence before this commission. I hold that if the Government think it is necessary to appoint a commission to find out that which they have professed for years and years to know, they should give power to the commissioners to summon what evidence is necessary to bring before them, and pay the expenses of experts who are going to be brought before them from New York and other American cities to give the evidence which we think is necessary to prove that the canal when constructed will be in the interests of the country. I can re-echo everything stated by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Cook), but I do not wish to say anything further, except to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to the fact that the expenditure of \$88,000 will be absolutely useless unless the work I have spoken of is carried out, and also to draw his attention to what I think is the feeling through the country, and that is that these commissioners appointed for the purpose of taking evidence should have their powers enlarged, and should have power to summon witnesses from a distance and guarantee their expenses, and not throw the onus of placing proper evidence before the commission upon the shoulders of private individuals and municipalities interested in the construction of the work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to the statements made by my hon. friend, but I draw his attention to the fact that this sum is to complete the work now under contract between Lakefield and Balsam Lake. I have no doubt that if it be found necessary, as the hon. gentleman says it is, to make further expenditure in order to make more useful the work which has already opened up a very considerable section of country, measures will be taken to do so.

Mr. LISTER. The work under discussion is no doubt a very important work *per se*; it is also a very important work as affecting the elections in ten or eleven counties. So long as I can remember, the Trent Valley Canal has been under discussion, and the Government many years ago undertook the construction of the work in question. The work no doubt is important, inasmuch as the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), and other hon. members have, year after year, in the most earnest manner, urged the speedy completion of the work; we are, therefore, bound to believe, from the statements they have made and from the zeal they have exhibited in urging on the Government the completion of this great work, that it is, as a matter of fact, a great work in the interests of the country at large and particularly in the interests of the people who live in that section. It, therefore, becomes the bounden duty of the Government to complete the work at the earliest possible moment, in order that the benefit of this great work may ensure to the people who live there. I have been in this House six years, and year to year I have heard the hon. gentlemen I have named urge on the Government the completion of the work, and I am amazed to-night on looking at the Estimates to see the excessively small sum which the Government have placed in the Estimates. If I am correctly informed it will cost nearly \$15,000,000 to complete this work, yet

the Minister of Finance comes down and asks us to vote a paltry \$83,000. What will be gained by that? It will be sufficient to dig a hole here and there which will never afterwards be seen. Is it the intention of the Government to trifle in this manner with eleven constituencies? Have they been trifling with them in the past in voting paltry sums? If the work is of the magnitude and importance represented by hon. members, it is the duty of the Government to come down and vote a substantial sum to complete the work at once, in order that the people living along the line of the canal may have the benefit of the work; but instead of doing so, they come down with an estimate for \$88,000. The Government have asserted that this work is a public necessity, and such being the case it is the duty of the Government to complete it with all possible speed. Have the Government done so? For over twenty years Parliament has been voting paltry sums year after year, trifling with the people of those counties and sending out engineers just before the elections, spending a few thousands of dollars here and there and wasting the money of the country. It is the duty of the Government to finish the work. If it is important let the Government vote \$10,000,000 to complete it, but do not trifle with the people along the line of the canal. It is unworthy of the Government just before an election to do as they have done in the past, namely, when an election was far off, to vote \$50,000 or \$60,000, but when an election was closed at hand they raised the vote and led the people to hope that the work would be speedily done, and not only so, but they sent engineers into the locality and led the people to believe that they would finish the work rapidly. If the people of those counties had a grain of common sense in their composition they ought to know that the Government had trifled with them and never intended to complete the work, but simply meant to try and bribe the constituencies. If the people were true to themselves they would act on the opinion which they must form of the course of the Government, which was a policy of delay. It is unworthy the Government, and it is their duty to go on with the work. The hon. Minister of Finance says that this work will cost a large sum, but he does not tell the committee how much it will cost to complete it as undertaken.

Mr. SHANLY. Would my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) vote the item of \$15,000,000 if it was in the Estimates?

Mr. LISTER. If it is a work of national importance, it is the duty of the Government to finish it in the speediest way possible, and not to trifle with the constituencies along the line there. My friend from Hastings knows it is an important work, and it is his duty to urge on the Government to vote a substantial sum, and not to trifle with the electors in the way they appear to do here. I hope the people of the country will understand that the Government have no sincere intention of proceeding with this work at all. Grand and magnificent and important as it is, and feasible as it is, because it must be feasible, or else the Government would not be spending the money they are from year to year. Being feasible, and being important in the interests of the whole country, it is the bounden duty of the Government to complete that work without further delay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am quite certain that whatever doubt the committee may have had before the hon. gentleman spoke as to the prudence of the course which is being taken by the Government, it has all been removed during the time he was on his feet. The Government have undertaken, at an expenditure of some \$688,000, to open up 150 miles I suppose - the hon. gentleman is more familiar with the distances there than I am—of a very good line of water communication through a very interesting and important section of the country. Finding that there were

very great differences of opinion as to the amount that would be required to carry the work to completion, they have adopted what I think the committee will agree is a very reasonable and wise course before proceeding with any further large expenditures on this. They are endeavoring to find what amount of money would be required to complete this work, and in the meantime to ascertain what amount would be involved in carrying this line of water communication to completion. If there is any truth in the estimate the hon. gentleman has made, that this work would cost \$12,000,000 or \$15,000,000, I think the committee will see that we are very wise in pausing, and resting on our oars and to a certain extent completing the work we undertook while we ascertained definitely what the expenditure would be. I am sure that the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has removed, by the statements he has made, any doubts on the minds of members of the committee on both sides of this House, as to the wisdom of the course we have pursued. When the committee reports, of course the Government will take the matter into their very serious consideration, and decide what it is the duty of the Government to do in relation to the cost of the work and the value of it when completed.

Mr. COOK. I am very much surprised to hear the remarks that have fallen from the Minister of Finance. He states there has been a diversity of opinion as to the cost of the work. It is perfectly absurd and ridiculous for a Minister of the Crown to make a statement of that sort, that after nine years and having engineers upon the ground the whole of the time, and spending \$600,000, the Minister should get up in his place, and say that there is such a diversity of opinion that the Government are wise in their generation by going slowly on with this work. The thing is perfectly absurd and bears upon the face of it the political complexion that I have already stated it has. How long were the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in discovering a line through to the Pacific Ocean? How long did it take to discover the necessary amount that would be required for canals on the River St. Lawrence? It did not take them very long. I remember very well a deputation that waited upon the Government a few years ago, and the present Minister of Finance then stated that he expected their report immediately, that the work was nearly completed, that they had not quite got the amount that it would fully cost, but that they would soon have it. Now after a lapse of three years the Government state that they are not yet in possession of those facts. I think it is trifling with the country, trifling with this House and trifling with the people upon the line on which this canal is to be built, to make a statement such as the Minister of Finance has made here to-night.

Mr. BARRON. The complaint the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has made, is that while the Government professed to be always ready and willing to build this canal as a canal, all they are now doing is improving the water connection known as Trent River waters. The hon. gentleman must know that throughout the country they have created the impression, that from the very outset of the discussion on this important public matter, they have always intended to go on with this as a canal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This portion already done is so much towards the canal.

Mr. BARRON. Yes, but you always professed and always said you were going to build the canal. What the people complain of is that while you have always expressed this, especially before elections, that now you are appointing a commission to find out what you have given the people to understand you have already been in possession of. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that if the commission reports against the feasibility of that canal he will not go on

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

with it? If he does he will deceive the people at large, because the people at large have always believed the Government were sincere in their professions, when they said they would build that canal. In 1872 the Premier himself in a speech made at Peterboro' said a sum had been placed in the Estimates for the purpose of going on with this canal, and the hon. the Minister of Public Works is reported by the hon. member for West Peterboro' (Mr. Stevenson) to have stated that this present summer the work would have been gone on with between Peterboro' and Lakefield as a canal and not as an improvement of the Trent Valley waters. I doubt very much, that the improvement of the Trent waters alone, will justify that great expenditure of \$500,000 or \$600,000. Unless the work is to be gone on with as a canal from end to end, that work should not be taken up at all. I understood the member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) to complain that the Government have been deceiving the people of the Midland counties interested in the canal before the election, and now all they say that they ever intended was the improvement of the Trent waters.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no.

Mr. BARRON. Well, all you have done so far is the improvement of those waters. I again ask the Minister of Finance if the commission reports against the feasibility of that canal will he go on with the work? If he does not, I can tell him that the people will be greatly dissatisfied, because they believed him to be in possession years past of the information which he now says he wants to find out by means of this commission.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I never knew until to-night that it would cost \$15,000,000. Until the member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) spoke I never knew that it would cost that sum.

An hon. MEMBER. You ought to know.

Mr. BARRON. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he would take the statement made here to-night by the member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister)?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BARRON. Wait till I finish. The member for Lambton was merely speaking on supposition at the time he mentioned those figures. The hon. the Minister of Finance has the report of an engineer to say that it will not cost more than \$3,000,000. He has the report lately of Mr. Rubidge that it would cost \$10,000,000. I can tell him that at a large public meeting held in the town of Lindsay, at which people from all sections of the country along the line of canal were present, they said that if it did cost that they were justified in asking the Government to go on with the expenditure. I believe the Government ought to do so, because they professed all along, and led the people to believe, that they were sincere in their intention to build the canal from end to end. I can tell them that the benefit to the people along that route would justify the expenditure of \$10,000,000—an estimate which although made by their own engineer is believed by other engineers to be largely excessive of the amount really required for that purpose.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope so.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Coming from the County of Victoria, I happened to be at that meeting which the hon. gentleman speaks about, and I happen to know something about the people in that part of the country. They were under the impression that that waterway could be built for a reasonable amount of money, and believing that, they were very anxious that the Government should expend that money. But if it is going to cost an immense sum of money, I think those people are patriotic enough to say to the Government: Hold your hand, do not spend the money

on that waterway, because there is no necessity for it. We in Canada are not anxious that the Government should spend a large amount of money if there is no adequate return for it. What we want to know is whether the Trent Valley Canal is going to be a great national work. If it is not, then the Government would not be justified in spending a large amount of money on it. If it is to be a great national work, I think the Government are right in having a commission to enquire into it, in order to ascertain, first, whether the waterway is necessary to the people of Canada or not, and in the second place, whether it would pay in competition with railways; and as to that the commission would enquire not only in Canada, but in the United States and in Europe. The Government should use every endeavor in their power to ascertain whether it is really advisable to go on with the scheme or not—not whether they should expend a large amount of money to benefit North Victoria and perhaps other constituencies, but whether it is a proper expenditure considering the whole of Canada; and I think that it is the proper way to look at the matter. If the expenditure on the Trent Canal is for the benefit of the whole of Canada, then the whole of Canada should contribute to it. If it is merely for the purpose of carrying elections in certain districts, it should be condemned. The work should be considered not from the local standpoint of the hon. member for North Victoria, or from any little petty considerations, but from the standpoint of the whole of Canada. If it is a necessary work like the Welland canal or the St. Lawrence Canals, then by all means let the whole money be expended. But if it is only to benefit a few little villages or districts contiguous to the canal, then I say the Government were right to stay their hand and enquire whether the expenditure would be for the benefit of the whole of Canada or not. Although it may be said that a considerable amount has already been uselessly expended, that is no argument for expending more; it is for the Government to ascertain whether the work is for the benefit of the whole country or not. Although I come from the county of Victoria, I would be very sorry to ask the Government to spend \$15,000,000 or any such large sum to benefit that part of the country alone. It would be better for the \$1,500,000 or \$2,000,000 to be lost to the country than to go on and spend a large amount more in building that enormous system. I think the Government have acted wisely in appointing the commission to ascertain whether it is for the benefit of Canada that this work should go on. If they say it is, let it go on; if they find that it is not for the benefit of the whole of Canada, then I say let the matter drop.

Mr. LISTER. I have listened with pleasure to the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth). He is perfectly familiar with this question from beginning to end; and after listening to his speech, I agree with him that this work is not a national necessity, and that a great deal of the money spent on the work has been uselessly thrown away, and that the Government should stay their hand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not hear that.

Mr. LISTER. Yes. If the work is a useless work, then the Government should stop this expenditure. From the hon. gentleman's speech, we can be satisfied that this is not a work that should be completed, and such being the case it would be worse than folly—it would be suicidal extravagance—for the Government to go on spending more money upon it. The hon. Minister of Finance stated that my estimated cost of the work was \$15,000,000. If I remember rightly, last Session, when this question of the Trent River navigation was before the House, the hon. Minister of Finance was urged to give the House an idea of the cost of these works when completed, and if my memory serves me, the hon. gentleman estimated that it would cost \$10,000,000, and knowing the hon. gentleman as well as I do through

the press, for I have not an intimate knowledge of him, I thought it quite safe to add 50 per cent. to his estimate. It is not creditable to the Government that the hon. Minister of Finance should have come before Parliament and made the statement that they have spent nearly \$600,000 of the money of the people of this country on this work without first satisfying themselves that it was feasible. The hon. gentleman tells us that it is necessary to appoint a commission to make an investigation to see whether this work can be completed or not. I hold that it was the duty of the Government, before they spent a dollar of the public money, to have satisfied themselves that the work was feasible, and that it was in the interest of the country that it should be completed. But I fear that this is just using the money of the people for the purpose of securing a few votes in this House, as the hon. member for South Victoria has told us. If it is used for that purpose, he says, it ought to be stopped. The hon. gentleman is honest, at all events, in that statement, and I am sure the statement he makes finds an echo in the minds of every member of this House. Every hon. gentleman here knows that the Government have been using this expenditure as a lever to carry eight or nine constituencies, and that being the case it should be stopped. I say to those hon. gentlemen in whose interest this expenditure has been made, that they ought to spend their own money to secure their elections, and not the money of the people.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a very improper doctrine, that people should use their own money to carry elections.

Mr. LISTER. Hon. gentlemen opposite have used their own money, notably the Postmaster General, who says he spent \$1,500 of his own money, and I do not know how much of the public money he spent. But if you are going to spend money at elections—and it is improper to spend any—you should spend your own money and not that of the public.

Mr. BARRON. I wish to answer one or two remarks made by the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth). I was at the meeting at which the hon. gentleman spoke, and he must know that it was the consensus of opinion there that this was a national undertaking. Now, I think, when the hon. gentleman knew that, he should have stated it here to-night, instead of throwing out a doubt and asking whether it was or not a national highway. It would have been better for him, in the interests of his constituents and of the people who came to that meeting, to have stated for the information of the House that they all agreed it was a national undertaking which the Government should build as soon as possible. The hon. gentleman must know that the sum of \$10,000,000 was mentioned there as the likely cost of this road. The sum of \$3,000,000 was also mentioned, but the sum of \$10,000,000 was mentioned as the possible cost of this canal, and he knows that the meeting was unanimous in favor of the canal being built. Why did he not tell the House that that was the feeling of the meeting? Instead of casting doubt on the project, did he not advocate the completion of that work? The hon. gentleman was honest, as the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has stated, in doubting the way in which these moneys have been expended. They have been expended for election purposes. I disapprove of such expenditure also. The hon. gentleman spoke at that meeting strongly in favor of the completion of this canal, and I was astonished to find him to-night throwing doubts as to the wisdom of going on with the work and as to its being a national undertaking instead of urging its construction with all his power. I have stated before, and I state again, that this matter has been approached by gentlemen on both sides in politics and considered by them irrespective of politics, and I must say

that, inasmuch as the Government have received the support in this scheme of gentlemen on both sides of politics, the building of the canal should be gone on with as speedily as possible; and instead of putting in a miserable sum for the completion of the water-way, the Government should put in a large amount for the completion of this work. I reiterate that the Government will not be able to shelter themselves behind the report of this commission, because they were aware, before they appointed the commission, of all the facts necessary to be known before undertaking to build this canal. This is not a new project. Ever since 1837 it has been written and talked about. We have the report of an eminent engineer and the reports of other engineers on this great project, and a vast amount of information given from time to time by engineers, from which the Government could have got sufficient data to go on with this great work.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It do not suppose it interests this House to know what difference may exist between the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) and myself. The meeting to which he refers, which was called for the purpose of asking the county council to vote a thousand dollars for the purposes of the commission, in order to obtain witnesses who would lay before the commission all the facts. It had nothing to do with the desirability or otherwise of the canal. I made no speech in the town of Lindsay in favor of this canal system. What I simply said was that I believed the Government to be honest in their endeavors to ascertain whether this was in the interests of the public and the whole country or not, and I thought the giving of a thousand dollars by the county council of the county of Victoria was a very small matter, and I urged upon them to give this money, which they did. The council of the county of Peterboro granted a similar sum, and other municipalities along the route of the Trent Valley system granted money for the purpose of bringing witnesses to testify before the commission whether the scheme was practicable or desirable or not. The town of Lindsay, the south riding of Victoria county, has a very particular interest in this canal, and if it was seen that the scheme was desirable and in the necessity of the whole country I would be very glad to see it carried out; but what I do say is, that I thought every information that could possibly be brought before the Government ought to be brought, and I thought they had taken the right step in granting this commission, in order to ascertain from all parties, not only in this country but in the countries in Europe, whether the scheme would be practicable or not. As I understood the hon. gentleman, when the scheme was first proposed a relatively small amount of money was asked to build this system, and it gradually grew and grew until it obtained mammoth proportions, and Mr. Rubidge—I have seen his report, but I never read it very carefully—reported to the Government, as I understood, that it would cost a very large amount, something like thirteen or fourteen or fifteen millions of dollars, but in the first place the amount asked for was not nearly half of that amount. Looking at the matter practically, I think the country would pause before spending \$15,000,000 upon a scheme which it was supposed in the first place was to cost \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000.

Mr. BARRON. Where did the hon. gentleman get his \$15,000,000?

Mr. HUDSPETH. It was stated at that meeting.

Mr. BARRON. The estimate which was spoken of as Mr. Rubidge's estimate was \$10,000,000.

Mr. HUDSPETH. When we find that a work is going to cost \$10,000,000 according to a surveyor's estimate, we may generally come to the conclusion that it will cost 50 per cent. more, and that would be \$15,000,000. So far as

Mr. BARRON.

the county of Victoria is concerned, both north and south, I would like to see a large amount of money expended there so long as that is in the interest of the whole Dominion of Canada, but I will not advocate the expenditure of any money in my own constituency or in any adjoining constituency if it is not in the interest of the whole Dominion. I think the Government acted wisely, after they ascertained that this work was to cost double the amount which was originally estimated, in appointing a commission to find out what the cost would be. The question was raised whether the Government should pay the witnesses who came here to give evidence, and I thought it would open the door to a great many frauds, that persons would come from all parts of the country who would be anxious to give evidence, and that it would be a very difficult question for the Government to solve, to say that all persons who came here to give evidence should be paid their travelling expenses, and I therefore thought it would be better for the county of Victoria to give \$1,000, and for the county of Peterboro' to give the same, and for the other constituencies which were interested to contribute towards the expense of getting witnesses before the commission, so as to find in the first place whether that waterway was necessary, and whether it could compete with railways, whether the evidence which could be obtained from the United States or from Europe could be applied to the solution of the difficulty, and whether that water-way would be of advantage to the whole Dominion of Canada. If it could be shown that such a scheme would be in the interest of the whole Dominion, and not simply in the interest of the township of Fenelon or any other township in North Victoria or elsewhere, that would be a different thing, but I think the Government were right in staying their hands and it would be better, after paying \$500,000 or any other sum, to drop the whole thing, if the Government found that it was not to be of benefit to the whole Dominion of Canada, than it would be to proceed with it if it were to be useless. That is the position which I took and which I have always taken.

Mr. DAVIN. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the North-West members are entirely in accord with him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And I suppose will contribute in proportion to what they receive. I think it is seven years since the first vote for this work appeared in our Estimates; that is, the first vote of recent times, because this was projected, I think, about fifty years ago, and about that time a good deal of money was spent upon this project. I would ask the Minister of Finance whether, when in the seventh year the Government proposed to spend \$88,000, they have any estimate of the probable cost of this work?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This estimate is to complete the contracts. We were carrying on certain works which were undertaken and which would have the effect of opening up fifty miles or more of very interesting country at a comparatively small cost. It was hoped that the estimates on which the work was originally commenced were reliable: we hoped to obtain a navigation of about 5 feet depth, which would answer for barges, for three million dollars or thereabouts; but, as the work progressed, it was found it would probably entail more expense than was contemplated, and, as my hon. friend is aware, the Government decided a year ago not to proceed with any new works, but simply to complete those which had been undertaken, until they had definitely ascertained, with all the exactitude that they could, what amount would probably be required to complete the work, and what relation that expenditure would have to the value of the work which would probably be done by the canal. This is simply a small amount required to complete the works already undertaken at Fenelon Falls, Buckhorn, Burleigh and Lovesick Canals, lock gates for Burleigh and Lovesick Canals, Young's Point Dam, Lakefield Dam; lock gate, Fenelon Falls; road bridges at Buck-

horn, Burleigh and Fenelon Falls, which make a total of \$688,000. The amount now asked, \$88,000, is to complete the work which is now under contract. When the commission report, the Government will take up the whole question, and next Session they will be prepared to state whether they think they should go on with the work or whether they would not be justified in taking another course.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has not the Government another report?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. Of course, before the work was undertaken, there were elaborate surveys made, but, as the works progressed, a doubt arose as to whether there had not been a considerable under estimate of the work required, and we thought it wise, before putting any new works under contract, which would entail a large expenditure, to have a careful investigation made by a commission. The report has not yet been received, but no doubt it will be in the hands of the Government before next Session, and then the Government will be in a position to state what their position is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I remember the report the hon. gentleman refers to, but I understood the reason for the Government issuing the commission was that they had received another report.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And that showed an enormous increase?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wanted to know what the amount was which that indicated?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not able to answer the question now, but the engineer who was in charge of the work and was quite familiar with it did, no doubt, report a very large increase over the original estimate, which led us to suspend any further works in the meantime.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the hon. gentleman could state the amount approximately?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I cannot. As the hon. gentleman knows, I am acting on behalf of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will obtain that statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will get the statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know what the total length of this navigation is supposed to be from lake to lake from the point on the Georgian Bay to the Bay of Quinté.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will get that.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The report is printed and before the House and any member can get a copy of it. It shows the whole matter from beginning to end.

Mr. CASEY. If this work is going to cost anything like the amount that has been stated, 10 millions or 15 millions, the amount of \$33,000 that is put in the Estimates, is a very trifling sum, and it must be put there purely for electioneering purposes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it is to complete existing contracts, made long since.

Mr. CSAEY. Not to complete the work?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, to complete all the work that is undertaken.

Mr. CASEY. All the works undertaken, but not to complete the canal?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, no.

Mr. CASEY. It has been stated that the work would cost 15 millions and I have not heard that statement denied. If the work is to cost 15 millions, the item of \$88,000 must be purely for electioneering purposes. If it is not to cost 15 millions, we ought to know how much it will cost. This thing has been before the House ever since I have been in the House, and that is 15 years. It has been used as an electioneering dodge at every election. The Minister of Finance has not told us how much it is going to cost, or whether it is ever going to be completed. If he is going to finish navigation between the Bay of Quinté and the Georgian Bay, he ought to tell us how much it is going to cost. This vote commits us to carry on the work to completion. If we pass this vote, we are committed to carry on this scheme of making a system of navigation from the Bay of Quinté to the Georgian Bay, and we ought to know how much it is going to cost.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We shall have to pay existing contracts, even though we were going to stop. This is to complete existing contracts, and must be paid in any case.

Mr. CASEY. But the hon. gentleman has not told us, as he should do, in connection with this vote, how much it is going to cost to complete the system of navigation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He does not know.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister confesses he does not know how much it is going to cost. Well, of course, I suppose this vote must pass, but I think the hon. Minister of Finance ought to tell us, before it passes, how much it is going to cost to complete the system of navigation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish I could.

Mr. CASEY. Well, perhaps if he had consulted with the engineers of the department, if he had had surveys made, if he had taken the steps that a Minister of Finance ought to have taken before asking this House to vote this sum, he would be able to tell us how much the completion of this system is going to cost.

Ste. Anne's Canal \$24,640

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This amount is required to complete the work of deepening the channel for about 4,700 and 100 feet wide at the bottom, and 10 feet deep at low water. This sum is a revote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How did it come to be delayed? It has been spread over several years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am unable to say what caused the delay, but this is the amount required to complete the work. The amount paid on this contract to 21st December, 1887, was \$236,800.

Grenville Canal..... \$7,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a revote. The sum of \$7,000 is required for the settlement of a claim connected with the enlargement. The work has all been done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the contractor?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The contractor was Mr. James Goodwin. It is the estate of the late Mr. Goodwin, and the matter has not been finally settled and is now under arbitration.

Tay Canal..... \$78,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This amount is required to settle matters connected with the construction of the canal; the work has been done.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are the works in connection with the canals always carried out by contract?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Always by public tender and contract.

Mr. CASEY. Who has the contract for the work?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A. F. Manning & Co.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will be the total cost?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$358,364.

Culbute Canal \$21,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is to settle claims for land damages in connection with lock and retaining dams. It is a revote.

Mr. CASEY. When will this work be finished?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is finished now.

Welland Canal \$58,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In regard to the item of \$15,000 for weirs and dam at Dunnville, is that for repairing the old dam, or is it for the construction of a new dam?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is required to face the dam with stone and lower the walls of the dam. The work is under contract. The sudden and heavy floods that occasionally take place on Grand River render it desirable that this work should be done.

Chambly Canal \$39,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this work for the permanent deepening of the canal or simply for cleaning the floor?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is for deepening the upper entrance of the canal between lock No. 1 and the Grand Trunk Railway bridge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What depth of water is it expected to have?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose nine feet.

Towards overhauling foundation of St. Ours Lock. \$50,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that last year a comparatively small vote was asked, only \$5,000; this year the hon. gentleman demands \$50,000. It appears as if there had been some error on the part of the department when that first vote was demanded.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. \$5,000 was voted towards overhauling the foundation of the lock in 1887-88, and after this being done it was found that they would have to take down the lock walls on both sides, lower the bottom two feet and rebuild the same in the winter of 1888-89. That is what the vote is now asked for. The probable cost of the whole will be \$75,000.

To settle claim of Thomas Stephenson as per agreement \$2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain what the agreement was with Mr. Thomas Stephenson by which he gets the sum of \$2,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The agreement was made between the Government valuator, Mr. Wood, and Mr. Stephenson, for damage caused to his mills and farm by the rising of the water in the Buckhorn Dam.

Mr. BARRON. Were there any other claims besides that one of Mr. Stephenson? It is singular he should have been settled with and no one else.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not aware of there being any other claim, and there is none in the Estimates.

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Was it settled by arbitration?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was settled by the valuator.

To build a dam at Bobcaygeon \$15,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is to construct a dam there. It will be placed in a better condition than the existing one.

Mr. BARRON. I know that we have a great deal of trouble by reason of the leakage of this dam. Not only is the trouble to lumbermen driving their logs, but I, being connected with navigation of steamboats there, have been put to considerable trouble by the leakage.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is to reconstruct the dam.

Clearing out the channel between Lakesfield and Balsam Lake \$8,500

Mr. BARRON. I would like the Finance Minister to draw the attention of the department to the obstruction I mentioned to him some time ago north of Fenelon Falls, between the points mentioned in the vote. If that obstruction is not cleared the entire system would be useless.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume that will be included in the work the vote is asked for.

Surveys and Inspections of Railways \$15,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see you have added to this \$5,000. What do you propose to do with this surveying and inspection? Is it to make a general examination of all the railways that are now under the Dominion authority, because that is a very large job?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This sum is to provide for the expense of inspecting railways to which subsidies have been voted, and also the expense of inspecting railway crossings over highways—all of those points which are required to be carried out by the railway commission.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that last year we expended \$1,072 in making a survey of the Prince Edward Island subway. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has a great deal of useful information to communicate to us touching that subway, and I should like to know what his private—no, I cannot ask what his private opinion is, but what his official opinion is about that work, for which we have spent \$1,072 in obtaining information.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid I shall have to refer my hon. friend to the distinguished senator who has taken a great interest in this matter, and who has sanguine views of the future of the work. I believe the surveys have satisfied that hon. gentleman that the construction of this subway is practicable, at a not inordinate cost, considering the nature of the work.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want to state that if the hon. gentleman is going to base the calculations of the Government on what an hon. senator says, who is not responsible to Parliament or the people, for the expenditure of money, I do not believe this House ought to vote any sums based on the opinion of an hon. senator. And I want to say further that I do not think these calculations, which we sometimes hear about things that may be done, ought to be accepted as a basis of action for this committee in our votes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps it was rather badinage on my part to refer to the very sanguine views that Senator Howlan entertains on this subject; but I may say that a great many gentlemen who have taken up projects that were at first regarded as visionary have gradually worked them into such prominence as to attract considerable attention. The expenditures in connection with the

surveys have not been extravagant; and when the Government of Prince Edward Island brought to the notice of Her Majesty's Government the fact of our being obliged to maintain continuous steam communication with Prince Edward Island, and the fact that eminent engineers had stated that this work was quite practicable, the Government thought they would be quite warranted in expending the small sum that has been expended for the purpose of taking soundings and getting information, which Mr. Howlan stated were necessary to obtain definite statements from competent engineers. I am not myself as sanguine as to the practicability of that work as some others may be, but at the same time I do not think it would be wise to hastily come to the conclusion that the thing is impracticable until it is subjected to the examination of able and distinguished engineers.

Mr. MITCHELL. If it does not cost more than \$1,000, I have no objection; but when the hon. gentleman speaks of enterprises which were first regarded as visionary, and afterwards proved valuable, I do not know what he points at—perhaps the Chignecto Railway. I know of a case in which Nova Scotia committed as great a folly in constructing the Shubenacadie Canal for conveying ships to the interior of the Province. The scheme was to start at the harbor of Dartmouth, where there was an inclined plane on which the ships were to be hauled, and from which they were to go into the canal. I heard there was just one little yacht that was hauled up there, but beyond that the whole scheme has proved a perfect failure, and a most disastrous failure, and I am afraid the Chignecto Ship Railway will be just the same.

Mr. WELSH. I do not want to kick up a row about this \$1,000 for these surveys, but I could have given all the information obtained by them for 10 cents. I know the whole place. If they had only looked at the soundings marked on Bayfield's chart, they would have obtained all the information that this survey has given. I am like the Minister of Finance—I am not going to pronounce on this scheme as not being feasible, but I have my own opinion on the matter. The hon. senator at the other end of the building, who has taken a great interest in this matter, and gone to a great deal of trouble over it, proposes that the tunnel should consist of an iron tube. I asked him if anything of this kind had been attempted in any other part of the world. He said, yes, in England. I made some enquiries and I found that there was one in operation under the Thames in London, near London bridge, and I believe they are constructing one or two more in England.

Building on Wellington-street. \$100,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a revote of \$100,000 from last year. This will be required to go on with the work this year, and we expect it will be completed by the end of the year. It will require an additional sum of \$80,000 next year to complete, and the total amount, including the land, will be \$707,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Last year the hon. gentleman said the cost would not exceed \$600,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That did not include the site, nor the furniture and so on.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The enquiry was made last year, and the hon. gentleman said the total cost would be \$600,000. Now he says it is \$700,000, and I suppose that is only an estimate, for there will probably be extras, which he is not in a position to give exactly.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will give the details, if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many officials will this accommodate?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention is to put in the basement the archives. On the first floor, we will put the Department of the Interior. On the second floor, the Department of Agriculture and Statistics. On the third floor, the Department of Indian Affairs, and a portion of that floor will be vacant, but will be used for some other department. The 4th floor under the attics will be for the model rooms. The rooms vacated in the other buildings will give more rooms to the other departments where the offices are very crowded.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman can avoid crowding the offices by not appointing so many clerks. I suppose when this new building is filled with clerks there will be a demand for another building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman knows that the eastern and western blocks were built, not for the wants of Confederation but for the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and the only addition to those was the addition made under the Government of Mr. Mackenzie in the western block. Since Confederation the number of departments and officers have increased considerably, and we had to find room elsewhere for many of them; for example, we had to put the Department of Indian Affairs in another building, and there is another building where we had to put some of the Post Office clerks. As soon as the new building is completed, the places which have been rented will be given up.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This explanation is all very well, but, if you consider the extent of the accommodation required for the conducting of a large business, such as exist in many parts of the world, a business more extensive than that under the direction of the Government, this expenditure is perfectly absurd. I have no doubt anyone would undertake by contract to run all these departments for fifty per cent. less than they now cost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What plan has the hon. gentleman adopted in laying out this building? Has he adopted the system of long rooms?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, there will be two long rooms, where the bulk of the clerks can be kept under supervision.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does appear to me that this amount of \$707,000 is an enormous sum to pay for that building. Where does the hon. gentleman get the stone from for that building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was obtained from New Brunswick.

Mr. MITCHELL. And it is a very good selection too. It comes from the town in which I was born, and it is the best stone on the continent. I am giving it a free advertisement now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I believe the stone is very good, as far as I am a judge, but it is a long distance to bring stone from.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is no further than I came myself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman can move himself, which is more than these ponderous masses can do. I should like to know the cost of transport of this stone from Miramichi here.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We asked for tenders for the work, and we took the lowest tender.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Who is the contractor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Charlebois.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A particular friend of the Minister of Finance, I believe.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contractor was bound to furnish the stone according to a sample which was exhibited for that purpose. The chief engineer had to have the quarries examined in order to see whether there was enough stone in a quarry for that building to prevent the risk of the stone coming to an end in that quarry, and thus, perhaps, having two different colors of stone in the building. Finally this stone was found to be suitable and good stone, and those who understand these matters—of course I am only a layman in matters of this kind—all say that the stone which has been selected is a very good one, and the hon. gentleman must see from the appearance of the building that it is a very good one.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Was not the original advertisement for stone which was to come from the county of Albert?

Mr. COCKBURN. So favorable has been the impression created by the appearance of this stone that a deputation came from the rising city of Hamilton to inspect it and see if it would not be the best for them to use in building their court house, and the result was that they decided to import that stone all the way to Hamilton for the purpose of erecting their court house.

Mr. BROWN. My hon. friend is wrong in one point. It was not the court house, but the city of Hamilton is putting up a new city hall at a cost of \$150,000, and after examining ten or fifteen specimens of stone from all parts of the Dominion, the experts decided that this was the best stone that could be obtained, and consequently we are putting up our building from that stone.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What did the Government charge the contractor for bringing that stone over the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot state the amount. It was paid by the contractor.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). But it was paid to the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was paid to the Railway Department.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Was it a special rate that was made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think so. I will enquire about it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It certainly appears to me that this amount of \$707,000 is an enormous sum to pay for that building, and it seems clear that a very large extra cost was incurred by the contractors having to bring that stone up here from Miramichi. I should have thought that there were other qualities of stone which could have been found and could have been laid down very much cheaper, though, of course, there may be qualities in this stone which might pay for the difference in the cost of transport. I should like the Minister to find out what was paid to the Government for bringing this stone up here.

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel it due to my county to give the hon. gentleman the information for which he asks. They did not select the stone in that county until they had failed in obtaining it in the Province of Quebec and also in Albert county, and until they found that there was not enough in any other part of the county of the same quality with which to complete that building. They had, therefore, to fall back upon this county, and I want again to advertise the stone which is to be found there which, like the member for the county, is of very good quality.

An hon. MEMBER. Very gritty.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not so gritty as you are, but a little inclined that way. There is enough stone there to build every public and private edifice in the Dominion of Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. COOK. They have very good stone in the county of Peel. In the city of Toronto they are using the stone from that county in their public buildings, and I think it is quite equal to the stone from the Province of New Brunswick.

Mr. BROWN. Nothing like it.

Mr. COOK. I should like to hear from the member for Peel on this question.

Port Arthur Harbor and Kaministiquia River..... \$125,700

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The sums which have been expended before were divided. There was an amount of \$94,000 for the Kaministiquia River, and \$223,000 for the Port Arthur breakwaters and matters of that kind. This sum of \$125,700 is to make provision for works for the protection of the ships at Port Arthur and in the Kaministiquia River. We have to continue the deepening of the River Kaministiquia, that is to say, we want to have a second cut in order to widen the channel and to make the navigation as perfect as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far does the hon. gentleman say he will carry the piers at Port Arthur?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is 1,600 feet, more or less.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that straight out seaward or is it in the form of an L.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a protection from the north-east, I should say; and by the reports I have, when the extension is built, then the harbor will be the safest we have on all the lakes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It will be purely artificial, will it not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, artificial to that extent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I remember right, the harbor is protected on the north-east by Thunder Cape.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, and in the other direction in order to form the large basin.

Mr. COOK. What proportion of this is for the Kaministiquia?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have, out of the vote of last year, \$45,000, on the 1st December last which will go to pay a portion of the contract for the extension of the pier or breakwater at Port Arthur. The total amount for the River Kaministiquia, if we complete all the works, will be \$125,000. Out of that, we expect to take, probably, \$30,000 for this year.

Cape Tormentine Harbor..... \$85,000

Mr. WELSH. Before that passes I want to say a word. We have got very good harbors in Prince Edward Island, we have a very good harbor at Summerside, and a very good harbor at Charlottetown; and on the opposite side, on the New Brunswick shore, there is a good harbor at Shediac. In Nova Scotia there is a good harbor at Pictou, a good harbor at Georgetown and a good harbor at Pugwash, which is the other side of Cape Tormentine. It seems the Government has undertaken to fight against nature and to build unnatural harbors. Now, at the very place where they are building this breakwater navigation is more difficult than anywhere else in the gulf. They can complete a harbor for steamers drawing, perhaps, 12 feet of water, where they are going to complete the pier. It is the only place where they are going to complete a pier, but on the other side it seems to me they are going to make an artificial harbor on the Cape Traverse side. I have grave doubts whether they will ever make a proper harbor there; if

they do, it will be at great expense. Now, if you are at all interested in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, take a map of Prince Edward Island and just look at its situation, and then look at the situation of Shediac and at Cape Tormentine, Pugwash and Pictou, on the other side, and ask yourself what occasion was there for all this expenditure being made in building artificial harbors? What is the call for it? If they could be used for winter traffic, I would not say one word. If there was any possibility that a steamship could be made that would keep up winter communication between these places, I would not say one word against it. I suppose the Government is committed to this matter, and it is useless to say anything about it; but had I been consulted in the first place, I would have advised the Government to save the money and lay it out where it can be of some use to the people of Prince Edward Island. If one-half of this money were applied to making good harbors and improving the good harbors we have around the island, it would do much more good. However, as the Government is committed to it, I am not going to say anything more.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think we should have some explanation with reference to this vote. As has been stated by my hon. friend, who has just resumed his seat, all along the coast of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, we have numerous safe harbors, and the Government now, having so much money to dispose of, are going to create an artificial harbor or pier there, in connection with the railway owned or presided over by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), or in which he is interested. I presume, if we could get at the bottom of the transaction, the *raison d'être* for the transaction is that the hon. member for Westmoreland and another hon. gentleman in the other branch of the legislature, having a short piece of railway running from the Aulac Junction, or one of the junctions there, down to this point, to assist these very enterprising gentlemen, the Government step forward now and put this large sum of money in the Estimates. It is not that the country requires it, it is not that New Brunswick requires it, it is not that Prince Edward Island requires it, but the hon. member for Westmoreland and his associates and their railway require it, and the Government are giving it to them.

Mr. WELSH. I notice here that it is a revote of \$35,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; the appropriation is \$100,000.

Mr. WELSH. And \$15,000 has been paid?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is the length of the pier?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. 1,200 feet. The total probable cost will be \$185,000.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What traffic is it intended to accommodate?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is the communication with the terminus on the New Brunswick side of the ferry.

Mr. KIRK. Do you mean it is in the interest of Prince Edward Island?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. KIRK. It appears to me in that case the hon. gentlemen who represent Prince Edward Island are not in favor of the expenditure of the money. I do not see why the Government should expend it, especially in face of the fact that in Nova Scotia we have numerous places where the people are suffering for the want of the expenditure of a little money.

Mr. WELSH. We are suffering in Prince Edward Island very much for the want of some money to improve our piers, our wharves and harbors; but I never heard of any one in Prince Edward Island agitating for this communication. As I said before, if the Finance Minister will take up the map of Prince Edward Island and a map of New Scotia and New Brunswick, and then look at the harbors opposite to each other along the shore, he will see that there is no necessity for building these artificial harbors. Even suppose you build this pier and this harbor at Cape Tormentine, then you have to build a pier and harbor at Cape Traverse, which is exposed to the north-east gale, and as fast as they build a wharf there, it will fill up with sand, you will have to build a breakwater and lay out an immense sum of money at Cape Traverse, before you can make this communication. If you have a pier built and a harbor on both sides, what is the advantage of it? It may benefit people on the centre part of the island. The Government are going to a great expense in these visionary schemes. They are entailing a heavy cost on the country, and if there is any benefit from it—I am not going to crack up the railway—it will benefit a certain number of people and the Sackville railway and people about Baie Verte. But as regards a general benefit to the people of Prince Edward Island, I do not think they have ever applied for it, but I am not going to object to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If this work were not under contract I would recommend the Minister of Public Works to strike it from the Estimates. What is the fact? We have an hon. gentleman pretending to represent Queen's, P. E. I., standing up in this House denouncing a railway to Cape Tormentine and supporting the insinuations of the hon. member for Halifax.

Mr. WELSH. I rise to a point of order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will find that in the words he has just uttered he has attacked this railway running up to Cape Tormentine and giving countenance to the insinuation thrown out by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), that the road was built in the interests of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) and was not required, that it is a waste of public money. What is the fact? The fact is that every person in Prince Edward Island, every member from Prince Edward Island, petitioned the Government to build the railway to Cape Tormentine. The leader of the late Government instituted elaborate surveys at various points. He took up the question of communication with the island as a question of vital importance, as every one knows it was under the arrangement we made with Prince Edward Island when Prince Edward Island came into the union, to do everything we could to perfect communication by steam with the island. When the hon. member for East York was leading the Government he appointed an able engineer and spent a large sum of public money in ascertaining how he could best meet the wishes of the members for Prince Edward Island, who unanimously petitioned for the construction of a road to Cape Tormentine as a project vital to the island; they pointed out that for six months in the year they had no means of communicating with the island except by Cape Tormentine and when they got to that point there were twenty or thirty miles to be travelled with sleighs through storms in order to obtain communication with the Intercolonial Railway. The report of the engineer, after examining all the localities and seeking to meet the views and needs of the island, was that it was absolutely necessary to have a railway constructed to Cape Tormentine, and tonight the Government is denounced for assisting in the construction of that railway, which we were told was absolutely necessary for the comfort and convenience of all the people of the island; I say the Government are attacked not only for assisting in the construction of that work shown

to be necessary, but the report of the engineer appointed by the late Government, adopted as that report was by the present Government, has been carried out and everything done in connection with it, yet we are attacked to-night. I say if the work is not under contract I would ask my hon. friend to strike out the estimate for a work that no private company would do. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that there is no natural harbor at that point of communication; but the railway requires to have its terminus there, because for six months in the year it is the only point at which the inhabitants of the island can communicate with the mainland. We have a right to expect different treatment from those for whom public money is being expended to promote their comfort and convenience. The Government acting in response to the invitation of all members of the island acted as I here said and yet this statement is made by the hon. member for Queen's in the House and sent broadcast throughout the country, at a time when they are carrying out the plans initiated by the late Government and are accomplishing that which the people of Prince Edward Island unanimously demanded, that we are expending public money for political purposes and to serve the interests of a member of this House. There is no member of this House to whom the people of Prince Edward Island are more indebted than the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood). Why? Because he has embarked his own money in constructing this road that conduces to the comfort and convenience and best interests of that island, and instead of being assailed for what he has done he should be commended, and the people should thank him and thank the Government for the assistance they were giving to do that which no private company could do, the road being carried to that point so as to afford communication in summer as well as in winter.

Mr. WELSH. I never objected to those railways. I approve of the railway to Cape Tormentine. No man suffered more before the railways were built than I did. Why did the hon. gentleman pick me up in this way? I was talking about piers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because you attacked the railways.

Mr. WELSH. I did not. I said the people would benefit by it—the people at Baie Verte would benefit by it—but I said if we built piers and ran a steamer through the winter to keep up continuous communication, I would approve of that more. If there is one place where you cannot run a steamer near shore it was there. In summer we have plenty of communication; the trouble is in winter. What good will a pier be in a place when a steamer cannot get within three miles of it? I say it is a necessity to have the railway to Tormentine and I am proud of the work the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) has done in building that road from Sackville to the Cape and the Government will have to take that road off the hon. gentleman's hands and run it as a Government work. The Minister of Finance must not pick me up and misrepresent me as running down the railway for which we have been petitioning. I approve of them—I never did anything else. Why did the hon. gentleman impute these motives to me? I never said anything of the kind about railways, and I do not want any words put in my mouth that I did not say. I spoke of piers, and of an artificial harbor that was useless in the winter. I did not speak of railways that were useless in the winter. I know the benefit of them and approve of them. The Government adopted their plan; let them try it and see whether it will satisfy the people of the island. As to railways I am astonished at what the Finance Minister says; he must have misunderstood what I said.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can assure the hon. gentleman that if the reporter took down his words he will find
Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

that my statement is correct, although he may not have considered that he attacked the railways as well as the piers.

Mr. WELSH. The words I used were these: You take a map of the island, and take the harbors of the island and the harbors of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. They are a great benefit to the island. You must keep up communication between Summerside and Shediac. It would be accommodation, I said, for the railways. Will it not be for their benefit? Of course it will. Will it not be for the benefit of the people living in the vicinity of the railroad? Will it not be for the benefit of the people of Cape Traverse? Of course it will. That is what I said, and that is what you will find out I did say. However, we will have a look at it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not pretend to say anything about the railroads, because I am not quite familiar with the country. I think I recollect that in the time of Mr. Mackenzie, we came to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman has come to, that steam communication on that strait eight miles wide was practically impossible.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid that is the case. I do not think the *Northern Light*, nor any other steamer has ever succeeded in making a passage there in winter.

Mr. WELSH. No one ever tried her.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I mean to say is that in our time, as well as the hon. gentleman's time, it was conceded that you cannot keep up steam connection across that strait eight miles wide.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid not in winter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In summer I understand that was a matter of very little moment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In summer the steamer will not require an hour to make the communication between railway and railway. There is a railway from Charlottetown to Cape Traverse, and a railway from Cape Traverse to the Intercolonial. There is a ferry of nine miles between the two and in summer it is perfectly practicable, in such a manner as my hon. friend asked the House to provide, that Prince Edward Island will be connected with the mainland by half an hour's ferry.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It has never been used or attempted to be used as a communication during the summer time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because there have been no facilities.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Why should we build an artificial harbor when a man can go just as well to Shediac. If he wants to go to Montreal or west, he joins the Intercolonial at Shediac and at the other end he goes by Charlottetown and Pictou. He can go from those points much more conveniently than he can from Cape Tormentine. Why should we spend \$185,000 on a pier there? It seems to me that it is a waste of money. My hon. friend in front of me speaks of Cape Traverse, which he knows very well, and he says if you carry out a corresponding work there, it must involve a large sum of money.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I must differ with my colleagues on this matter. It has been the object of the people of Prince Edward Island to make communication between the island and the mainland as connected as possible. In the winter season we have to run our ice boats at this very place. It is one of the objects we have in contemplation that a summer ferry be made between those two piers, and that our mails and passengers will cross there and not between Shediac and Charlottetown. This is a hope we have been looking to, and for that reason I agree with the hon. Minister in this

regard. I also approve of the expenditure that is made on the two railways. It is only an act of justice to Prince Edward Island to make this expenditure, and they cannot be completed unless we have a summer ferry here. I see now that it is advertised in some of the western papers that a steamer runs across the straits of Mackinaw through ice, which is quite as difficult to get through as the ice between Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, we do not know what science and engineering skill may do in the future, and it may yet come that we will have winter communication.

Mr. WELSH. It seems to me that my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Robertson) has misunderstood me. I said I was not going to be against this vote, and I will support it. I want to agree with my hon. friend that this ferry will shorten the sea voyage from three hours to one hour.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Or half an hour.

Mr. WELSH. Well, we will say an hour. If you leave Charlottetown in the morning and go by Pictou or Shediac you just arrive at St. John or Halifax the same time as you will by this route. You have a shorter sea route, but you have a longer railway. I will certainly support this vote, as the people of Prince Edward Island do not get so much from the Government and when we do get anything like this I am not fool enough to vote against it. I will support it of course.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It just comes to what I stated at the beginning, that this road was built by enterprising gentlemen from subsidies from this House and the Local Legislature.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The road was undertaken and built to a considerable extent before any Dominion subsidy was given.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That does not make any difference.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I was living in Sackville at the time the road was undertaken. It was one of the few roads in New Brunswick in which a large amount of private capital was invested, and years went by before the Dominion subsidy was obtained for that road. The hon. gentleman is unjust to the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) in what he says.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not wish to be unjust to the member for Westmoreland. The reason given by the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) for carrying out the idea that they were not entitled to a subsidy after they built the road —

An hon. MEMBER. They had to finish the road.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Well, the road was under way, and a person has no right to come to this House and ask for a subsidy when a road is undertaken and contracted for. A subsidy is only to start a road. This road was undertaken and built, and I have no doubt it was managed successfully by those gentlemen and was useful to the locality. It was useful as a mean of communication between Prince Edward Island, Cape Traverse, and Cape Tormentine in the winter season, but the Government were not required to build a pier at a cost of \$185,000 for the benefit of that road; because this work is for the benefit of that road and those connected with it. What is this money all expended for? Under the most favorable circumstances to shorten the passage between the island and the provinces two hours, and as has been mentioned by my hon. friend from St. John persons cannot reach St. John or Halifax any quicker than by the other route. It does seem a most ridiculous waste of public money.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The people of Prince Edward Island were put to a great deal of trouble on account of the shiftings we had between the east and west end of the island, and the consequent delay of the mails. If we can succeed in having the one road for winter and summer it will be a great advantage to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. WELSH. Certainly I agree with the hon. member for King's (Mr. Robertson) in that.

Public Buildings, Nova Scotia..... \$31,000

Mr. EISENHAEUER. It will be remembered by the hon. Minister that provision was made two years ago for a public building at Lunenburg, while provision was made for one at Annapolis only a year ago; and yet I find a further appropriation of \$19,500 for the latter, while no appropriation is made for a building at Lunenburg. I had an interview with the hon. Minister about this matter, and he made a promise that he would recommend an appropriation, but I find that no appropriation has been made. The late member (Mr. Kaulbach) during the election campaign, gave the people to understand that he had the solemn pledges of the Minister of Public Works and of the Government that a further sum would be voted the following year, and the building erected; but if that was the case, they have gone back on their promise. I had some conversation about this matter with the hon. Postmaster General, and he seemed to lay down the principle that there was not sufficient money collected at Lunenburg to warrant the Government in erecting a building there. But I find that the net post office receipts at Annapolis are \$864, and the net post office receipts at Lunenburg, \$846. The receipts from customs at Lunenburg last year were \$14,000, while at Annapolis the receipts were only about \$8,000. I also find an appropriation for Sydney post office, where the net receipts amount to \$895, very little more than the net receipts at Lunenburg. I think it must be evident to every hon. member that that is not the reason why there is no appropriation this year, and I think the Government should give me some reason that I can give to my constituents why they have overlooked this matter. Are we to take it that the reason is that which was given by the hon. Finance Minister last Session in regard to the railway subsidy, when he said that the people did not deserve any subsidy, because they had not sent Mr. Kaulbach back?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that.

Mr. EISENHAEUER. I would like the hon. Minister to give some reason why he left this item out.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman says he came and spoke to me about a public building at Lunenburg. I think he is perfectly right. I recollect that he came to me, and we had a pleasant talk together about the matter, and I told him what he had just stated, that I would submit the matter to my colleagues. I did so, and the result is what we see here. I cannot say more than that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think I can tell more about it; I have been there myself, and I can tell how it is. I can tell the hon. member for Lunenburg that he will be very fortunate if he gets anything; but if he turns around and supports the Administration for a while, he will probably get something.

Mr. LISTER. That is a very disgraceful state of affairs. There is no question that the Government are using the patronage which they have in the way of building post offices and customs houses, merely for the purpose of bribing and debauching the electors of this country. When we are told that the town of Annapolis has public buildings which it will cost almost as much as the total revenue of the place to keep and take care of; when we are told that Cayuga,

in the county of Haldimand, had a vote in the Estimates for public buildings previous to the last election there; when we are told that the town of Strathroy previous to the last election, for the purpose of carrying the constituency for Mr. Roome, had dangling before it the promise of a building, and hints as to where the site would be selected, as to what people should receive the contracts, and so on—I say it is disgraceful on the part of the Government. These public buildings should be given to places entitled to receive them from the extent of the business done. There should be some principle laid down, which would be binding on the Government to give these public buildings to towns of a certain population, or to towns whose post offices or customs house yield a specified revenue. In doing that, you would be doing what is fair to the whole community. But to give a post office to a town, simply because the county has sent a representative to support the Government, as an inducement to the people to swerve from their political allegiance and support the Government, is disgraceful in the extreme; it is debauching the electors, and doing an injury to the people of this country that is inconceivable. In the Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and other Provinces of the Dominion, we find towns with a comparatively small number of inhabitants receiving public buildings, while large towns in the western Provinces have received no consideration at all, simply because the counties in which they are situated are true to their political faith, and send gentlemen here to oppose the Government of the day. Before the election, the Government put in the Estimates a sum for the purchase of a site for a post office in the town of Goderich, and the people were given to understand that if they would support the Government they would receive public aid. They did support the Government, and the post office is going on; but if the late representative had been in the House, nothing of the kind would have been done. If it was not entitled to it in 1882, it was not entitled to it in 1887: and the only conclusion is that the Government are using these votes for the purpose of buying up the constituencies and debauching the people.

Mr. RYKERT. Very easily bought.

Mr. LISTER. You know as well as I do that the votes for these public buildings are dangled before the electors for that purpose. We know that in Haldimand the great issue was whether a bridge would be built or not. The hon. gentleman who now represents that county told the people that if he was elected they would get that bridge. He was elected, and we find a vote in the Estimates for the bridge. I am not saying that it is not wanted; but I say it is unfair and improper on the part of the Government to refuse to give public advantages of that kind if they are in the public interest. The public interest should be the only ground upon which those votes are given. The money is not yours to spend, it is not yours to bribe the country with. It is mine as much as yours, and if the town in which I, or any other hon. gentleman lives is entitled to a public building, it should have that building regardless altogether of the political complexion of the people.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understand the Government purchased the land in the town of Lunenburg for a public building. If they did not intend to put up a public building there, that was an unnecessary expenditure. It is a small piece of business, simply because the people of Lunenburg exercised the right of returning a member to this Parliament to represent their views, that they should be treated in this way and that the Government should take this revenge. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think, and seem to act as if the money and the country belonged to them, and not as if they had merely the disposal of it in the interests of the people. I have nothing to say

Mr. LISTER.

against Annapolis, but, on the contrary, I am glad that it will receive this building. I may mention, however, that Lunenburg is also an important town. The number of vessels that entered the port of Annapolis and departed from it last year were 71 and the tonnage 16,110. The number of vessels leaving the port of Lunenburg was 327 and the tonnage 40,614. I merely mention this to show that Lunenburg is a much more important place than Annapolis; and I say nothing against Annapolis getting its proportion, but while the Government are giving that to Annapolis they should treat Lunenburg with equal justice. The Government should deal with public matters in a public spirit and not in a narrow spirit that now characterises their dealings.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). A stranger would infer from what has been said that Annapolis is a very insignificant place compared with Lunenburg. But we have vessels leaving Annapolis for all parts of the world: steamers running to London loaded with freight, vessels going to the West Indies and all parts of the world, so that Annapolis is not such a very insignificant portion of Nova Scotia.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No one ever said anything against Annapolis, but I was only arguing that if Annapolis—

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). You say it by inference, and I do not wish that that inference should go on public record uncontradicted.

Mr. LAURIER. No one complains of the grant made to Annapolis, but my hon. friend asks why a similar favor is not extended to Lunenburg, which is on a par with Annapolis. One is granted a public building and the other is refused, although in the latter the land was bought for that purpose. My hon. friend asked the Minister of Public Works what the reason was, and the hon. the Minister gave an answer which was simply trifling with the House, and the conclusion we must come to is that there is no rule for the granting of money for public buildings except the desire to secure political support. There ought to be some uniform rule adopted which would apply to all places, whether they return Conservative or Liberal. The hon. gentleman who represents Shelburne (Gen. Lauric) stated, in reply to some strictures, that if a supporter of the Ministry were returned the demands of the people would be reasonably treated. We must infer from that that, if not, their demands would not be reasonably treated. We should have some public rule which would apply in all cases, and this matter should not be left to the caprice of the Government and be made an instrument to reward a political supporter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would ask the Minister of Public Works whether or not this amount was actually paid? I remember the appropriation to which the hon. gentleman referred, but was the land bought for the post office at Lunenburg?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not remember at this moment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am under the impression that the lot was bought.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. Minister stated across the House that the lot was bought, and he gave the name of the person from whom it was bought.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will see, where he undertakes to buy a piece of land for a public work, the members of this House have a right to enquire why the work is not gone on with, and he will see that the Ministry will lie under a very grave imputation, if they have bought a piece of land for that purpose, and then have taken no further steps in regard to the building. One of two conclusions must be adopted, either that they made the purchase without any ground for making it, and in that

case it was a gross waste of the public money, or that, when they bought it, they intended to put a public building upon it. What is the reason why they have not? The hon. Minister did not give any reason at all for that.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I complied with the promise I made to the hon. gentleman to submit this matter to my colleagues. I did so, and the result is what we see, that there is no vote for Lunenburg. I may add that, this year as in other years, all the demands or petitions which have been made to me for public works have been laid before my colleagues, together with the amounts that would be required to carry them out; but that is no reason why, because I lay these matters before them, they should be supposed to assent to these demands or requests. When the estimates which I laid before my colleagues came out of the Privy Council, I must say that this list was much shorter than it was when it went in; and that did not apply to one county or another; to counties represented by Liberals more than those represented by Conservatives. I think if the leader of the Opposition had looked at the Supplementary Estimates he might have seen there a city not represented by a Conservative, but by a Liberal, the city of St. Hyacinthe, and he would have seen that we have placed a sum of money in the Estimates to buy a site there and to go on with the work, and then there is also the county of Laprairie represented by a Liberal, and there is another sum of money for a public building there. The Privy Council thought that these two places were entitled to their attention, and so they put in those votes. I think that the imputation made by the hon. gentleman against the Government on that head is not well founded. In this case, as in many other cases, the Council have not been able to recommend this year the vote of large sums of money such as I and they would have wished to vote, if the finances of the country would have allowed it, but we could not do it. We have curtailed the expenditure very largely, and I was very sorry that we had to do it. I knew that a large number of these matters which we were asked to vote money for were very useful, but we had to postpone them.

Mr. LAURIER. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on the fact, as he states, that two counties which are represented by Liberals are receiving some share of the favors of the Government. I only regret that I cannot congratulate the hon. gentleman further, in regard to Lunenburg.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a beginning.

Mr. LAURIER. You have already, for two years or more, had this land in your possession. You do not intend to seed it or plant it, I suppose. I understand from the hon. gentleman that he submitted this matter to his colleagues. I can only regret that his colleagues did not share in the same sense of justice.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman said he could not state from whom the land was bought. I may tell him that, as I am told, it was bought from Mrs. Creighton, the aunt of Mr. Kaulbach, the late member, at double the value.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is very unfair. The hon. gentleman knows that this question comes up without any notice. He should have told me that he would bring the matter before the House, and then I would have had the data before me, but it is an impossibility for me to answer every complaint of that kind without knowing anything about it and no papers to guide me.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says that the list which he submitted to the Privy Council was very much curtailed. It seems to me a rather singular coincidence that all the votes which are given to the Province of Nova Scotia are given to the constituencies represented by Conservatives, except a small amount for the city of Halifax which is necessary in regard to the public buildings,

and that I am sure is not put there on my account. Under the head of harbors and rivers in Nova Scotia, we find that all the sums of money which are voted there, with the exception of \$1,000 for Yarmouth, which is voted for the removal of wrecks and matters of that kind, are given to the counties which are represented by friends of the Administration, and not a cent is given to counties represented by Liberal members. Take the county of Guysborough, which has long been true to its Liberal principles, and I hope will long continue to be true to them, and there has not been a cent of public money spent there for I do not know how many years.

Mr. KIRK. For fifteen years, I suppose—six years any way.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No public money has been spent there for a long time, and that notwithstanding the fact that a county like that requires harbors and piers as much as any other county. It will hardly do for the Minister of Public Works to say that there is no attempt at fairness of discussion in this matter, because the public accounts show that we have no expenditure made in our Liberal counties, although we pay to the revenue as much as other counties do.

Mr. KIRK. I would like to know on what principle the Government appropriate moneys for public buildings. I cannot see where they have any principle at all. In the Province of Nova Scotia I find some counties represented by supporters of the Government that have public buildings in two or three separate towns, while there are other counties and other towns which have as large business, as large a population as they have that have no public buildings at all, and in which there has not been a dollar of public money expended for the last six years. I want to know if that is fair. It is true, as the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has said, that the Government expend the money entirely in the interest of their party and not in the interests of the people. That is true, and it is also true that in the whole of the Estimates which have been submitted to Parliament this year, there is not a dollar appropriated for counties in Nova Scotia represented by Liberal members in this House. Why is that? Why should it be that these counties should be deprived of their rights, because they think it proper to exercise them as free men in electing whom they please to represent them in this Parliament? If there is not something wrong in such a state of affairs, I do not know what wrong is. The county of Guysboro' that I have the honor to represent in this House has applied for several public works. They have applied for aid for the construction of a public building in the town of Guysboro' and they have been pressing that application, but not a dollar has ever been voted for that purpose. Guysboro' is just as much entitled to a public building as the town of Annapolis, or the town of North Sydney, or the town of South Sydney, or any other towns that have public buildings. Why should it be overlooked? Then, again, the county of Guysboro' has petitioned year after year for a small amount for one particular breakwater in New Harbor; they have been pressing that year after year, the people have subscribed money to assist in building the breakwater, but not a dollar will the Government give. I want to know why it is, or upon what principle the Government have appropriated the money belonging to the whole people? Is it because of the political necessities of the Government, or of the wants of the public? I believe it is in the political interest of the Government, and not in the public interest at all.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). South Sydney post office, custom house, &c., \$10,000, will that finish?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The chief architect tells me that the probable cost of the building will be about \$20,000.

Public buildings, New Brunswick,..... \$17,900

Mr. ELLIS. Dalhousie post office, \$12,000, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what the Dalhousie post office is to cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The site and the construction of the building will be \$19,000.

Mr. ELLIS. Dalhousie is highly favored. It gets \$17,000 for a branch railway that was completed some time ago. Now, there are 900 people in the town of Dalhousie who are served by the post office, and the whole parish takes in probably 2,200 or 2,300 people. It seems to me to be a very expensive post office for Dalhousie.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2.10 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 16th May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPRESENTATION OF MONTMAGNY.

Mr. LAURIER. I will call the attention of the House to the petition presented some time ago by the hon. member for Provencher with reference to the hon. member for Montmagny.

Mr. ROYAL. Dropped.

DIVORCE CASES.

Mr. SMALL moved that the second part of rule 65 be suspended in regard to the following Bills from the Senate: No. 128, for the relief of Eleonora Tudor; No. 129, for the relief of Andrew M. Irving; and No. 130, for the relief of Catherine Morrison, and that the said Bills be placed on the Orders of this day for consideration in Committee of the whole House at the usual hour for the consideration of Private Bills.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt the motion will be carried on division, but I suggest that the Bills should be put on the Order to-morrow, so that the members of the House may know what is coming up. The Clerk of the House tells us that the Order of the Day to-morrow does not include Private Bills after 8 o'clock, but I suppose we might have the Order of the Day changed for to-morrow. In any case, there is Friday, and there is plenty of time. I think my hon. friend had better change his motion to to-morrow.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It will have to be made a special Order for to-morrow.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is still Friday and Saturday, and at the end of the Session the hon. gentleman knows that the Rules are not much in the way.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Unless this is made a special Order for to-morrow, it will not appear on the paper to-morrow, but will go over until Friday.

Mr. EDGAR. And then any member objecting could prevent its going through.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. I move that this be made a special Order for to-morrow at 8 o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

THE LABOR COMMISSION.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, How many persons have been appointed as members of the Labor Commission, and how many persons are at present members of the Commission? What salary or remuneration is allowed to each Commissioner, and what amount for travelling expenses and contingencies?

Mr. BOWELL. Fifteen persons were appointed as members of the Labor Commission; one of them, Mr. Côté, is a member without salary. The Commission finished the taking of evidence on the 12th instant. The salary or remuneration allowed to each member was \$10 a day, besides actual travelling expenses, and \$3.50 *per diem* to cover hotel and living expenses.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 116) to amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

The CHAIRMAN. This section is proposed to be re-cast as follows:—

Sub-section 2 of section 47 is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:

Temporary clerks employed continuously since the first day of July, 1882, may be appointed permanently, if otherwise qualified, at a salary equal to their average pay during the two years previous to such permanent appointment, but in no case exceeding the actual salary of a third class clerk.

Mr. DAVIES. That is the same clause we were at yesterday. It appears to me that it is not acting fairly with the large number of young men who have prepared themselves for examination and have successfully passed examinations, and are now entitled to receive appointments in the Civil Service. There are, I believe, some five or six hundred of these young men scattered throughout Canada, but you come in and with a stroke of the pen you enact that a large amount of temporary clerks who have not passed, and presumably cannot pass, that examination, shall be eligible for appointment for permanent positions as third class clerks, and so exclude five or six hundred young men who have gone to the trouble and expense of preparing themselves for these vacancies. Sir, when you passed these young men, if you were not making fools of them, they had a right to assume that as positions became vacant in the Civil Service, and were being filled up, they would be filled up from their ranks. Instead of that, you take some favorites who have been employed temporarily since 1882, who have never passed any entrance examination at all, and you give them the preference over those men who have prepared themselves. I say it is a most unfair clause, calculated to work very unfairly towards young men who have prepared themselves, and I shall oppose it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before dealing with this question, I wish to make one observation. We sat very late last night, and at a very late hour a prominent supporter of the Administration came to me and said: "Mr. Mitchell, we have about 350 votes to pass, and at this rate we shall not get through by Saturday night." Now, if the Government desire to get through the business that is to be done by Saturday night, I wish to say that the proper course for them to adopt is to drop out a lot of useless Bills, such as this one under consideration now, and let us come down to the practical business of voting the supplies, because I presume that is what they want to do. I think the suggestion is one that will meet with the approval of some members of the Ministry, at all events, who have some common sense about them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. There are some of them who have common sense, and I am glad to be able to say it. I think it would be in the interest of this House for the Government to adopt my suggestion, if they wish to get through the business by Saturday night, and I may say it is the only way they will get through. Going on with Bills like this, upon which we spent nearly the whole of yesterday afternoon, and it is likely to occupy a considerable time this afternoon, is not the way to get through within a reasonable time. I think if the Government will strike out a lot of these useless measures which are not called for, and not occupy the time of the House with them at this advanced season of the Session, Bills that ought to be left over for more mature deliberation when we shall have time to deal with them, I think it will be in the interest of the House, and will promote the interest of the Government. I make this suggestion in order to facilitate business, and enable the Session to draw to a close. I can tell the hon. gentlemen that, if they do not do something of that kind, there is not the slightest chance of getting through by the time the hon. gentlemen said they wished to finish.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This Bill is one the consideration of which we have nearly finished, only two clauses remain to be passed; so I do not think the remarks of my hon. friend will apply to this Bill. We have made a great deal of progress with it, let us finish it, and after that the hon. gentleman will know, by the proceedings of the Government, what Bills they intend to push and what other Bills they may drop. But I think it is too much to ask the House to drop this Bill now, when we have considered it to that extent. I think the Bill will be a good one, as it is being amended, and I have no doubt that my hon. friend will help us to carry it through, and then we will see what other measures we shall go on with.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman be prepared, before the House separates at six o'clock, to intimate which of the numerous Bills the Government have on their paper they are prepared to strike off, and let us see whether we can get through the business by Saturday night or not? If they do that, I think there will be some disposition on the part of the party I represent, at all events—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I can tell them that the party I represent is not an unimportant one in determining when the Session shall come to a close. If they wish to meet the wishes of the House, let us know what it is they propose to do, so that we will then be able to judge whether we will allow any and how many of the iniquities which they propose to the House, to go through or not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sure there is no one in this House that would be disposed to minimise the importance or the influence of the third party. At all events, my hon. friend knows that I am not the one to underrate the importance of what he says in the remarks he has just made to the House. I am not in a position now to give him an answer, but when the First Minister is here, I will consult with him, and will state myself what will be the course.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would make just one observation. I understood that the hon. gentleman meant to take up Supply upon the House assembling this afternoon. That was the understanding between the Minister of Finance and myself. Now, I do not want to delay the business of the House over a matter of this kind, but I must point out to the Minister of Public Works that it is not convenient to come to these understandings and then go into other measures.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not understand it so. Of course, I may be mistaken. Before coming from the Council to the House, we came to the conclusion that we should go on with certain Bills, and then we would take up Supply. That was the understanding. But perhaps the hon. gentleman misunderstood what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance said about it; or perhaps my hon. friend did not express himself with sufficient clearness to convey the idea which he had in his mind. But I am sure the hon. gentleman does not suppose for a moment—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Understand I am not imputing any bad faith at all. I merely call attention to what the hon. gentleman knows, that it is very desirable that we should know exactly what is to be taken up.

Mr. SHANLY. I wish to make a few remarks with regard to one particular word that was used by the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies). He alluded to these young men who have passed the examination as being entitled to Government appointments. Now, I wish it to be put on record that I take entire exception to that word "entitled." These young men who have passed the examination come up of their own free will and accord. I suppose there is not a member of the House who has not applications from people in his constituency enquiring about the Civil Service Act. I myself have had communications from perhaps two dozen of my constituents, but I have invariably told them that passing this examination does not entitle a man to an appointment, it simply qualifies him, and there is a great difference between a man qualifying himself to fill a situation that may turn up, and a man being entitled to a position. I wish particularly to have this point, which I have often inculcated among my own people, placed on record, in order that people should not be led to suppose that because they pass the Civil Service examination they are entitled to the consideration of the Government and a position in the service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has obtained a wrong impression of my views. I did not say that all who passed the Civil Service examination were entitled to appointments, very far from it, and if I said so I did not intend to convey that opinion. What I intended to impress on the committee was this: that the 500 or 600 men who have passed the Civil Service examination have a right to assume that appointments will be made from their ranks. A misapprehension as to the meaning of the clause now before the House appears to prevail. That misapprehension arose from the debate which took place on an amendment moved by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill)—the amendment relating to a class of appointments made in the Civil Service before 1882. The present amendment of the Secretary of State has nothing to do with that amendment, but it relates to appointments made in the Civil Service of a temporary character since 1882.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The words might be inserted, "appointed before but employed since 1882."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The clause says "employed continuously since 1st July, 1882."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Then they must have been appointed before.

Mr. BOWELL. My hon. friend's object is to allow those who were in the employ of the Government in the departments previous to 1st July, 1882, who have been continuously employed since but have never been appointed—by appointed we mean appointed by Order in Council—to be appointed now upon the certificate of their qualifications from their superior officer. Now, my hon. friend proposes to go further. Where he gives that power to appoint, he also provides that they shall be entitled to promotion without examination. I do not know that I differ

to any extent from the position of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). If that concession is to be made to those who were in the service temporarily and afterwards appointed, then it seems to me the same privilege should be extended to those appointed afterwards. If you do not do this you at once give the privilege and the right of promotion to a man who never passed an examination, and you debar the man who has passed an examination, because he entered the service only one day afterwards, that is on 2nd July, from the same privilege.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that those clerks who were appointed temporarily before 1882, and employed continuously since now, become third class clerks and are entitled without examination to an advance of \$50 a year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Most decidedly; they are permanent clerks.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And how many are there?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not suppose there are 20, because those who have been employed continuously since 1882 have gradually come into the permanent service. There are a few old servants, some of whom have been ten, twelve or fourteen years in the service, and it has been very hard to pass them to \$400 under the present Civil Service Act; some were receiving \$2.50 a day, as they had done during ten years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take it that a good deal of the trouble has arisen from the rather vicious practice pursued for a long time, very probably even under the *regime* of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) to some extent, that when you want to give a man an appointment a little better than a third class clerk you very often place him at \$2 a day, which means about \$730 a year, and he is kept as a temporary clerk, instead of being made a third class clerk in the ordinary fashion and given \$400 or \$500 a year. I have some doubts as to whether so small a number as 20, unless the hon. gentleman has enquired into the matter, are affected by this change; I suspect the number will be found to be considerably larger. Owing to the practice to which I have alluded a great many of those gentlemen remained in the position of temporary clerks, but in any case it appears to me that this shows in a very strong light the utter inadequacy of the Civil Service examination of the character we now hold. If we are going to do any good by this system we must make the competitive examinations and give the men certain rights. To allow 600 or 1,000 men throughout the country to qualify, and then cause them at the same time to understand that they can only get appointments by political influence, renders the Civil Service examination an utter farce.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I cannot conceive how we can agree that a third class or temporary clerk not capable of passing the examination, should be entitled to \$50 a year increase.

Mr. BOWELL. That only applies to the inside service.

On paragraph 2,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know whether this paragraph does not permit the Secretary of State to grant a larger salary than \$400. If a man passes in optional subjects I suppose he could be given \$600?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. What length of time constitutes a temporary appointment? How long can a man be in the service and be considered only a temporary clerk?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. So long as he is not permanent.

Mr. MULOCK. Then a temporary clerk may be a permanent clerk in fact?

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Some of them are.

Mr. MULOCK. There is no limitation to an appointment that may be called a temporary one. Appointees may be continued in the service as long as the Government may wish to keep them?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We have to re-appoint them every six months by Order in Council.

Mr. McNEILL moved in amendment;

The provisions of "The Civil Service Act" so far as they render promotion in the Civil Service contingent in any degree upon examination as provided in the said Act, shall not apply to any civil servant who entered the Civil Service before the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two; and any civil servant who entered the service prior to that date shall be eligible for promotion in every respect as though such provisions as to examination had never been enacted.

Mr. COUGHLIN (for Mr. CURRAN) moved in amendment to the amendment:—

That all the words after "1882" be struck out and the following substituted in the place thereof: "Except in so far as regard the duty of the office to which such civil servants may desire to be promoted."

Mr. McNEILL. I may say that I am willing to accept the amendment to the amendment.

Amendment to amendment agreed to.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) moved:

That no person shall be temporarily appointed, or continued in the Civil Service of Canada for a longer period than two years unless he has been permanently appointed.

He said: I have heard the Minister say that a number of young men have been appointed temporarily, and that they remained there from one to ten years, then the Government of the day is pressed to put them on the permanent staff. My object is to prevent the nomination of those supernumerary clerks in the departments and to confine the appointment to the regular service, so that when more assistance is required at least within two years, those people, if they are there and competent, and having passed the examination, can be appointed permanently.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am very sorry my hon. friend was not here yesterday and he would have known that it was not the intention of the Government to do what he is saying now. It is not the intention to appoint all the temporary clerks permanent, but when the needs and the wants of the service requires that such an officer should be made permanent, then he will be made permanent without having recourse to the difficulties we should otherwise meet. We will make permanent those of the temporary clerks that we require.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My hon. friend does not quite apprehend my argument. He says that it is not contemplated to appoint those supernumerary clerks.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Not at present.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). According to my view they should be appointed and placed on the permanent staff or their services dispensed with. Some of them he says have been there for eight or ten years. Surely if they have been there that time they are entitled to some acknowledgment for their services.

Mr. MULOCK. Why make temporary appointments? Is it because there are not enough candidates to select from who pass the examination? If there are to-day some 2,000 candidates who pass the preliminary examination it appears to me the temporary clerks ought to be selected from those.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We must select them from the list of the candidates who have passed the examination. The law says so.

Mr. BOWELL. If you make them all permanent, it would add three or four thousand dollars to the superannuation list every six months.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the hon. gentleman wants to put his amendment in the Bill, let him put his name on it, because it is the existing law.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend misapprehends the purport of this amendment. At present there are men in the service who have been employed as temporary clerks for years, since before 1882. Those men are reappointed by Order in Council every six months. My hon. friend's amendment is that after a man has been employed as a temporary clerk for two years, it will not be at the option of the Government to keep him as a temporary clerk, but either his services must be dispensed with, or he must be put on the permanent list. The idea is a good one, that you should not keep a man five or six years as a temporary clerk.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. Secretary of State says that if the hon. member for Halifax will put up his name to the amendment, he will let it go into the Bill, but he does not want to let it go into a Bill for which he is responsible. What trash that is for a Minister of State to talk! Why, Sir, it is the veriest rot that ever was spoken. The hon. gentleman should understand his position better than that. If he is passing a Bill through this House, he knows that he is bound to accept any amendment which is according to the sentiment of the House, and it is useless for him to talk about the hon. gentleman putting his name to an amendment to a Bill for which he (the Secretary of State) is responsible. It is the discussion of questions like this that takes up the time of the House, and prevents getting an adjournment.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have only to thank the hon. gentleman for the politeness of his language.

Mr. MITCHELL. All I can say is that my language is quite as good as the hon. gentleman's, and I think my common sense is a mighty sight better.

Mr. BOWELL. Let us see what the practical operation of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Halifax would be. If it is adopted, I take it that every person who is in the employ of the Government for two years—it does not say continuously—will have to be put on the roll permanently or his services will have to be dispensed with. What would he do in the case of men who are appointed year after year at seaport towns? I have in my mind at present a man who died a few months ago, who was continuously in the employ of the Government during the summer season in Quebec for 50 years. Would this amendment compel the Customs Department to put him and scores of others similarly situated on the permanent list, or dismiss them? In Montreal, for instance, twenty or thirty men are put on every summer, sometimes more, sometimes less, in proportion to the amount of shipping and commerce. Many of these scarcely do anything in the winter, but in the spring they are re-appointed.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman will see that during the winter their services are dispensed with. My object is to prevent the departments here being crowded with supernumeraries who are not required, with the object of putting them on the permanent staff as soon as possible. Surely the hon. Minister will admit that if a person has been employed for two years, he should be made a permanent employé, or be dismissed.

Mr. BOWELL. There are in Halifax men who receive \$1.25 or \$1.50 a day in the summer, and who in the winter are kept on at 50 cents a day, although there is not much for them to do. They have been so employed for years, and they would come within this amendment.

Mr. JONES. I will change my amendment to make it apply to the inside service.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This amendment would work injuriously in more ways than one. For example: in the engineering branch of my department, a number of engineers are temporarily employed, and they are kept there from year to year. The reason we do not put them on the permanent list is, that occasionally, for two or three or four years, we may not have work for them, and they find employment elsewhere, so that the country is not charged with the expense of these men when there is nothing for them to do. We have a number of architects employed in the same way in the chief architect's branch; and if we had to dispense with their services at the end of two years, we should have to obtain others who would not be so familiar with the work. For example, Mr. Ewart, who is the first architect under Mr. Fuller, the chief architect, has been twenty years in the service, although he is not on the permanent list.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). He should be.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think so; but his case is an exception. He deserves great consideration from the department, for I must say he is a very good officer. If he were put on the permanent list, we should have to put a number of other officers on at a time when we have not much work for them. Therefore, if an amendment is to be made, I think it should be limited to persons in the service who are not employed for technical work, so that it will accord with the remainder of the measure.

Mr. MULOCK. I agree largely with what has been said by the hon. Minister of Customs and the hon. Minister of Public Works. I think the Government should have some power of expansion and contraction with its employés. There are certain services which at times are more pressing than at other times and there should be some latitude allowed to the Ministers. It may be that a man is kept on for fifty years, yet his appointment is a temporary one. In a sense it is a permanent one; it is permanent as long as the work is there for him to do. He is appointed, for instance, during the period of navigation, and stops work during the winter, and the next year he is taken on if there is work. His appointment is as permanent as the work itself, but I think it will be a mistake to say he should be made absolutely permanent by Order in Council, and thus made a charge upon the resources of the country, even should his services no longer be required. The test of his permanency is, are his services necessary?

Mr. SPROULE. There is another very important objection to this amendment. A temporary clerk may be employed for any length of time without an increase of salary, and the work he is expected to do is only ordinary work. Should this amendment be carried and these men be put on the permanent list, they will be entitled to the statutory increase of \$50 per year, and when they reach the maximum of their class, they will want promotion. It means creating large additional expense.

Mr. DAVIES. (P.E.I.) It means that, or their dismissal.

Mr. WELSH. I think some discretion should be left to the Government, and I would be sorry to see the amendment pass.

Mr. BOWELL. I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to a case which has suggested itself to me since I took my seat. After every census is taken, it is necessary in the Agriculture Department to appoint a large number of hands, and it generally takes two or three years before the statistics are completed. According as that work ceases, the commissioner discharges these extra hands.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not wish to delay the committee, and as there are objections to the amendment I will withdraw it, but the principle is the right one.

On section 12,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This clause is to prevent the Government from paying any additional salary or remuneration or compensation for any work done by any officers in the service except on bringing the claim to Parliament and having it voted as a bill of indemnity in the service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The existing law seems to arrange for that, because it provides that no additional salary or remuneration of any kind shall be paid to any civil servant unless the same has been voted in the Estimates.

Mr. THOMPSON. The insertion of these words "in the Estimates" invites everybody to apply.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The first part of the fourth clause in the present law provides that when an officer fulfils the duties of another officer of higher rank during three months, he is entitled to the difference in salary. This is struck out.

On section 15,

Mr. BOWELL. There is no provision in the schedule for the grading of packers in the Customs Department. In some places, such as Toronto and Montreal, where there are a dozen packers, one should be appointed to oversee the whole, with a maximum salary of \$600, while the others have \$500. At present we cannot appoint a chief packer to look after the others.

On the preamble,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. the Secretary of State argued yesterday that the adoption of the principle contained in the amendment of the hon. member for Bruce would be a fatal blow at the principle underlying the Civil Service Act. I thought his arguments were conclusive, and was prepared to vote against the amendment. Under the law, as it stands, it is provided that when a vacancy occurs in a higher class, the head of the department shall select from the list of successful candidates for promotion the person considered best fitted for the office, and in making his selection he should have reference to any special duties to be performed and special fitness, &c. That is a good principle, and I believe it should work well. The hon. the Secretary of State yesterday said it would never do to repeal it. Now you have repealed that, so far as concerns the officers appointed before 1882. They are no longer to be required to pass any examination at all, except the purely formal ones relating to the department in which they are. What is the sense of keeping the clause at all? The hon. gentleman has changed his mind, and he should explain why the principle, which he thought yesterday was subversive of the Act, should be accepted to-day.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 92) to amend chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes respecting the Customs be concurred in. He said: The first amendment made by the Senate is to substitute 15 for 10 in the clause providing for the increase of duty in case of an undervaluation. Under the old law, if an article were undervalued 20 per cent., it carried with it a penalty of 50 per cent. of the whole duty. The amount which I proposed was that, if an article was undervalued 10 per cent., it should carry a penalty of 10 per cent. of the duty, and so on proportionately to the undervaluation. The Senate have come to the conclusion that 10 per cent. was too low a rate, and they have inserted the word 15. The result is to the importer that an undervaluation of 15 per cent. carries a penalty of 15 per cent., and an undervaluation of

Mr. BOWELL.

20 per cent. carries a penalty of 20 per cent., and so on, so that an undervaluation would have to reach 50 per cent. in order to carry the same penalty which was provided under the old law.

Mr. MULLOCK. What penalty is provided if the undervaluation is less than 15 per cent.?

Mr. BOWELL. None.

Mr. MULLOCK. That is given as a margin?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. If there was an undervaluation of 14½ per cent. there would be no penalty in addition to the duty.

Mr. MULLOCK. The Senate has given 50 per cent. more latitude for undervaluation than that the Minister proposed.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; that was a suggestion which was given by the Board of Trade in Montreal.

Mr. MITCHELL. Was that the result of the conference between the Board of Trade of Montreal and the gentleman who was sent down there from the department to see them?

Mr. BOWELL. I had consented to that arrangement before Mr. Parmelee went to Montreal at all. He was there on other business, and I gave instructions that he should see the committee of the Board of Trade and find out from them what objections they had, so as to see how far we could meet their views.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then I understand that the Board of Trade is the legislative body in this country, and not this Parliament? That is what it comes to.

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot agree in that view. I think it is necessary for the Government to obtain all the information they can from the people who are interested in the working of any law of this kind, and that is the principle upon which I have acted during the ten years that I have had charge of the Customs Department. In order to show the hon. gentleman that the Montreal Board of Trade is not the legislative body, I may tell him that they made a number of suggestions which I did not deem it advisable, either in the interest of the importer or in the interest of the revenue to accept; and when it was explained to them what the effect of some of their proposed amendments would be, they admitted that they were wrong and the Customs Department was right.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to ask the Minister if the visit of Mr. Parmelee to Montreal was before or after this Bill passed this House.

Mr. BOWELL. It was after.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it would have been better to have obtained the views of the Board of Trade before the Bill was passed. I had a rather warm controversy the other evening in consequence of something which was said by the Minister of Finance to me when I was not addressing him in any way, and certain comments were made upon that in the newspapers which were entirely untrue. I simply desired, as I said, to have the further consideration of the Customs Bill postponed, in order that the commercial interests of Montreal, Toronto, Quebec and other great centres might have an opportunity to discuss the provisions before the Bill passed; but I was told in the most peremptory way that the Bill must go on. I thought it was not asking very much, as I told the Minister of Public Works who was then leading the House, after the way in which we had facilitated on this side the promotion of public business, to ask the Government to allow the Bill to stand for further consideration from Friday until Tuesday, but I was peremptorily told that the Government would not consent to that, and the Minister of Finance interjected a most impertinent remark on that occasion, although I was not speaking to him at all. He said, as far as I remember,

"Your impertinent threat, Sir, precludes the Government from meeting your wishes." I was not talking to the Minister of Finance, but to his leader, the Minister of Public Works, who, I must say, has always treated me very courteously, and I thought the remark which was made by the Finance Minister on that occasion was very impertinent and entirely uncalled for.

Mr. BOWELL. I was in communication with the Board of Trade before the Bill was passed through this House. All these matters were under consideration before the assistant commissioner visited Montreal, not in connection with this matter, but in connection with a large seizure there, which I desired to have investigated before it was finally decided; but I considered that, being in Montreal at the time, he might see these gentlemen and explain to them that some of the propositions they had made would result more adversely to them than in their favor. If it had not been for that seizure, Mr. Parmelee would not have gone to Montreal at all. The next line applies to section 29, in which the following words are added "manufactured articles, composed wholly or in part of polished steel, &c." The present law provides that persons importing hardware cannot claim anything for damage arising from rust or salt water except on Russian polished iron and Canada plate. We propose to add to that exception all polished cutlery, or polished steel, which will enable the importer, in cases where damage has occurred—it does not occur very often to this kind of article—to put in a claim for damage and have a rebate upon the duty. The third amendment relates to the clause which provides for the examination of goods. Under the old clause some of the packages were sent to the merchant's warehouse, and certain packages were retained in the appraiser's department. Under the old law the customs officer had the power to go to the merchant's warehouse a month afterwards, if he chose, and claim an examination of the goods which were in the warehouse. The law further provided that the merchants were not to open the packages, under liability to a penalty, until the appraisers had finally disposed of those packages which were left in the warehouse. This clause confines the right of the appraisers to visit the warehouse to three days; after that the merchant can open his goods and dispose of them as he pleases, unless fraud is found to have been practiced. These concessions are in the interest of trade, and they do not in any way affect the revenue. I would therefore move their adoption.

Amendments concurred in.

SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Order for second reading of Bill (No. 112) to amend the Revised Statutes, chapter 77, respecting the Safety of Ships, read.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If the Minister will allow me, I will suggest to him that, as this is a very important Bill—

Mr. FOSTER. I was going to say that I have determined to move for the discharge of this order. The reason is not that I do not think that some legislation is necessary, but that, after having the Bill printed and distributed, a large number of very valuable suggestions came in, both from ship owners and from mariners, and I came to the conclusion, after considering the matter very carefully, that the Bill did not meet the case as regards the ship owners, nor did it sufficiently provide for the protection of life and property. I propose, during the summer, to take up the whole matter and prepare a more comprehensive Bill, which I think will be more satisfactory all round. I therefore move that the order be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

REPRESENTATION OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved second reading of Bill (No. 76) to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 50, respecting the North-West Territories. He said: I explained the object of the Bill when it was introduced. I may say, it is to carry out to completion the legislation which has previously taken place. It will, perhaps, be remembered by the old members of Parliament that a constitution was given to the North-West Territories under the auspices of the present member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) who was then Minister of the Interior.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He was not in the Government then.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought it was his Bill. It was, at all events, a measure introduced while my hon. friend for East York was at the head of the Government. It provided that there should be a Lieutenant Governor, assisted by a nominated council; that the Lieutenant Governor and his council should sit together, and the Lieutenant should have a vote with his council, and have a casting vote. The Bill also provided that when the Lieutenant Governor ascertained that within a reasonable area there was a population of a thousand souls, he might give them an elected member. Under that clause the Lieutenant Governor did, from time to time, lay out constituencies, which constituencies elected members. The Act also provided that when there were twenty-one elected members, the nominated councillors should cease to exist, and that there should be a Legislative Assembly, consisting of twenty-one elected members; that the Lieutenant Governor should no longer sit with them and act with them as one of the body, but should assume more the position of a Lieutenant Governor of a Province, and that they should have the full power of legislating while he had the power of rejecting, or reserving, or assenting to their measures. The constitution has been in existence for some time, and on the whole has been satisfactory, but the time has come when the nominated members must cease. The population has increased in such a degree that they have fully a right to 21 members. This measure provides for 22 constituencies. I may say I have consulted the members of this House who represent the North-West, and after going into the matter with them the schedule attached to the Bill now under consideration sets out the 22 constituencies. The original Act provided that the term should be two years for the elective members. After full consideration, and after consultation with those hon. gentlemen, it has been thought well to extend the term one year more and make the term for three years, as two years is a very short period. We all remember that when first elected it appeared strange for the first session to enter into the business of general legislation.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, but that North-West country changes very fast.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question was whether we should leave it to be two years or to extend it to the term in most of the other Provinces, four years, and we thought on the whole it would be well to adopt a compromise and to extend the term to three years, the first session being a session when the members would begin to learn the business, and the second and third sessions when they would be useful members of the Legislature. In consequence of the rapid or expected rapid increase—

Mr. LAURIER. Oh, oh.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says "oh, oh." I repeat that in consequence of the expected rapid increase in the North West, perhaps three years would be better than four, so that the rapid population coming in for the next three years might have an

opportunity of voting. No doubt hon. gentlemen opposite have examined the clauses of the Bill, and I do not desire to go over them very closely, as this can be done more conveniently in committee. I may say, however, that it has been thought well to place a clause in the Bill similar to the clause in the British North America Act, which provides that no measure for the expenditure of public money can be taken up by the Legislature without a message from the Executive. Under that provision we would really have a one-man power—that of the Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. MITCHELL. Just as we have got here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The one-man power has been exercised so beneficently that it has received the undivided support of the third party. The North-West Act provided that when there were 21 elective members the Governor should cease to be a portion of the Council and become Lieutenant Governor proper and withdraw from the Council, but there is no provision in the Act by which there is any executive or responsible government, or by which the system that obtains in the Provinces should be carried out. The true theory, as I think, of the territorial system, so long as it continues, both here and in the United States, is that Government proceeds from here. That is the principle on which that original Act was based, and until the territory evolves from its present condition into that of a full grown Province we should, owing to its sparse population and the fact that considerable assistance must be given from the central power, the Parliament of this Dominion, and there must be *ex necessitate* very considerable aid given to that country, responsible government in its accepted sphere would be premature. But this Bill provides that the Lieutenant Governor, as I have already stated, must give his assent to money grants, and there is a clause which has been omitted from the printed Bill, but which I will ask the House in committee to add, which provides that the Lieutenant Governor shall select from among the elected members three persons to be an advisory committee on matters of finance. When they have settled upon the appropriation of the fund to the territory the statement will go down by message from the Lieutenant Governor; but it cannot go down unless it is carried by the assistance of the advisory committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Can the three members of the advisory committee override the Governor?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. The Lieutenant Governor will have a vote and also a casting vote in case of a tie. The object of the Government has been to alter the original Act as little as possible; and as this will be the first election by the people of representatives to a representative assembly, holding all the characteristics of a legislative body as in other Provinces, we desire that it should be left to them, either at their first or subsequent Session, as they think proper, to suggest such amendments or improvements in the system as their experience may dictate. We adhere to the present lines as much as possible. I will give one instance. We have not provided for vote by ballot. There is a considerable difference of opinion I find on that point at present. The present Council have asked for vote by ballot. We have no objection to have vote by ballot there, but I should like to have the positive, well-considered decision of the Legislative Assembly on that point. There is no power existing there that can exercise undue influence over voters.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Some hon. gentlemen say "oh, oh!" I think if they will look at Manitoba and the North-West, they will find that so far as the central Government is concerned, no influence can possibly be used.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is not the general impression.
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events there is no Lieutenant Governor similar to the Governors we have in the Provinces, and no Council with a Lieutenant Governor to exercise any authority over the people. However, that is mere badinage. The practical difficulty is that the settlers are scattered over half a continent, in small groups, and by a very rough and ready system the votes have been collected in those places. If there is going to be a charge upon the infant treasury of the North-West to furnish ballot boxes and to send them along the trains, leaving those boxes at different places along the whole continent, why the expense would be enormous, and it would swallow up the whole of their very sparse revenues at this moment. However, that is for their consideration. Hon. gentlemen suggest that the system of voting by ballot would be a good system, and they assume, as a matter of course, that all the expense would fall on the general treasury. There is no reason why it should fall on the general treasury. The Territories must pay the expenses of their own elections like the Provinces. We have, however, as the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) knows, in aid of the local treasury, paid the councillors out of the Dominion funds, and that principle is continued. Under the North-West Act it is provided that the Government may pay to each councillor for his annual attendance a sum not exceeding \$1,000. In the resolution which you will see on the paper, it is provided that elective members shall get \$500 for each Session, and that there is a new provision in this Bill that there shall be legal experts, who shall not exceed three in number, who will sit with the elected members, but who will have no right to vote. The object of that clause, which is a novel one, is to give the Assembly the advantage of having some men to advise them as to the drafting of Bills, as to what the law really is, and if any amendments are submitted as to how the amendments are to be prepared. The language of the Bill is: "legal experts." It is, however, I may say, the intention of the Government to select those legal experts from the present judiciary there. Judge Richardson at Regina, who is the senior judge, and in all but title the chief justice, has from the very beginning of this Council been nominated a member of the Council, and he has been of the greatest assistance to that body. In fact, I believe that the very able and well considered system of legislation that has been adopted there, so far as the legal phrases go at all events, is very much due to him.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He is the Attorney General of the Territories in fact?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; I think he was sent up there by my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Mackenzie). He has proved himself to be a most valuable man, so valuable that from a stipendiary magistrate he has been appointed to the position of senior judge. The members of the Council in all probability will not contain any legal men among them. They may or they may not, but hitherto there has been no legal men elected to the Council, and the chances are that there will not be legal men elected. It was suggested that there might perhaps be a law clerk appointed to assist the new Assembly, but the objection to that is that it would be very difficult to get a man fit to hold that office who would be of any real value to the Legislative Assembly. The fact that a man is a lawyer and perhaps a good lawyer gives no assurance that he is an adept at legal phraseology as a parliamentary draftsman. Judge Richardson is one and I may say Judge McLeod is another, and they both have been members of the Council and have been thoroughly trained in that regard. Those two judges would be quite sufficient, but it has been thought well to appoint a third. I may mention that if this Bill passes it is the intention of the Government to ask the Governor in Council that Judge Rouleau should also be appointed. The appointment of those gentlemen is only to last during the

term of the Legislature for which they are appointed. I do not suppose that can last very long, but I wish to point out further that the appointment of a law clerk will not be satisfactory. You cannot get a man who is thoroughly competent to assume that duty, unless you give him a large salary, and you cannot get a man to leave any of the Provinces and give up his position, unless you give him a very large salary. In fact, I do not know any man that would be suitable, because it requires great training to be a good parliamentary draftsman. Therefore this scheme has been adopted, and I think it will present itself to the favor of the House. I do not know that there are any other clauses that I need specially discuss just now, but when we go into committee on the Bill the various clauses can be discussed.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very sorry that I cannot look upon this measure as being a measure of reform. It has the pretension of being an extension of popular rights, and so far it sounds well, but in reality there is no extension whatever, except in name, of rights which can be at all useful to the people. The only pretension of the Act—in fact it is the basis of the Act—is to provide a Local Legislature for the Territories. So far that is perfectly satisfactory, but no provision whatever is made for an Executive Council which would be responsible to the Legislature. It is within the experience of every Canadian that a Local Legislature, which has not at the same time the power of controlling the Executive, cannot and did not ever work satisfactorily. We have had experience of such legislatures in Upper Canada and also in Lower Canada, and under such a system it is always in the power of a Governor to baulk the will of the people and set it aside. The hon. gentleman has stated that it is intended that the central governing power should emanate from the Government; and this system is to carry out that intention. The Dominion Government will be the colonial office of those Territories; in fact, the Dominion Government will govern the Territories by the agency of the Lieutenant-Governor, who is an officer appointed by them and responsible only to them. When this Bill was introduced, my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who is admitted on every side of the House to be an authority on such matters, took exception to what he characterised as a fatal omission in the provisions of the Bill. The hon. Prime Minister answered that there was no demand for an Executive Council or for responsible government in the Territories. I will refresh his memory with the words he used on that occasion:

“In the first place, I must tell the hon. gentleman that in the North-West they have a most holy horror of responsible government. The representations are, I may say, without any exception, against the premature introduction of responsible government. If the hon. gentleman were in the position of the Minister of the Interior, he would find that the one cry is: Do not at all at present give us a Government of that kind.”

Now, as far as I can construe the opinion of the people of the North-West, that is altogether the reverse of what the hon. gentleman said it was. Instead of having a holy horror of responsible government, it is the very thing they are asking for. We have not ample means of communication with those Territories, and their press is not such as to give us much idea of the opinion prevailing there; but here is a memorial of the North-West Council, laid on the Table of the House by the hon. gentleman himself, in which they ask, as one of the features of their constitution:

“That the Lieutenant Governor carry on his executive functions by and with the advice of an Executive Council of three, who shall be from time to time chosen and summoned by the Lieutenant Governor and sworn in as Privy Councillors, and who shall hold seats in the North-West Council.”

They are asking the very thing which the hon. gentleman said was regarded with holy horror by the people of the Territories; and these people, coming as most of them do from the older Provinces of Canada, and knowing something of their former history, cannot but entertain the idea

here set forth, because the hon. Prime Minister must remember that the system of government which he now provides for the Territories never gave any satisfaction in his Province or in the lower Provinces, and, of course, the same causes must produce the same effects. So far, I think the measure is deficient. I notice also that no executive power is to be given to the Legislature, but it is to have absolutely the same powers as those now enjoyed by the North-West Council, and nothing more; at least, I fail to perceive in the Bill any evidence of a disposition to give increased powers to the new Legislature. Now, the powers at present enjoyed by the North-West Council are of a very limited character indeed. At present they have only three different powers under the statute: to make ordinances with regard to education, to make ordinances with regard to the administration of justice, and to make ordinances with regard to the calling of juries; all their other powers are such as are conferred upon them by the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council is authorised by the Act to extend their powers, that is, to give them such other powers as are conferred on the Provinces by the British North America Act. These powers are rather numerous, and the Governor in Council can select from them those which he thinks ought to be conferred on that body. The hon. gentleman must see that this is very unsatisfactory legislation. In such a country, though the population does not increase as rapidly as was hoped, we must still expect some increase, and changes may be required pretty rapidly. As the hon. gentleman stated, the time has come when the constitution which has been given to the Territories should be modified and defined in such a manner as he said, that is, by giving them a purely elective Legislature instead of a nominated body. At the same time it seems to me that they ought to be given, if not all, at least a great many of the powers which are given to the Local Legislatures under the constitution. I am surprised, for instance, that no authority exists in the law for giving to the Territories municipal powers, which is the very first thing that should be done. They may have been granted to them by the Governor in Council—I am not aware of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes.

Mr. LAURIER. If they have it is very proper. I do not know how far the provisions which the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce with regard to an advisory board and legal experts may work satisfactorily. This is altogether a new experiment. I do not know that it has ever been tried anywhere else; but it seems to me that responsible government of some kind such as they are now asking, would be the best system to adopt. With regard to voting by ballot, the hon. gentleman said there could be no undue influence in those Territories. Why, Sir, it seems to me there is no part of Canada which is so liable to undue influence. The hon. gentleman stated that the Territories would have to be governed from Ottawa. That is the very undue influence which I dread in those Territories—that of the hon. gentleman and his Government. The Lieutenant Governor is their agent; the land agents are their agents; they have a crowd of agents there, and I do not think I am wrong in saying that the power of these agents was unduly felt during the last election.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it a pity that the hon. the First Minister should have introduced his Bill so very late in the Session. There is no doubt that the questions raised are of great importance, and it is very difficult at so late a time as this to give them the consideration they require. I should be glad if the hon. the First Minister would agree not to take the third reading of this Bill until as late a period as he can, so as to give my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) an opportunity of expressing his opinion of it. Of course, he cannot take the third read-

ing to-day but I would suggest to him that it would be better to defer the third reading until Friday. I suppose he will have no objection to that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not the slightest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know if this covers the whole of the Provinces, which return members to this Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, it covers all the North-West.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the three Provinces, Assiniboia, Saskatchewan and Alberta, if I recollect aright.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, it is a very big territory for these parties to exercise authority of any sort over.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice, whatever else is or is not likely to increase by leaps and bounds, the charges for the expenses of Government in the North-West Territories are likely to so increase.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In what way?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I judge from the returns. I notice that they were \$102,000 for the present year, and the hon. gentleman proposes to take \$142,000 for the future year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You mean the expenditure voted here?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; and I should like to know what, if any, revenues these local councils, or Legislative Assemblies, whatever you like to call them, will be called upon to administer. There is one serious difficulty in the way of giving these parties legislative powers. If we are to provide the funds from the Dominion for them to expend, there is no doubt that there will be no check, or a very imperfect check indeed, placed upon them in the way of securing prudence and economy in their expenditure. For that reason, I should like to know whether they have any power of taxation for their own purposes?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have the power of direct taxation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They can tax by direct taxation just as one of our general assemblies can?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are going to have, I presume, municipal institutions similar to those which exists in the older Provinces.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They may have them. In some places they adopted municipal institutions, but in other places they have refused to do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They have a school system and tax in some parts, but I do not know whether they have adopted the municipal system outside of possibly such places as Calgary and one or two others.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Calgary is a municipality, with a mayor and corporation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; there they would tax the town people just as an ordinary village or town in Ontario or elsewhere would. Have these people got any revenues, so to speak, that they are likely to obtain by direct taxation? Where they have municipalities the probability is that the municipalities will absorb all the sums that can be raised by direct taxation out of the people just as they do in the older Provinces.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In older Provinces, they have Crown lands and some other modes of supplementing their revenue, which, I presume, will be totally wanting here, inasmuch as we are the landlords.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, as I understand it, these people will, with the exception of some very small licenses, have no funds except such as they may receive by direct taxation. That is the position?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And wherever there exists a municipality there will be extreme reluctance to pay direct taxation to the Local Government, as well as to the municipal body. So that I take it, practically, with the exception of what funds they may get from Ottawa, these people will have no funds to dispose of. Is that the case?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is very much the case. The revenues that are at the disposal of the Council, and will be at the disposal of the Legislature, are very small. There is an amount received for permits, there are auctioneers' and other licenses, there are fees from practitioners at the Bar, and things of that kind, which certainly do not amount to much. The members of the Legislature have been paid out of the central treasury, and the main improvements, such as bridges, roads, and so on, have been also paid from here; and I think, on the whole, liberal grants have been given, from time to time, for the improvement and development of the country. The hon. gentleman mentions that there is an increased vote in the Estimates for this year. There ought to be an increased vote. As the population increases, the demands will increase, and necessitate increased pecuniary supplies to be got from some source. The powers are being largely increased from time to time. I am not sure that these powers have been brought down to the House, but I fancy they have been reported regularly in the various reports from the North-West; but the powers are nearly co-extensive with those of a Provincial Legislature, and once the power is conferred I do not think there is any means of taking it away. At all events there is no disposition to take them away, and I quite agree with the hon. the leader of the Opposition that the sooner these powers, which have been granted by proclamation, are embodied in the statutes the better. The expenditure for the opening of that country is guided here. It does not come within the purview or control of a Local Government or Legislature any more than in any votes here it would come within the control of a Provincial Legislature. Votes for public buildings in any Province of the Dominion are under the control of the Department of Public Works.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I meant to have enquired was, as these people have, as it appears to me, very small funds of their own, does the hon. gentleman intend to allow them to dispose of all or a considerable part of this vote of \$140,000, or is he going to supervise that, as we are the parties who furnish the money?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course the vote is here and the responsibility is here, and that money will be appropriated on the responsibility of the general Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This Local Legislature, as I understand, will not receive a lump sum to divide at their pleasure?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. I may say that the hon. member for Bothwell, in his remarks on the introduction of the Bill, suggested in consequence of the paucity of the fund at the disposal of the Local Legislature, that something like a subsidy or grant for general purposes should be

given. That is worthy of consideration. I am not at all sure, inasmuch as these people contribute to the revenue by consuming dutiable goods, that there ought not to be a sum placed at their disposal to be used at their discretion, in the same way as the subsidies which are granted to the various Provinces may be dealt with by the Provincial Governments. However, we do not propose to ask Parliament for a vote this Session for that purpose, and there is not any provision made for it in this measure or the resolution upon the Table. The hon. the leader of the Opposition said that this Bill is one nominally extending all the powers of self-government. I have already explained that it is exactly on the line laid down by the present measure. It is not intended to be in any way a perfect constitution. It cannot by any possibility be so. Hitherto the North-West has had a hybrid constitution, partly nominated and partly elected. That kind of government has always failed in the long run, and now that we propose to have a purely elective body, it has been thought better, as a matter of caution and prudence, to allow them to assume the responsibility of making the suggestions for the future development of their constitutional system. My hon. friend opposite disputed my statement that they had in the North-West a holy horror of responsible government. I did not speak simply from the statement that was made by the North-West Council, in the paper which has been laid on the Table, that it should be an Executive Council. That statement shows that there should be a legal expert among them. The point taken is that there should be some restriction of their powers. The whole body now is either elective or nominated by the Governor, and is an executive body. The Governor sat with them, and they voted upon every subject, whether matters of administration or of legislation, and the Governor could be out-voted; and at the same time they had the whole control of the administration and legislation of the North-West. The request of the Council simply amounted to a cutting down and diminishing of their powers, and the proposition which I now make is greatly in advance of the measure which is now law. By that measure it is provided that the Lieutenant Governor shall be the sole executive, that he shall sit alone, that the Assembly may pass what laws they desire, but that he is to have full power to veto, to assent to, or to reserve any of those measures as he believes it right for him to do. He is under no control of any kind, and I think this Bill makes a step in a liberal direction, and that is in providing for an advisory committee in all matters of finance to assist the Lieutenant Governor, and not only to assist but to control him in regard to money levied on and collected from the people there.

Mr. MACDOWALL. The hon. leader of the Opposition has spoken of the desire of the people of the North-West Territories to have responsible government; but I think he is rather mistaken in regard to the feeling of the people in those Territories in that respect. I know that in the constituency I represent, which is within four square miles of the entire area of Great Britain and Ireland, the people sent me a petition requesting that responsible government be not granted at present. The right hon. gentleman proposes that the Lieutenant Governor shall be assisted by an executive of three. Under the old *régime*, he was assisted by the whole Council, and I think that if, in place of three, the number were increased, it would be better, because I think that, if the number were limited to three, the various interests of the Territories would not be so well represented. The largest population is, of course, along the line of the railway, and probably the part of the Territories which lies away from the railway line would not have representation in the executive. I look upon it as one of the most valuable matters in regard to the North-West Council that, by means of their representatives, the people can make

their wants known; and I do not think that they will ever believe that their wants are properly attended to if a small executive is appointed, in which the various districts may not be represented. I hope that the hon. gentleman will at least take in another member and make the number four, so that the four districts which are represented in this House may be represented also in the executive of the North-West Council. As to what has been said in regard to the appointment of judges as legal experts in that Council, I am thoroughly in accord with the right hon. gentleman. I was a member of the North-West Council myself for some time, and I found, during the time I was there, that all the members were indebted to the knowledge and the kindness of the judges, who were then nominated members, for their valuable assistance. I believe the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Perley), who was a member of that Council afterwards, will agree with me that they gave very valuable assistance to the Council, and in no way whatever blocked the carrying out of the public sentiment which the elected members represented in that Council. As to the extension of powers to the North-West Council, to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, the North-West Council have enormous powers at present. There are some powers which they do not possess, such as the power to charter railways, and I think at present it is just as well that they should not have that power, because, if they had that power, I do not see how they would be able to exercise any great control over the companies which they might charter. At the same time hon. members must recollect that this Parliament during the last eight years has chartered railways running through the North-West. They have shouldered the responsibility themselves, and I take it that this Parliament is in duty bound to relieve the people in the North-West of the disabilities which they are under from want of railway communication. Therefore, I think it is not well that the North-West Council should have this power granted to them until they are in full possession of power to carry out such works, and that cannot be until this Parliament has done more than it has already done to open up the North-West. If that were done the country would be repaid in a very short time for any investment it might make in that direction. In regard to the question as to the duties of the Council and the revenue and expenditure, it is true that the revenue received from the North-West is necessarily very small, because, without direct taxation, they had very little to draw a revenue from. They had auctioneers' licenses; and an amount of 50 cents a gallon, which some people imagine to be an iniquitous tax, on permits for liquor. With some other small matters, these constitute all the revenue which they have to receive. The total revenue of that Council, when I was a member of it, was not more than \$10,000. I do not think they can do much with such a revenue as that. I think it is necessary, therefore, that they should have a subsidy from the Dominion Government. I believe every one must admit that the objects on which they have expended their money are good objects. They have been mainly educational and for the improvement of roads and bridges. We know that it is necessary to have roads and bridges in order to carry on the work of the country, and I am sure that no one will object to the amount which has been expended on education, because that is one of the best objects on which money could be expended. I believe that we have in the North-West one of the best school systems which exist in Canada, and I hope that the amount expended in that way will be increased every year. I think it is a great sign of the improvement of the country when money is expended on education, and also when money is expended on roads and bridges, it shows that there is an increase in the population which requires greater facilities, as it does when there is an increase in connection with schools. As to the powers of the Council, I

would simply say that they are rather larger than the hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition imagines. They have had, for some years, the powers to incorporate municipalities, and in many districts along the railway municipalities have already been formed. In the district which I represent, there is only one municipality incorporated just now, and that is the town of Prince Albert, which is, I believe, one of the most flourishing municipalities in the North-West. The people of that municipality were parties to signing the petition which I presented to this House opposing responsible government, on the ground that it might increase their taxation. They have managed their own affairs well, but they are afraid that, with a small representation in the Council, and with their large area, they may be taxed, and that other districts of the North-West may receive the benefit of that taxation in a greater degree than they themselves would. I believe that the powers of the North-West Council given in this Bill, together with what they have, will be quite sufficient for the Territories for the next three years. I hope that during the next three years the country will have increased so much in population and importance, that there will be a necessity for instituting a Legislative Assembly, with full powers of Local Government; but at the present time I think it would be premature. There is, however, one section in this Bill to which I must take exception, and when it gets into committee, I shall take the opportunity of moving an amendment—I refer to section 17, with regard to intoxicants. I regret extremely that the question of intoxicants has not been dealt with in this Bill, because I think the North-West Territories are placed and are left in a most anomalous position. They are just now placed under a most arbitrary law with regard to intoxicants, which has effect only in that part of the country that had not representation in the Parliament that made the law. I consider that this is to some extent, unconstitutional, and that the sooner it is remedied the better. As one of the first representatives of the North-West, I raise my voice against it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Won't you have free liquor?

Mr. MACDOWALL. No, Sir John; let it be under proper restraint, and my amendment will be to this effect when we reach the proper stage.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I wish to say only a word or two, because my hon. friend and colleague has covered nearly all the ground that it is necessary to cover. I must say that I am pleased to see that hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side are disposed to take an active part in the discussion of this Bill, because I want to see the matter fully dealt with, not from any party standpoint, but from the standpoint of the greatest good to that part of the country. I had the honor of being a member of the North-West Council a few years ago, and I was a member when we memorialised the Dominion Government with reference to responsible government; and I may as well say that during the last session of the North-West Council, a similar resolution was passed and sent down here asking for a full-fledged responsible government. Well, Sir, the people of the North-West were opposed then, and they are opposed now, to responsible government. As the right hon. leader of the Government has said, only a small portion of the country was represented in that Council; a thousand adults in a thousand square miles elected a member, and the result was that a very small portion of the whole North-West was represented in the Council. These gentlemen did undertake to offer some advice, and very properly so, to this House, with reference to the form of government that we should have, and they did recommend that we should have a form of responsible government. But, Sir, after I came down here last Session, and again after I came down this Session, when it was thought that

Mr. MACDOWALL.

this matter would come up, many letters that I had from my constituents protested against the form of responsible government, unless this Parliament was disposed to grant a sufficient sum of money to run that government, and to meet all the requirements of legislation and everything of that kind, without bringing direct taxation upon the people. If this Parliament will grant us a sufficient sum of money so that we shall not have to resort to direct taxation, of course we will accept responsible government. But I believe the present system, with some slight amendments, is the system that will suit the great majority of the people up there the best. It is true they have spoken of what they called the one-man power.

Mr. MITCHELL. We complain of that here.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). Well, your complaint has not amounted to much. You will remember that until a couple of years ago the people of that country were governed, and of necessity they had to be governed, by one man, because there was only a person here and there in the country until two or three years ago. Then the North-West Council was increased because the population increased, and there was a greater number of representatives in that Council; and from that time down to the present I may say there has been no conflict between the Council and Mr. Dewdney, the present Lieutenant Governor. I may say that on all occasions he has endeavored to meet the wishes of the people, so far as it was in his power to do so. The Government have given us a large grant, which has been used for local purposes. The North-West Council administered the school money. The money was voted for that purpose, and the Lieutenant Governor handed the grant, as it were, over to the Council. He said: You make an ordinance for the expenditure of this money, and it will be all right. Very well, we make an ordinance, and I had the honor of being a member of a committee which framed that ordinance, and it received the assent of the Governor in Council; so that the money is now being expended under an ordinance which has been made by the people's representatives in that Council. More than that, we have made municipal ordinances; and I can tell hon. gentlemen here that in a small portion of the district that I represent, there are four well organised municipalities, working as well and as orderly as any municipalities in the Dominion of Canada. I have had some experience in municipal affairs, in New Brunswick, where I was councillor for seven years, and I can say that the municipality in the district that was known as the Qu'Appelle district, is as well ordered and as well regulated as any municipality that I am acquainted with. The other part of the district has, under the same ordinance, the power to organise municipalities, but the people refrain from doing so, because they do not want to get into a system of direct taxation, which they would be under the necessity of doing. Now, Sir, what we want is this: We want this Council to have full power over the money that is granted for roads and bridges. I think the school money that is granted is entirely satisfactory. The Government here are building large bridges and attending to the public works of that country, and that is satisfactory. But the people of the North-West desire that their members should have control of the money granted for roads and bridges; they want to expend it where they think it is proper, and they wish it to be taken from the control of the Lieutenant Governor. I may say, also, that the North-West Council wish to have the ballot. I have had considerable talk with the Government with reference to that matter, and I understand that they will give power to the Council to regulate their own local elections hereafter, that will be satisfactory. As regards the revenue, the only revenue we have is from liquor, billiard and a few minor licenses, as my hon. friend here has said; but the license fee is a paltry one, which, with other

local items of revenue, does not amount to much. Therefore we will require a very respectable subsidy to be given to that Council to expend. Any subsidy that has heretofore been given has been placed in the hands of Lieutenant Governor Dewdney. A small pittance, ten or fifteen thousand dollars, was granted last year to build roads and bridges. That is a very small amount, and it should be very largely increased—any one can understand that. But that will be a matter to discuss hereafter. The Government, I think, are disposed to give us a very fair bill. I may say with reference to the license system, that I see there is a clause in the Bill which deals with that. I may say that I have presented a petition, as will be remembered by every hon. member of this House, signed by nearly 3,000 people in the Territories, asking that at this election for the North-West Council, they may have an opportunity of voting on the liquor question. That is to say they should vote whether they desire to have prohibition or a high license. If there is no provision inserted and no regulation made so that the people can have an opportunity of voting, it will create very great dissatisfaction all over the country. The people have asked that by petition, and it is a widespread opinion that they should have a chance of pronouncing their opinion in favor of prohibition or a license system. The present system of handling liquor is entirely unsatisfactory, and some steps should be taken by the Government to give the people either prohibition or license, for we have neither now.

Mr. LAURIER. What system now prevails?

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). A respectable person, if properly recommended to the Lieutenant Governor, can get a permit by paying half a dollar per gallon, and that permit will cover one, two, three or more gallons; in fact, I saw the Lieutenant Governor myself two or three years ago, when I was a member of the Council, where I brought this matter up, and he told me he had power to give a permit for one gill or a thousand gallons. I must say that Governor Dewdney administered his duties in that respect most admirably. He refrained from giving permits to some persons, and they found fault with him; he refused to give permits to hotel men, nevertheless there is liquor all over the country. Liquor is smuggled in; and if a man has a permit for two gallons he probably brings in four. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have a license to sell light wines and beer, and there is very great fault found with that privilege. There is a provision in the Bill that any vehicle shall be seized and sold. I do not know whether the Government intend to seize the Canadian Pacific Railway cars going through the country—it will be quite an institution to handle. I repeat that the people in the North-West are very anxious to have a vote taken on the liquor question at the time of the election of the Council, in order to ascertain whether they favor prohibition or license. Anything short of that will not be satisfactory to any class of the people, either to those who wish a license system adopted or those who favor entire prohibition. This matter will come up when the Bill is in committee, but the system with some little amendment can be made entirely satisfactory to the people. The people do not want responsible government unless they have sufficient money to administer it without resorting to direct taxation.

Mr. WATSON. There appears to be a difference of opinion as to what the people of the North-West really want, but this House should be guided by the representations made by a body such as the North-West Council. That body has asked Parliament to give the North-West responsible government, and their petition should be listened to. The Council have also asked for the ballot. That should be granted at the time of the first election of North-West members, and after that if the Government decide to do away with the ballot well and good, but in the first instance

the ballot should be given. I am in a position to state that there is no portion of the Dominion of Canada where greater undue influence is brought to bear upon the people than in the North-West Territories.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then it must be pretty bad there.

Mr. WATSON. It is bad. I can assure this House that at the last general election of representatives to this House influences were brought to bear that were actually shameful, because while the people were not asked to sell their votes and receive money for them, they were told that unless they did support the Government candidate they would not get common justice. In a portion of the territory which I visited during that election, the people were told that unless they accepted the Government candidate, they would not have a chance to get a second homestead, and further they would not get an extension of the time for paying for their pre-emption.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I distinctly state that through all my campaigning I never heard such a threat used or insinuation made. I do not believe one word of it.

Mr. WATSON. I know those threats were made—electors told me that they were afraid to record their votes as they would like to do for the Liberal candidate. The electors told me that themselves. I will give further evidence to show the influence of a circular letter issued in Prince Albert district on that occasion. We are all aware that a certain number of settlers in the Prince Albert district had claims against the Government, and they appointed a solicitor to look after their interest by the name of Mr. W. V. McLise. A few days previous to the election he addressed circulars to those who had claims against the Dominion Government. It is marked "confidential," and is as follows:—

"Confidential.

"DEAR SIR,—I deem it to be part of my duty, as solicitor for your rebellion losses, to inform you in reference to the Federal elections, that on Friday last I telegraphed my agents in Ottawa, who are attending to your interests there, the following message:

"Please wire me what seems the general result of election so far." Yesterday I received by telegram the following reply:

"Government majority so far is 13. 204 constituencies have so far elected members; there remains 11 more to be held. It may be assumed that the Government will receive at least half of these."

"Now, in conclusion I will remind you that by section 51 of the Representation Act each voter casts openly and his vote goes one for or against the Government in the poll-book. By section 61 of the same Act the poll books must be forwarded to Ottawa after the election here. As it is certain that the Government is not defeated the losses will be paid this next Session, yours I trust with the rest.

"Your obedient servant,

"W. V. McLISE."

I, therefore, claim that undue influence was brought to bear on those people from the fact that there was open voting, that the poll books would be sent down to the Ottawa Government and they would know how the people voted, and upon that would depend whether their claims were paid or not. I believe the ballot system should be extended to the North-West Territories, and when the Bill is in committee I will move to that effect. The Hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Macdowall) said that the people of his district were opposed to full responsible government for the North-West. That was simply because they were afraid they would not have sufficient control of that body. I do not see how they would not have sufficient influence in the Local Legislature on account of the small representation they possess in this House. I believe the people of the North-West are quite capable of electing representatives who are fully able to control public affairs without the advisory board provided by this Bill. I believe they are sufficiently intelligent to elect men to the Local Legislature who would be able to advise His Honor the Lieutenant Governor as to how the money should be spent. I hold that in the interests of that country this House should grant a sum of

money to the North-West Territories for the purpose of furnishing them with as much *per capita* as is given to the different Provinces, and thus give them the full powers of a Local Legislature. I believe that the people would wish that. In fact these gentlemen who have spoken have advocated for, and against further power being granted to the Legislature. It seems to me that the Governor, who ever he may be, can select three men as his advisers and they will control how this money should be spent, so that the representatives of the people have little or no say in it, or if they do have a say, they have no power.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg your pardon.

Mr. WATSON. The three men selected as the advisers of His Excellency would control the manner in which that money is to be spent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Those three members are to be members of the elected body, and who will be selected just as the Governor General has selected us.

Mr. WATSON. They are appointed by the appointee of this Government, and the three men who are selected can overrule the rest of the Council. As far as the matter of economy is concerned, I think that if we take the statistics we will find that the North-West Council has been most extravagant in the administration of its affairs under the present system. I have figures here to prove this, but I shall not bother the House with them now. I believe that the Territories would be much better governed, by a Local Legislature having full powers the same as any other Province in Canada.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

Committee rose.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Speaker leaves the Chair I would like to make a suggestion to the First Minister. I think it would be desirable that he should intimate to the House what Bills he proposes to drop, and those which he intends to go on with. If they hope to close the Session within a few days it would very much facilitate business, if we knew exactly what work we have to do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right. I shall be able by three o'clock to-morrow to inform the House what measures we propose to drop.

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

After Recess.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 76) to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 52, respecting the North-West Territories.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is merely a re-enactment of the clause in the original Bill. It provides 22 councillors instead of 21. It also provides for the legal experts. Sub-section 3 makes the duration of the legislative Assembly 3 years instead of 2.

On section 4,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a re-enactment providing that the Legislative Assembly shall meet at least once in every year. The only alterations in the clause in the late Act is that we take out the power of veto,—the power of rejecting Bills.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By the way has the Lieutenant Governor the right to dissolve this Legislative Assembly?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have no such provision.

Mr. WATSON.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They sit for three years whether or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, for three years.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I would like to ask if it is the understanding that the North-West Council will have the power to establish the ballot?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. They have the power to regulate their own elections. They have it now.

On section 7,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is an alteration of the voting power.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why should we not confer on these people the blessing of having an Indian suffrage which we have ourselves?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Whenever the Legislature of the North-West ask for it I suppose we will give it.

Mr. LAURIER. They have been asking for responsible government?

Mr. MITCHELL. If I recollect, when we were passing the Franchise Bill, the right hon. gentleman was very anxious to extend the suffrage to the Indians for members of this Parliament. We are creating a constitution for a local Parliament, and we must remember that a very large proportion of the population of that country consists of Indians, and if they are intelligent enough to vote for members of this Assembly, they ought to be intelligent enough to vote for members of a Local Legislature.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). They do not vote for this Assembly.

Mr. MITCHELL. If they do not, we need not thank the right hon. Premier or the hon. gentleman who supports him. It was because of the public opinion which was brought to bear on this Parliament that that was stopped. But it seems that the hon. First Minister has changed his views in regard to giving Indian votes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not at all. If the hon. gentleman looks at the Act, he will see that the Indians of the North-West were excepted. There are Indians and Indians, some wild and some tame. However, we will not go into that discussion.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is pretty hard to draw the distinction. I have met some Indians in the North-West who are quite as intelligent and quite as capable of judging of their own interests and of the difference between right and wrong as a good many Indians whom the hon. gentleman enfranchised.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This section provides that a person is not entitled to vote until he has resided for twelve months in the North West Territories and three months in the electoral district in which he votes.

Mr. WATSON. Would it not be well to provide that enfranchised Indians must be out of the treaty for a certain time before they are allowed to vote? The Manitoba Legislature have thought it necessary to make the time three years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would not like to impose that limit, otherwise I might become liable to the hostile remarks of the third party. The Indian, when enfranchised, is a white man to all intents and purposes, and if he has lived in the Territories for twelve months and in the electoral district for three months, I do not see why he should not have the right to vote. Suppose an Indian from the Six Nations at Brantford goes up and settles in the North-West, why should he not have a vote as well as a white man? Indians are not being enfranchised in the North-West at all, as the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. WATSON. We do not know how soon they may be. We know that many Indians in Manitoba have become entitled to vote under the Provincial law, and I think the Indians in Manitoba are probably just as intelligent as the Indians in the North-West Territories; yet the Legislature of Manitoba, which knows these Indians, does not believe they should be entitled to vote, owing to their lack of intelligence and knowledge of the public questions of the day, until they have been enfranchised for three years.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I think the hon. gentleman should blush when he asks any Parliament to adopt the franchise of Manitoba, which has disfranchised the most intelligent people in that Province.

Mr. WATSON. I take it that the people of Manitoba know their own business best, as to who are entitled to vote. Before this passes, I wish to move the following as subsection 1 of section 7:—

Whenever a poll has been granted, the same shall be opened at the hour of 9 o'clock in the forenoon, and kept open until 5 o'clock in the afternoon of the day fixed for holding it, and the votes at the several polling stations shall be given on that day, and by ballot.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would render it impossible to have an election at all next summer.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I am rather astonished at the position taken by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). He reproved my hon. friend from East Assiniboia for what he said by stating that the people of Manitoba knew what was best for themselves; and yet the hon. gentleman, before six o'clock, had the presumption to say that he knew better what was wanted by the people of the North-West Territories than the gentlemen who were elected to represent them last year.

Mr. WATSON. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman approves of open voting, because but for that he would not likely be in the House to-day. The hon. gentleman obtained a small majority by means of a certain circular, and I am not surprised at his wanting open voting. But the ballot has been adopted in every Province and by the Dominion in Dominion elections, and I wish to see that principle extend to the North-West. The people themselves have asked for the ballot through the North-West Council, and knowing the injustice which was done to them in the last election by their not having it, I feel it my duty to move that they should get it.

Mr. MACDOWALL. So far as I am concerned, I do not object in the least to the ballot. Possibly, if we had had the ballot in the North-West, I should have had a larger majority than I had, and I believe that if the tactics adopted in opposing me had been more truthful, probably I should have had a majority of 600 or 700, instead of a majority which was more than double that which the hon. gentleman had under the ballot. Therefore, I am perfectly justified in taking the stand I do.

Amendment negatived on division: Yeas, 35; Nays, 63.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The second clause is an alteration to the law. It provides for the deposit of a sum of money by any candidate, just as in the Provinces, of \$100. It is found there, as elsewhere, that when there is no such security for *bond fides* on the part of candidates, all kinds of men are proposed, to the great detriment of the public.

Mr. WILSON. Is it intended by this clause that only a person who is entitled to vote in an electoral division can be a candidate, or may a non-resident be a candidate?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad the hon. member has drawn my attention to this. I will amend the clause so as to make it read: "Any British subject, by birth or naturalisation, shall be eligible for nomination or election."

Mr. MULOCK. I think we ought not to require that deposit of \$100 in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is more money there than anywhere else.

Mr. MULOCK. It is questionable whether it is a wise provision to be in any Act. At all events, I think the minimum amount of votes that would lead to forfeiture is too great. It means a fine of \$100 on a candidate for not being sufficiently popular.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is half the sum we are obliged to deposit.

Mr. MULOCK. It is too much. I do not think we should put this embargo on the candidatures of men in the North-West. All you want is evidence that a candidate is in good faith. I would suggest to make the minimum number of votes a quarter instead of a half. Supposing a successful candidate gets 500 votes the man who got 125 votes would lose his deposit under this clause, and yet the fact that he got that number is good evidence of his *bond fide*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The argument of my hon. friend would go to repeal our present law. That is the law in all the Provinces, and the deposit required is \$200. It was thought \$100 would be quite sufficient for the purpose, and I do not think we should alter the proportion. It is of some importance that our laws should be as much as possible assimilated.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is slightly in error. In Ontario there is a deposit of \$50 required, but there is no forfeiture. Now, this election is for a Legislature which has not the dignity of a Local Legislature proper. I think that the sum should be less. I understand that the only object is to obtain *bond fide* candidates?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, if the candidate gets a quarter as many votes as those given to the successful candidate, I think he must be supposed to be a *bona fide* candidate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the same in the Dominion elections. It is with the same object.

Mr. MULOCK. But now we are providing for local representation. This is not in reference to the Dominion Parliament, and I think that the precedent set by the great Province of Ontario, if it were adopted, would not be productive of any evil.

Mr. BOWELL. There have been some there who have lost their deposit.

Mr. MULOCK. Name one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They lose their deposit in Ontario.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think so, but I speak subject to correction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought so.

Mr. MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman will not accept the suggestion, I will move that, instead of \$100, the deposit shall be \$50.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I do not think the only object to be attained is in reference to the candidate himself. An election always causes a great deal of cost to the people, and the object of having a deposit is to prevent a dispute when a case arises in which a candidate has nothing to deposit.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). There are many farmers who have not so much money to spare, and I think the amount should be \$50. I have known five candidates to run for one constituency. While I should like to see a deposit provided for, I think \$50 is quite sufficient, because farmers have not very much money to spare in that way.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). I think that anyone who cannot put up \$100 for a candidature for the North-West Council should be left at home.

Mr. WATSON. If there is a popular man in a constituency, who might otherwise be elected, he should not be compelled to put up that amount of money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he is a popular man, it will be put up for him.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think that is a proper system. If the candidate is a good man, he should not be called upon to put up such an amount, because that might deprive the constituency of obtaining the services of the most popular candidate. I think \$50 would be quite sufficient.

Mr. MULOCK. I am surprised that hon. gentlemen here, who are supposed to represent the interests of the North West, should upon this occasion take such a position as to seek to stifle the expression of the views of the people of the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman may laugh or seek to stifle the expression of that opinion, but I think the people of the North-West know the value of the men they have there. For us to say that every candidate for the North-West Council is to put up a deposit of \$100, is, as my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) has said, to place the candidate in a position of losing his deposit if he does not poll the proper proportion of votes. He has to take his chance. This is a restriction upon the choice of the people. It is provided that this shall be a condition before a man can become a candidate, and it is *pro tanto* limiting the choice of the people. It is simply that these hon. gentlemen have decided that no one is competent to represent the people in the North-West Council unless he possesses \$100. Why do they not go further, and say, as was once proposed by a member from British Columbia, that the deposit shall be \$500, which shall go to the successful candidate? That would only be going a little further than the present suggestion. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not attempted to advance a single argument in favor of this proposal, but they say they have decided upon this arbitrary sum.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You are speaking against your own amendment.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not doing anything of the kind. In Ontario you cannot see any case in which the law has been defeated by any bogus candidature, and it is very unlikely that such a thing will happen in the North-West if you require a deposit of \$50. But the hon. gentleman has no right to say that I want to prevent the \$50 deposit. I know that whatever is proposed on the other side is likely to be carried. This has ceased to be a deliberative assembly, and, therefore, I know that my proposition will be voted down as usual.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think myself there is a good deal to be said against allowing anyone who chooses to put a community to the expense of an election, but I do not think that a money penalty is the proper plan to be adopted in such a case. I think that anyone who can get a certain number of his fellow-citizens to nominate him should be allowed to come forward, and particularly in regard to a case of this kind in the North-West Territories, where the Council is very much like the municipal councils elsewhere. I think that twenty-five or some other number of electors should be allowed to nominate a candidate as they please, and I am clear that this would be as effective a barrier against useless nominations as the imposition of the deposit of even \$50.

Mr. MACDOWALL. Supposing 25 voters were to nominate a candidate and he should get 200 votes where there were 2,000 electors, the constituency would be put to a

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia).

great deal of trouble and expense although the candidate would only get one-tenth of the total vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is entirely an innovation. Hon. gentlemen are always quoting England. I should like to know when it was proposed in the English Parliament that any man standing as a member of Parliament should be fined in a certain sum if he did not poll a certain number of votes. It is an innovation, and a very bad innovation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was an innovation introduced by the Government of the hon. member for East York, of which the hon. gentleman was a member, requiring a deposit, by the candidate. However, as the hon. gentleman has lived a great many years since then, perhaps he has seen reason to change his mind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I have. I do not recollect the fact, but if so I think we did make a mistake, and the result has shown it.

Mr. WATSON. In the case of a man running for mayor of a city there is no deposit required, and I do not think we should adopt a different principle here.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I was in favor of a small deposit, but I got a letter from one of my constituents who desired to have the deposit raised to \$200 so as to keep other parties from offering, and the moment I heard that, I changed my mind. But I still think a small deposit would be better, because I know that in certain elections in the North-West, men have run who had no business to be candidates, and materially affected the elections.

On section 9,

Mr. WATSON. I do not know whether the North-West members have considered this clause, but I think there should be a majority of the elected members present to form a quorum, because they have not a right to vote, and you might have a very small vote on a very important question. I think there should always be a majority of the elected members to form a quorum.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I believe there will generally be a majority of elected members attending the Council. If they do not attend the Council, I imagine there is no use of their being elected.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only object for putting the clause in is to have a majority as soon as possible, and as often as possible, and to prevent the breaking up of the sitting for want of a majority. I think when we provide that a majority of the whole Council, which will be 25, can form a quorum, the Council can sit, whether the other nominated members are there or not. In this House, although we have 215 members, I think 19 members and the Speaker form a quorum. I do not think we ought to keep too large a majority. As my hon. friend has just said, the majority will, in 999 cases out of a 1,000, be there.

On section 12,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that we insert a clause between 12 and 13, to be called 11½, as follows:—

The Government shall select from among the elected members of the Legislative Assembly, four persons to act as an advisory council in matters of finance, who shall severally hold office during pleasure; and the Lieutenant Governor shall preside at all sittings of such advisory council and have a right to vote as a member thereof, and shall have also a casting vote in case of a tie.

I will explain this when the Speaker is in the Chair.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I understand this correctly, the Lieutenant Governor and one faithful adherent would always control this council of four.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think in such a case the council should certainly be enlarged to five, because under this arrangement the Lieutenant Governor might,

for form's sake, appoint a couple of opponents, but himself and one *aide de camp* would rule the roost altogether.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is supposed that the Lieutenant Governor will be anxious not to come into collision with the legislative body over which he presides. I take it that every Lieutenant Governor will try to get on as well as possible. One of my hon. friends opposite, I think the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall), suggested four instead of three. I have no objection to make it four.

Mr. WATSON. I suggest that that clause should be changed, and that these three or four members of the advisory board should be elected by the members of the Council. I think certainly the members here from the North-West will agree with my suggestion. If there is to be an advisory board, they should be elected by the votes of that Legislature.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that it is of very great importance that the Governor in Council should be in accord with his advisory Council. If this advisory Council in their recommendations in matters of finance, does not meet the views of the Legislative Assembly, the Assembly has the best means in the world of expressing their ideas that it is not a proper advisory Council, by simply refusing to assent to the financial propositions made. Now, I do not think that my hon. friends from the North-West will throw such an apple of discord into the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. WATSON. The First Minister states that it is of the utmost importance that these three men should be in accord with the Governor in Council. Now, I think that is a wrong principle altogether. It is simply a one-man power; it is intended for that, and it will be that, if this Act is carried into force. It is absurd to suppose that the people are going to be satisfied with a man who may use arbitrary powers, and select three men who may act against the general interest of the whole North-West. I say that the Local Legislature should have power to elect the three members who will advise the Lieutenant Governor. But the First Minister says: No, it is of the utmost importance that those men should be in accord with the Lieutenant Governor. That is simply one-man power.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has just heard from those who have the most right to speak for the people of the North-West, that the people did not want responsible government.

Mr. WATSON. But what does the North-West Council say?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Including the nominated ministers?

Mr. WATSON. Yes, exactly. They represent to the Government and advise the Government here to give full representative government to the North-West. Under the proposed arrangement the Government here will be able to control the whole arrangements in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You could not have a better body.

Mr. WATSON. This will be the case because the Lieutenant Governor and the advisory board will consult the Government here and follow their advice.

Mr. MACDOWALL. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has spoken several times and has informed the House that the members from the North-West do not represent the views of the people there, and he has tried to impress on the House that he alone of all representatives from the North-West submits the correct views of the opinions held by the people there. For my part I do not object to the hon. gentleman thinking so if he would only represent the true views of the people. I have endeavored to do so

by presenting a petition sent here, showing that the people of the North-West do not wish to have responsible government.

Mr. WATSON. What about the petition from the North-West Council?

Mr. MACDOWALL. The district I represent has only one representative on the North-West Council. He voted against responsible government, and the district has sustained his vote. I, therefore, believe I am representing the true feelings of the people there. Then the hon. gentleman went on to try and prove that I did not represent the feelings of the people of the North-West, and he read a circular letter from W. V. MacLise, which was addressed to certain half-breeds there, and he thought he would be able to prove that I brought undue influence to bear.

Mr. WATSON. I did not say you did.

Mr. MACDOWALL. The hon. gentleman endeavored to convey the impression that I had brought undue influence to bear on the half-breeds to induce them to vote for me. I happen to have a letter dated 29th March, 1887, from the same W. V. MacLise. It was addressed to Mr. Burbidge, who was then Deputy Minister of Justice, and the writer says:

"PRINCE ALBERT, N.-W.T., CANADA, 29th March, 1887.

"SIR,—Reference has been made to the fact that I have written a circular letter to certain electors here, in some of the eastern papers, mentioning the fact that I am Crown prosecutor, &c., and as it takes a month to hear from here by letter, I should prefer that the hon. the Minister, if called upon to make any statement regarding the matter and desirous to know what the facts were, should be previously informed. The facts are as stated hereunder:

"In my ordinary business as a practitioner I was retained by about 150 claimants to act as their solicitor in obtaining compensation for losses in consequence of the rebellion in 1885, and as such proved those claims before the Commission who sat here last spring, and will not cease to be their solicitor until their claims are respectively adjusted. When the elections were over in the east the promoters and managers of the *Globe* (Toronto) and *Free Press* (Winnipeg) newspapers endeavored by a series of telegrams to the Reformers here to deceive the electors of this district as to the result of such elections. As such solicitor I took a line of action indicated in the letter they have intercepted and partly published, one copy of which I enclose. It is a letter from solicitor to client and nothing more—unless a sort of bombshell amongst Grit lies.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"W. V. MACLISE."

This letter was dated from Prince Albert on 29th March, 1887, and addressed to Mr. Burbidge the late Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is it an official letter to the department?

Mr. MACDOWALL. It is not an official letter at all. He gives this note:

"(Confidential.)

"PRINCE ALBERT, Tuesday, 2nd March, 1887.

"DEAR SIR,—I deem it to be part of my duty as solicitor for your rebellion losses to inform you in reference to the Federal elections that on Friday last I telegraphed my agents in Ottawa, who are attending to your interests there, the following message:

"Please wire me what seems the real result of elections so far."

"And yesterday I received by telegram the following reply:

"Government majority so far is 12. 204 constituencies have so far elected members; there remain 11 more to be held. It may be assumed that the Government will receive at last half of these."

"Now, in conclusion, I will remind you that by section 51 of the Representation Act each vote is cast openly and his vote goes one for or against the Government in the poll books; and by section 61 of same Act the poll books must be forwarded to Ottawa after the election here. As it is certain that the Government is not defeated, the losses will be paid this next Session—yours I trust with the rest.

"Your obedient servant,

"WILLIAM V. MACLISE."

Mr. MULLOCK. Who signed the telegram to him?

Mr. MACDOWALL. He does not say—his Ottawa agents.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Was the letter written to the department?

Mr. MACDOWALL. The hon. gentleman has asked me if the letter was written to the department. I have already said that the letter was written to Mr. Burbidge. It is all right so long as it got in my hands and I am able to read it here. It is from Mr. MacIise, and it shows clearly the position the Grit party assumed at the election at that time. You would hardly believe what they did: you would have had to have been present at their meetings to know it. They talked rank treason. And what is more—hon. gentleman know whether they told the truth or not when on the very night of the election, which was held on the 15th March, I think, they stated that Mr. Blake had a majority of 6. Do you suppose they were stating the truth?

An hon. MEMBER. Was that treason?

Mr. MACDOWALL. An hon. gentleman asks was that treason. I say it was treason to the truth if nothing else.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman by what process he came into possession of a letter to the department.

Mr. THOMPSON. I handed it to the hon. gentleman about 10 minutes ago.

An hon. MEMBER. It has not strengthened his case.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I think it has strengthened my case. The simple fact is this: that Mr. MacIise was a solicitor, that he wrote to his clients a letter which he thought was in the interests of his clients, but I am not responsible for the view that any solicitor in my district holds. If I am responsible for that, probably the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) is responsible for the views that his opponents hold.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Have the claims been paid?

Mr. MACDOWALL. None of those claims have been paid, and none of the men voted for me, so that it really had no effect.

An hon. MEMBER. Is that treason?

Mr. MACDOWALL. I shall tell the hon. gentleman what the treason was. I believe that anything that is contrary to the views I have heard expressed by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, as well as by the right hon. the leader of the Government, as to the true position of a law-abiding Canadian, must be treason more or less to the constitution. The secretary of the Grit Association in Toronto (Mr. Preston), I believe, sent Mr. Lemieux and Mr. Campeau up from Montreal to my constituency, and those gentlemen held meetings among the French half-breeds of Batoche. I can assure the House that those gentlemen simply talked rank treason. They talked treason against the present constitution of the country, for they told the people to hold themselves in readiness to overthrow that constitution when they were called upon. Would you not call that treason? At all events I would call it treason.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if Mr. MacIise was not one of his supporters?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Do not answer.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I am very sorry that this has descended to a political discussion, and I hope that every member in this House will assist to give us the best law for the North-West. I think that the Government may be trusted to appoint a good man as Lieutenant Governor for the North-West Territories, and I have no doubt that the ends of justice will be served. I have every confidence in the Government to do that, and I do not believe the Government will pursue any course detrimental to the interests of the North-West.

Mr. MACDOWALL.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) if he would be kind enough to allow this public document to be laid on the Table? It is a public document, and I might tell the Minister of Justice that it belongs to me as much as it belongs to him, and that it belongs to every member in this House and to the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will appear in *Hansard* I have no doubt.

Mr. MULOCK. But I wish to see it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You cannot see it now.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. the First Minister can refuse it if he likes. He can be as tyrannical as he likes, but I propose to insist on my rights and on the rights of this House and this country to see that public document. We are willing to assist him in the progress of the debate and the work of the House, but we are not prepared on his whim to allow matters to proceed just as he in his pleasure may think fit. That document is ours as much as it is his. He has the trust of it for the country. The hon. the First Minister shakes his head. He may shake his head as much as he likes, but I want to know how does it come that public records are to be placed in the hands of one member of this House and not in the hands of another? How is it public documents are available for some members of the House and not for others?

An hon. MEMBER. You would steal it.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, let us have a chance of looking at it anyway. I do not know we are likely to do any great harm by looking at the document. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who read that document, was not Mr. MacIise one of his supporters during the campaign he has referred to?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Do not answer.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman's silence gives consent. He refuses to answer, because he knows very well that the writer of that letter was his active man in the election, and if I am correctly informed, and I speak subject to correction, this gentleman was his agent in the election. Was he not?

Mr. MACDOWALL. The hon. gentleman is altogether wrong. I believe the writer of the letter did vote for me, and I value his vote as highly as that of any other elector, but the gentleman was not my agent and he did not represent me in any way whatever.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman will not contradict the statement that the writer of the letter was an active worker for him?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. Hon. gentlemen opposite have allowed this letter to be read. They have allowed the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) to give his charges against this party, and now they will try to stifle any attempt to reply to anything he says. This is what they consider British fair play. This is the party of loyalty and the party that is so glad to see justice done. This is how they are stifling public discussion in the country. The writer of that letter, I am credibly informed, was one of the hon. gentleman's active supporters in this campaign. Does he deny it?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Do not answer.

Mr. MULOCK. Why not answer? Was he never at one of your public meetings?

Mr. MACDOWALL. He was at one of Mr. Laird's meetings.

Mr. MULOCK. He was at one of your public meetings, and anyone who can put two and two together can see that the hon. member, through himself or his friend, inspired

the wording of that letter in order to coerce these men. The First Minister may laugh; probably he is so innocent that he cannot see through those things. What about the seed grain? What about issuing licenses for seed grain in other constituencies, and having the applicants for that seed grain going to the candidate to get an order on the Government for the seed grain which was to grow food for him? Is that not coercion, and is that not intimidation of the worst kind? I maintain that there could be no greater interference with the rights of the people. You may talk of treason, but it is the rankest of treason for the Government to interfere with the free will of the people, and now the Government refuse to give this House the possession of a public document. I do not hold the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) responsible. I acquit him of responsibility, because he has done it in the presence of his chief here, and he was told to withhold from the public a public document which was read in the Parliament of the people. The whole Government have now to take the responsibility of trying to suppress this document, which they brought to-night for certain purposes. Now that it has done, to a certain extent, mischief, they are afraid to show it to the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a new way to suppress a document to read it.

An hon. MEMBER. There is more in that document.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As to laying it on the Table, I shall tell my hon. friend to satisfy him, that it shall be laid on the Table to-morrow.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I want to know if the hon. gentleman had any reference to me about giving orders for seed grain?

Mr. MULLOCK. No, I did not refer to you.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). Well, that is all right.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Chairman, I ask your ruling on a point of order. I ask whether an hon. gentleman in this House is allowed to read a public document without laying it on the Table?

The CHAIRMAN. I was not present. Who read the document?

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) read the document.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the rule is not applicable to ordinary members of the House, but only to members of the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. A member of the Government has said in this House that he supplied that document to the gentleman who read it. This is the way in which the Government evades the Rules of the House then?

Mr. THOMPSON. I handed the paper to the hon. member who used it and who read it. I desire it shall be published in *Hansard*. It shall be laid on the Table and every member of the House shall have a certified copy of the original afterwards, but until it goes into *Hansard* I do not propose to lay it on the Table.

Mr. LAURIER. That is simply evading the Rules of the House, and I hold that, in all justice and fairness, it should be laid on the Table of the House now.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the course pursued by the Government is a most extraordinary one. If they desire to promote the progress of business, I think they could do it very much by laying that paper on the Table. Is there any reason why it should not be laid on the Table? The hon. member for Assiniboia has professed to read it. I presume the hon. gentleman is inspired by too much honor to have read it unfairly, and I presume that he read what was in it; and as you, Mr. Chairman, have decided that documents which are read in Parliament can only be

demanding to be laid on the Table when they are read by a member of the Government, I say this is a document read by a member of the Government, because the hon. Minister of Justice gave it to the hon. gentleman to be read. If that is not practically being read by a member of the Government, I should like to know what is? Why should the Government desire to conceal anything in this matter? Is there any secret reason? We are told that it will be laid on the Table to-morrow. Is it to be to-morrow all the time in reference to public business? Why should it not be laid on the Table to-day, while the subject is being discussed, so that every hon. member can see it? I think it is nothing short of a quibble for hon. gentlemen to say that they will publish it in *Hansard* to-morrow, and keep it back when we desire to have it in the discussion of this important Bill. Sir, we had better postpone this Bill until to-morrow, or until *Hansard* comes in. Was it for political effect that that document was read and immediately handed back to the hon. Minister of Justice? I do not know any other reason why it was sent back by my hon. friend to the hon. Minister of Justice, who gets up and tells us that he will not lay it on the Table now. Sir, it is an arbitrary exercise of the voting power which the Government possess; but although they possess that, they do not possess the power of muzzling men who are determined that their rights shall be respected; and it is one of our rights to have that document laid on the Table, so that we may judge as to whether or not it was fairly and rightly read. The suspicion created by this refusal is that there is something in this document which the Government are afraid to publish and that the public ought to know.

Mr. EDGAR. I believe you have decided, Mr. Chairman, that a document read by a private member may not be laid on the Table, but that a document read by a member of the Government must be laid on the Table. Now, the hon. Minister of Justice got up and stated that he had handed that letter to the hon. member a few minutes before to be read. Therefore, I say it was read by the hon. Minister of Justice, according to his own statement, and I ask your ruling whether he should not now lay it on the Table.

Mr. THOMPSON. I submit that the question is decided, and the hon. gentleman is out of order in raising it again.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that the document was not cited by the hon. Minister of Justice, but was introduced by a private member.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to dispute your ruling, but I will point out to the House that this is a quibble and an evasion of a well-understood principle. It is obviously for the convenience of debate that when any document belonging to the Government, who are trustees of the people and are not entitled to treat public documents as belonging to themselves privately, is quoted in this House, whether by a Minister or a private member, any member of the House should be allowed to inspect it. It is a most preposterous thing that members of the Government should supply supporters of theirs with public documents, and then refuse to allow them to be inspected by other members. They may have the technical rule of the law on their side, but it is a disgraceful and a cowardly evasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that language is called for.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is very applicable, though.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman should not interrupt me. I do not think the language is at all called for. This cannot, in the strict sense of the word, be called a public document. What is the fact? This man, as counsel or solicitor for a number of people up there, thought it his duty to write this letter. Then, when he hears

that charges may be brought against him—and I understand that charges were brought against him in the press—for having written this letter, he writes an explanatory letter to the Department of Justice, showing that he wrote that letter in the interests of his clients. The charge has been brought against my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowell) that this letter was used by him, or with his cognisance, for electioneering purposes. My hon. friend denied it most explicitly, and the hon. Minister of Justice handed him that letter to show that the charge brought against him by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) was unfounded. He read it, and I have no doubt he read it correctly. There can be no object in concealing that paper. The fact of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice handing it to the hon. gentleman shows that there was no desire for concealment; on the contrary, it was for the purpose of having it published that he handed it to my hon. friend. The House has heard it read to-night, and I have stated that it will be laid on the Table to-morrow and let us get on. The hon. member for South Oxford says the technical rule is in our favor. If it be so there is an end of it; the decision is in our favor and it must be upheld, because it is the correct decision.

Mr. LAURIER. I would not question the decision of the Chair, but according to the rules of equity and justice it is not a correct decision. I leave it to the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. Minister of Justice could not read that letter himself without placing it on the Table of the House, and will we be told that he could evade the rule by placing it in the hands of a private member? The hon. gentleman says it is not a public document. What is a public document? As I understand, this gentleman, as an agent of the Government, a Crown prosecutor at Prince Albert, and paid in that capacity, thinks it his duty to write to the hon. Minister of Justice explaining some conduct of his.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is afraid of being punished for having written that letter.

Mr. LAURIER. Then it is an archive of the Government, and it is brought here for the purpose of being used in this House. If it is not a public document I should like to know what it is. That letter goes to show how important it is that they should have the ballot system.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think if the hon. First Minister desires to expedite the passage of this Bill he will yield to the desire which has been expressed to have that letter placed on the Table at once. The argument of the hon. First Minister was not so much against placing the letter there as against placing it there at this time. The hon. gentleman says, let us have our own time and we will place the letter on the Table; that is to say, he will not place it there to-night, as he should do, according to parliamentary rules, but he is going to exercise the authority he possesses, and place it there to-morrow. Now, it is hardly treating the House fairly; it is a captious way of dealing with an important question. The hon. gentleman has raised a question of principle, and it is that question we are debating. I have not the slightest doubt that the hon. member read that letter correctly, and that we will gain no further information by its being placed on the Table; but at the same time there is an important principle involved which I think this House should maintain, and that is that the letter should be placed here on the Table, and that the Government should not exercise their discretion as to whether they should lay it on the Table or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says there is a principle involved. The principle is this: that the House should have full communication of all official documents that have been quoted. But the House is not in session, the House is not sitting at this moment. We are in committee, and documents can only properly be laid on the Table when the Speaker is in the Chair; that is the

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

rule, and no hon. gentleman for a moment ventures to assert or even insinuate that the document has not been read in full. Do let us go on, and at the proper time, Mr. Speaker being in the Chair, the paper will be laid on the Table. You cannot have it now, because it is contrary to the ruling of the Chair and parliamentary practice.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I find in the Journals of the House (7th April, 1880,) that when Mr. Cockburn, in an important debate, read extracts from certain official papers, Mr. Mackenzie, member for the electoral district of Lambton, raised the point of order that official papers, when cited by an hon. member, ought to be laid on the Table of the House, and the Speaker ruled that the point of order was well taken, and that the papers cited by the hon. members for Essex and Northumberland should be placed in the possession of the House.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman says that this document is not in a sense a public document, and then goes on to explain that it was a letter written by an employé of the Government to the Government, explaining his conduct as a public officer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, not as public officer.

Mr. MULOCK. He was afraid that he was going to be discharged or punished for having taken some part in the election, and wrote an official letter explaining his conduct as a public officer, and it is this document that the hon. the Minister of Justice stated across the floor, unreservedly and unqualifiedly, was of public record. Now the First Minister differs from the hon. the Minister of Justice, and also states circumstances that show the correctness of the attitude of the hon. the Minister of Justice. The suppression of this document certainly is suspicious. The hon. gentleman who read it did not read it all. And I will tell you wherein he did not read it all. He did not read the name of the person to whom the telegram was directed, nor the name of the person who sent the telegram in reply. Who was the Ottawa agent that was communicated with by Maclise? And who sent the reply to him? Who was that gentleman? And what was the date of the telegram to the Ottawa agent? And what was the date of the telegram in reply?

Mr. THOMPSON. The evasion is altogether on the other side of the House. The circumstances are these: Before dinner the hon. member for Marquette read an article from the *Toronto Globe* containing this circular, which is appended to Mr. Maclise's letter.

Mr. WATSON. It was from a Winnipeg paper.

Mr. THOMPSON. A Winnipeg paper. As published at the time the article was intended to convey the impression that Maclise had written that circular in the service of the Government, countenanced by the Government, and as an officer of the Government, because he held the office of Crown prosecutor. The hon. member for Marquette before dinner read the circular of Mr. Maclise, and intimated that the hon. member from Prince Albert owed his election to this House to the influence and coercion which that hon. gentleman and Mr. Maclise on his behalf had exercised in the constituency. After this letter appeared in the Winnipeg papers, and was quoted in some of the papers east of Winnipeg, Mr. Maclise felt that the imputation being that he had written and circulated it as a servant of the Government and while he held the office of Crown prosecutor, he would be called to question for having made such a use of his position, wrote a letter for the purpose of showing that he had acted in the interest of his own clients, who, all through the North-West, were threatened with the loss of the claims they had against the Government unless they voted against the Government of Sir John Macdonald, which, they were told, had already been ejected from power. It was in order to remove that impression from

the minds of his own clients that Mr. MacIise wrote that letter, and it was circulated without the slightest knowledge of my department or the slightest connivance of myself. After dinner, having the letter, I placed it in the hands of the hon. member from Prince Albert, not knowing whether he was aware of the circumstances which the letter explained. I was making no evasion whatever. If I had thought it necessary to read the letter, I would have read it myself and taken the responsibility. But I thought it right that the hon. gentleman should be informed of the circumstances under which Mr. MacIise sent the circular, and I placed the letter in his hands for the purpose of giving him that information. It was a matter of indifference to me whether the hon. gentleman read the letter to the House or not. The letter was entirely on the hon. member's own business, and related to his own explanation in reply to the charge of the hon. member for Marquette, and I did not hand it to him for the purpose of evading any rule of the House or of getting on the pages of *Hansard* a document which I was not bound to lay on the Table. I leave to the hon. gentleman who read the letter to say whether he read it in full or withheld any part of it. I do not believe that he withheld a syllable. I think the House is ready to accept the hon. gentleman's statement to the fullest extent, and this shout about the evasion of the rule is raised to cover up the retreat of the hon. member for Marquette after the insinuation made by him before dinner.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like, after the statement made by the hon. Minister of Justice as to the circumstances under which that document came before this House, through his hands and from his department, to know whether your ruling, Sir, should not be changed?

The CHAIRMAN. The ruling is equally applicable under the circumstances as stated.

Mr. LAURIER. I am quite willing to accept the statement of the hon. the Minister of Justice, but at the same time I hold that, under the circumstances, the Government should not have entrenched themselves behind a document, and then refuse to produce it.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no evasion; it will be laid on the Table before the Bill reaches the final stage.

Mr. LAURIER. While I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, the fact remains that we have not the letter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not suppose the Minister of Justice or the First Minister wishes to have a second discussion brought up on this question to-morrow. Now the object of laying this paper on the Table is to have the question disposed of at once. Had it been laid on the Table the discussion would have been over, and the Bill would have passed.

Mr. WATSON. Although I did not wish to provoke a discussion, I am pleased that it should have arisen and that the truthfulness of that letter has been substantiated by a letter from Mr. MacIise himself and by the hon. the Minister of Justice, because it was contended that, by placing such a circular in circulation, the Government tried to make the people believe that unless they supported the powers that be, they would not be entitled to their just rights, and thus tried to bring influence to bear on the general public of the North-West to vote for this Government. There is no doubt in the mind of anyone that the intention of Mr. MacIise was to advance the interest of this Government in the Saskatchewan District. The First Minister apparently felt that the electors would support the Government candidate if they thought the Government was sustained. I find that the First Minister sent a telegram to his friend the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) stating that the Government were sustained, and no doubt he expected that

for that reason the people would vote for that hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WATSON. They say "hear, hear," which shows that they approve of that policy. I think it is to be regretted that anyone representing a popular vote in a constituency should not have equal rights with anybody opposed to him who happens to support the Ministry of the day. I find that the following telegram was sent:—

"To N. F. DAVIN.

"OTTAWA, 3rd March.

"It is reported here that the Grits are still endeavoring to deceive the people of the North West by stating that the Government has not been sustained at the polls. It is everywhere conceded that 53 supporters of the Ministry have been elected in Ontario, 14 in Nova Scotia, 9 in New Brunswick, 4 in Manitoba, and one in British Columbia, while of the 65 members from the Province of Quebec we are certain to be supported by 37 and probably 38. In all there are already 118 Ministerialists and 86 Opposition, a majority of 31. We confidently expect to carry the eleven remaining constituencies, which will make our majority 43, but supposing we failed to carry any seat in which a Grit is running our majority would still be 21.

"JOHN A. MACDONALD."

Mr. HICKEY. Was not that true?

Mr. WATSON. It may be true, but I say it was sent to that member with the intention that it should affect the electors and induce them to vote for him as a supporter of the Government. That carries out what I say, that the ballot should be put in force in the North-West. The Government are in a position at present to use undue influence with the early settlers in the North-West, because those settlers have to get their claims decided by the Government of the day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What has the hon. gentleman to say as to the telegram which was sent by Mr. Blake to British Columbia?

Mr. MULOCK. Read it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not got it here.

Mr. MACDOWALL. Mr. Preston, of the Liberal Association of Ontario, telegraphed up that Mr. Blake had a majority of six, and it was necessary for us to find out from our friends what was the true state of the case, and so we got that telegram from the leader of the Government, and it proved to be true. I will leave it to the hon. gentleman to say whether that can be said of the telegram which he received from Mr. Preston.

Mr. WATSON. It is clear that the hon. the First Minister sent the same telegram to the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) as he did to the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

Mr. MACDOWALL. He was asked to give the information.

Mr. WATSON. No doubt they asked him for that telegram, because they thought it might have the effect of changing some few votes in their interest. I do not care what telegram Mr. Blake may have sent or Mr. Preston may have sent. What I was insisting upon was that the people should be allowed to record their votes by ballot irrespective of any pressure on the part of the Government. I say now, as I said before, that in East Assiniboia the son of the Premier was shown there as the son of a crofter, and it was stated: "If you elect Mr. Perley it will be helping the crofters."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may tell the hon. gentleman that my grandfather was a crofter.

Mr. WATSON. It will be seen that every possible means was used to influence the electors. They even went back to the right hon. gentleman's grandfather in order to influence a vote.

Mr. EDGAR. The objection which we took to the publication of that letter just before the election was not as to whether the Government had succeeded or not. Everyone has a perfect right to state his views in regard to that. What we objected to was that the writer stated that the voting was open, when the voting would appear on the poll-book, and that would be sent down to Ottawa; and that the land claims of these voters would be decided upon that. I think the House would hardly believe that any Government officials would before an election have distributed such a letter to intimidate the voters, but it appears that that was a genuine document, and if anything was required to show how the elections in the North-West were conducted, it is shown by the fathering of that document by the Government. After all, the promises which were made did not amount to much, because, according to the hon. member for Alberta, none of those claims were paid, and why were they not paid? Because, according to the hon. member, the parties voted against him.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I never gave any such reason. I trust, the hon. gentleman, when he quotes me again, will quote me correctly. As I understand, the Government had nothing whatever to do with the settlement or payment of these claims. A commission was appointed, and that commission enquired into the claims and decided simply as justice dictated to them the way in which they should be settled.

Mr. LISTER. What were the books wanted at Ottawa for? I must say that I am glad to hear now where the Premier really was born. He has stated to Irishmen that his grandfather was an Irishman, and to Welshmen he has stated that he was a Welshman, and now he says that his grandfather was a Scotch crofter. The hon. gentleman has referred to Mr. Blake's telegram, and, if he had been elected under that, he would have been a Grit to-day.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I deny that.

Mr. LISTER. He is one of those who are Conservatives for revenue. I say it is a most disingenuous thing for the Minister of Justice and the First Minister to have kept back as they have done the contents of that letter. I notice that there were several other papers appended to the document while the hon. gentleman was reading it, and I should like to ask him whether he read those. He is silent. He is afraid to answer.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I am not afraid to answer. I stated before that I read everything that was there, and I do not think it necessary to state that for the third time.

Mr. LISTER. Upon what possible principle is it that the Government refuse to produce the letter? Now, the hon. gentleman leading the Government is a great man on telegrams. It appears that he telegraphed up to this gentleman that the Government had a majority, and that they would have a much larger majority. Sir, I remember that that hon. gentleman telegraphed once before, a telegram that has become historical. "Send me another ten thousand, last time of asking."

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the course pursued by the Minister of Justice is unparalleled in my experience of parliamentary legislation. I think it is a matter of fair play to this House that when a document has been used for party purposes, or personal purposes, or for the purpose of the legislation under the consideration of the House, that the party using that document should lay it upon the Table of the House. The Premier says that he will give it to the House to-morrow; the Minister of Justice says he will give it at the next stage of the Bill. Now, if there is not some covert reason for keeping that document back, of which this committee should be put in possession, why are they so anxious to get on with the business, with the

Mr. WATSON.

Premier even entreating us to get on with the Bill. Some hon. gentleman on the other side spoke of delays arising from this side. The delays in this case have arisen from the other side of the House, from the disingenuous way in which the right hon. gentleman and his friends are suppressing a public document, which has been used for some purpose in this House, and are preventing the gentlemen on this side of the House from having an opportunity of seeing it. I will occupy no further time in discussing this matter, but I will let the country judge as to whether there has been any motive for suppressing that letter. I will not impute a motive to any of them, but I will say that the circumstances are very suspicious, and I will place upon them the responsibility before the country of pursuing the course they have adopted.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In this matter there is a vital principle at stake. It is the question whether the ordinary Rules of the House are going to be observed by the Government, and whether in a matter, of debate, the Government are going to extend one rule to those who support them and another to those who oppose them. After the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowell) read the letter, I sent over a page and asked to let me see it, as I was very anxious to see the letter, and he sent me word that he had sent it to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I did not send you word.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I then sent over to the Minister of Justice and asked if he would have the kindness to allow me to see the letter after he had read it; and he returned the answer to the page, "I will not." I believe that the hon. gentleman has been on the bench, I believe that he is distinguished for some courtesy, and that was the official statement of the Minister of Justice—not in writing, the page gave me the answer. I wonder the Minister of Justice did not shudder when he spoke in such terms as that to a page, returning such a contemptuous answer to an hon. member of the House. Now, there is a principle of the highest importance at stake. Are the Government to come before the people of this country and say that they will pursue a course so cowardly, I will say so contemptible, I will say so unworthy of any Government—

The CHAIRMAN. Order, that is going too far.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When the Government give the letter to one member and refuse it to another, I ask you if there is any word in the English language that will more fitly characterise their conduct than the word "cowardly"? I have no hesitation in designating it by that word, I regard it to be that. The hon. member for Saskatchewan read the letter, and we believe, from the action of the Minister of Justice, that he has not read all of this letter; we believe that if he had done so, he would have had no hesitation in allowing it to be laid on the Table. There should be the same rule meted out to every member in the conduct of debate. This letter that was read was issued by one who was in the employ of the Government, a Crown prosecutor, and he says they have claims and that the poll books should be returned and would be examined in Ottawa—one of the worst forms of coercion that the Government could possibly adopt, and something that this House should stamp out, emanating as it does from the Department of Justice to the people where an election was being held. If that is the way the Minister of Justice holds the scales of justice, God help the country, I say.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must express my regret that the production of this letter should have been refused at this particular stage of the Session. If I know anything of the feelings of hon. members on this side of the House, it is that we should proceed as rapidly as possible with the business before us. It is exceedingly unfortunate that the Minister of Justice should so far have stepped out of his

way to help an hon. member as to place in his hands documents of a private character, belonging to his department. I know that since this House met, orders have been voted for returns, including copies of telegrams that members on this side of the House want to use in the course of discussion, in connection with items in which they are interested, of interest both to the House and country, and up to this time those returns have not been brought down. But the hon. gentleman, a friend of the Minister of Justice, goes to him at a moment when he thinks that he can, by the use of private documents, correct his own position, and the Minister of Justice at once hands out to him a document that he is permitted to read before this House, to use in his own interest, and then, when another private member wishes to have the same privileges accorded to him, the Minister of Justice returns the very curt answer: "I will not." Now, if this is the mode in which hon. gentlemen intend to adopt for the expedition of business, with the expectation that the close of the Session will be reached speedily, I think it is an exceedingly unwise course. If the Government are disposed to give the Opposition the privilege of examining that document, why should they not place it upon the Table? Now, I should like very much to see this discussion brought to a close, but I must say that, in my humble opinion, a very imprudent act has been committed by the Minister of Justice, in bringing up, at this late period, a question that has caused a good deal of discussion, and that possibly may last for some time. I think if the Minister of Justice was willing to place the document before the House, we might get on with the business much more rapidly. If he does not do so, and we are forced, as a matter of justice, to defend the rights of a member on this side, to enjoy the same privileges as hon. members supporting the Government, then we may sit here all night, and by to-morrow we will have made no progress.

On section 13,

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). Will the advisory board consult with the Lieutenant Governor as to the expenditure of money?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In all matters of finance.

On section 18,

Mr. LAURIER. I wish to consider the question which arises with respect to dual representation. I suppose it is not his intention that members of this House should be members of the North-West Council.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That point has not been raised.

Mr. LAURIER. I raise it now. I apprehend it is not intended, nor do I think it is desirable that members of this House should be members of that Council or that Council should be members of this House. We should, I think, preserve the same principle we adopted long ago of having no dual representation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that is the principle. I think the principle is, that when the Legislature of any Province prevents any member of the Dominion Parliament from being elected to the Provincial Legislature, any member of the Provincial Legislature is ineligible for election to this Parliament.

Mr. LAURIER. I will read a section from the old election law:

"No person who on the day of nomination at any election for the House of Commons is a member of any Legislative Council or any Legislative Assembly of any Province now included or which shall hereafter be included in the Dominion of Canada shall be a legal member of the House of Commons."

It is true you are not establishing a Province, but you are establishing a Legislature in a Territory. I contend that,

unless you have some such provision inserted in this Act, a member of that Council might be a member of this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would be so.

Mr. LAURIER. Is that the object of the hon. gentleman?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The point never occurred to me. There was no such provision in the old Act?

Mr. LAURIER. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will consider it before the third reading.

On section 17, sub-section 2,

Mr. MACDOWALL. I desire to call attention to the fact that every vehicle in which intoxicating liquor is carried is liable to seizure. On the Canadian Pacific Railway line they have refreshment cars; I want to know whether the farmers' cart and the railway train are in the same position or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object of the clause is very well known to the hon. gentleman. Spirits or intoxicating liquors are brought across the line by carts and teams of different kinds. If they are caught the liquors are seized and destroyed; and in order to put an end to this kind of thing, it is provided that the vehicle and team are liable to seizure, and this will have a great effect against smuggling. The same principle prevails throughout the customs law. Whenever any goods are seized the vehicle in which they are smuggled is likewise seized. This is a check on smuggling, and the bringing into the North-West of forty-rod whiskey from across the line; and I know the hon. gentleman will say it is a very just provision.

Mr. MACDOWALL. Although this may prevail in the customs law, I am afraid it is a kind of law that only applies to the North-West. I believe that the feeling of the people there is in favor of abolishing the system prevailing in the North-West just now, because it interferes with the liberty of the subject in a manner in which it is not interfered with in any other part of Canada, in that it is exceedingly arbitrary. A mounted policeman can enter a house to search for liquor, merely on suspicion, or almost without suspicion. If liquor is found there the man in whose premises it is found has to prove that it was brought into the Territory under a permit, and he has to produce that permit, and prove that it is the permit on which the liquor in question was imported. I believe a great many of the troubles arising in the North-West are caused by this liquor law. It is generally contended by advocates of temperance that crime and trouble are occasioned by the use of alcoholic liquors, but a great deal of the crime and trouble in the North-West is caused by the fact that the people are prevented from having that liberty which is accorded to every Canadian in every other part of the country, except, perhaps, Keewatin. I hope soon to see the liquor law amended. I should like to move an amendment to this Bill, but I am afraid, in the present temper of the House, I should not meet very much success. I would, therefore, say that when the new North-West Council are elected I trust they will advocate the placing of the settlement of this question in the hands of the people of the North-West, because they are sufficiently intelligent to be able to decide what is best in their own interests.

Mr. WATSON. Speaking in the interests of the North-West, I consider it is extremely important that this law should be enforced and enforced strictly. The Indians are the wards of the Government, and every means in the power of the Government should be used to prevent liquor from going into the Territories, because part finds its way to the Indians. This clause might operate in a very arbitrary manner on innocent parties. Liquor is frequently taken into the Territories packed in goods and even in a

sack of flour, and with our present system of carrying freight in carts and by teams, innocent freighters might have their teams and carts confiscated because they were carrying contraband goods, of which they had no knowledge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman must know that this clause is just the same as under the old Act, and no more rigid than the customs law, which provides that vehicles carrying contraband goods are seized. Many vessels are seized, the owners of which are quite ignorant of the fact that their vessel has been made the means of carrying smuggled goods. The best mode of appealing in those cases is to the Customs Department, and if there is evidence of innocence on the part of the owner of the property, the vessel or vehicle is always released. This is a very important clause in the interests of sobriety and temperance. The hon. gentleman can, I think, trust the department with not allowing innocent men to be punished. It is all very well to say that an innocent trader may have his horses and waggon seized, but if he is a man of common sense he will, when this law passes, ascertain whether he is carrying intoxicating liquors or not on board his cart. If by any unfortunate accident it should be found that he unintentionally had carried liquor, his vehicle will be released. This rule always has been carried out.

Mr. EDGAR. I think the House would very much incline to support the Government in the direction indicated by the First Minister just now. I cannot help drawing the attention of the House to the statement which was made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Perley) before six o'clock, about the sale of liquor in the North-West. As I understand it the hon. gentleman said that one of the great evils they complained of in the North-West was the giving of a permit to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to sell liquor on the railway, and that that was a great and growing evil. I think it is very important for us to know something more about that from the Government. Is it possible that the Canadian Pacific Railway, as a corporation, is given a permit to import and to sell liquor in the North-West Territories? Although the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has a great many powers under its charter, I have never seen that they were licensed to buy and sell liquor in the North-West or anywhere else. I cannot conceive it possible that such a thing is done. What will be the result if it is the case? A great corporate body like the Canadian Pacific Railway Company given that power, they must transmit it to their servants and employés, and one class of servants is as much entitled to do that business for them as the other. When you consider that from one end of the country to the other every employé of the Canadian Pacific Railway is entitled, under that permit, to deal in liquors, you will see the extent of the abuse. It surely cannot be so, and the hon. gentleman must be mistaken. I suppose that, on the recommendation of the Canadian Pacific Railway, at certain places along the line, some reputable and respectable and responsible person is allowed to have those permits. As the matter was raised by one of the hon. members from the North-West, I think it is of sufficient importance to have an explanation from the Government as to how it is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The system of permits is established by the original Act, and permits have been issued ever since. As an hon. member who knows the facts and who comes from that portion of the country has stated, I believe that the issue of permits has been carried on with great discretion and great care, and that the consequence of that care and discretion is that there is such an absence of intoxicants in that country, and that smuggling is so very great. If the permit system had been used without discre-

Mr. WATSON.

tion, and if permits had been granted promiscuously, there would not be the amount of smuggling there is.

Mr. EDGAR. There may be an exception in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the Canadian Pacific Railway has broken the law they are liable to be punished as well as any person else, or any other railway company. I do not myself know whether there has been anything sold in the way of intoxicants on the Canadian Pacific Railway. I believe from what I am informed that wine and beer is being sold to the passengers crossing the continent. I have been told that is the case, but whether by permit or not I do not know. The hon. gentleman will see that, perhaps, there is a good deal of excuse for any such practice obtaining, because if people are obliged to keep to cold water crossing from Toronto to Vancouver, they would be very apt to go south of the line. I cannot speak as to that from personal knowledge.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia) I wish to give an explanation as to what the hon. member has said. I did not say that there were intoxicating liquors sold, but I said that wine and beer were sold on the dining cars, not at stations but during meal hours along the line, and I believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has a license for that purpose. They get a permit from the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories to sell passing through the Territories. I think that we ought to discuss this liquor question a little here, because the people all over the North-West Territories would like to have some change made in it. There is fault found that the Canadian Pacific Railway should have license for wine and beer, whilst hotels in the country cannot have it; and that if a gentleman is coming from Ottawa, Toronto or Montreal, England, or anywhere else, he ought to be subject to the same restraint in respect to liquor that a man in that country is subject to. I think there is good sense in that. Whilst the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was building across that country, and the Indians, were wild on the plains, it was a matter of importance to have a law to keep the liquor away from the Indians and there is no doubt the law has served a good purpose, both during the construction of the road and in respect to the Indians. That country is now civilised. It has a system of local government, and law and order are established, and the people think they ought to have the right to say whether they should have entire prohibition or a proper and well regulated license system. That is the opinion of all parties, both of persons who like liquor occasionally and those who do not like it at all. They think the time has arrived when the Government ought to take some steps to get the opinion of the people on this matter, and all parties are willing to abide by the vote whether it be for liquor or no liquor as the case may be. I think the time has come when the Government should make some provisions of that kind, because the people have the impression that the Government will take the recommendation of the newly elected Council in reference to this matter, and if that is so, it will make a terrible election in that country. It will make one of the bitterest contests in an election campaign that ever was known in Canada if the idea goes abroad that the Government will take the advice of the new Council with reference to the liquor system in future of the North-West Territories. I think it would be well on the day of the election, if we had two more candidates in the shape of "license" and "prohibition." It will not cost a cent and the people will carry out the result of that vote whatever it may be. If a man goes into a poll and votes for Mr. A. let him make a mark, and let the returning officer say: "Do you vote for prohibition or liquor? Let a mark be made opposite which he may vote for and then we shall have the voice of the people on this question. There is great dissatis-

faction in that country at the liquor system. There are a great many people who come there and think they ought to have beer, and if a man who enjoys those luxuries, as he may call them, cannot pass through the country without having it on the Canadian Pacific Railway the people think it is a denial of justice to them that they should be subject to this restraint. I wish the Government would settle this matter now, so that it would be settled before the present election. If it is there will be no strife and we will get good men. It will not be the liquor crowd in one place and the prohibition men in another place, that will elect the candidate. By this means which I have pointed out, you will get the voice of the people as to prohibition or high license and the result will be a great benefit to the country.

Mr. COOK. Before dinner the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat stated that when permits were granted by the Lieutenant Governor for a quantity of liquor, the persons receiving the permits usually smuggled in double the quantity. I think the Government should take action in this matter, and I think that action should be to abolish the system of granting permits by the Lieutenant Governor or anybody else to traffic in liquor, and they should put a prohibitory law into force in the North-West Territories. The very fact of the hon. gentleman's statement shows that a great deal of liquor is brought into the country illicitly, because of the authority of the Lieutenant Governor to issue permits.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I do not say that that is the case in every instance; I say that it is often the case that a man brings in more than he has a permit for.

Mr. COOK. There are respectable men everywhere, and you will find them in the North-West. It was the intention when this Act was passed that the country should be under prohibition, and that the permit system should be used only to a very limited extent; but that system has been abused very much indeed, and I think the Government should now pass a prohibitory liquor law for the Territories.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). I take exception to the remarks the hon. gentleman has just made. I think he knows very little about the North-West. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman ever takes a drink himself, or whether he is strictly cold water, but that makes no difference. When he gets up and talks about what the people of the North-West should do, I think he should first find out what the feelings of the people of the North-West are. I represent the district of Alberta, where I have lived for nineteen years. We are supposed to be a total prohibition country. Of course, we can, by applying to the Lieutenant Governor and paying half a dollar a gallon, get a permit for two gallons. You must remember that the North-West Territories are enclosed by different countries. There is British Columbia on our west, the United States on our south, and Manitoba on our east, where free whiskey flows in every direction. Now, I would like to know why the people of the North-West Territories are to be deprived of the same liberties that the rest of the people of Canada enjoy. I would like to see a clause in this Bill to give the people of the North-West Territories a chance to say whether they will have total prohibition or high license, whether they will have liquor or not. The permit system is neither one thing nor the other; in fact, it is a delusion, and an encouragement to people to make money out of smuggling whiskey and selling it. I can show you twenty-five saloons in the town of Calgary where you can buy a drink for 25 cents just as you can in Ottawa. I think we should have the right to derive a revenue from these places. I believe in making every man who wants to sell whiskey in the North-West pay \$1,000 for a license. In that way you can control the

trade; but at present you can neither control nor stop it. I would like to see an amendment made to this 17th section such as my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) had this evening.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this clause, that the present system is unsatisfactory, and that the permit system, which is absolutely necessary to a certain extent, ought to be amended so as to prevent the evils which have been described. I quite agree with my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Perley) in everything he has said, except in his proposition that, at the same time that an election takes place for members to the Legislative Assembly, a vote should be taken as to whether there should be prohibition or high license in the North-West Territories. The trouble has been in this country, as well as elsewhere, that politics have been mixed up a good deal with the moral question, and I should be very sorry to see it recognised at any political election that there should be also the moral question: Are you in favor of prohibition or high license? I think the two subjects, one referring to politics and the other to morals, should be kept quite separate. As I have already stated several times, the object of the Government has been to make as few changes as possible. This election will be the first election of members to the North-West Assembly without the mixture of any Crown nominees. When that body meets, it will be invited—it will be its duty without any invitation—to consider that question as well as all other questions affecting the interests of the North-West Territories. The people there, I am sure, are fully alive to the importance of their first real election of a Legislature for themselves, and they will choose men fully charged to consider the question of prohibition and the question of high license, as well as all other questions connected with the welfare of that country. Therefore I have abstained from dealing with that subject until we have received something like an authoritative statement of what the wishes of the representatives of the people to be elected under this law are.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). Will the recommendation of that Council, with respect to the liquor question, be acted upon by the Government in another year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It depends upon what that recommendation is. It will be submitted to Parliament for its judgment. The legislation of that body will be laid before Parliament at its next Session, whenever they pass any laws on that or any other subject, and the action of this House upon it will be invited.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Am I to understand from what has been stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have power to get a permit from the Lieutenant Governor to sell liquors on their trains?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot speak positively. I do not know that as a fact, as the question has never been brought before me; but I understand they have a permit to give wine and beer in the dining car at meal time to those who are travelling across the continent.

Committee rose and reported progress.

House resolved itself into committee to consider resolution (p. 1174) respecting the indemnity and travelling expenses to be paid to elected members of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories, and salaries to be paid to officers thereof and others.

Resolution considered in Committee; reported, and referred to committee on Bill (No. 76) respecting the North-West Territories.

House again resolved itself into committee.

Bill reported.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

House again resolved into committee on Bill (No. 24) to amend and consolidate the Railway Act.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose to go back to section 194, which relates to fencing. It was not the wish of the committee, I am sure, that the clause should be made so stringent as to necessitate the fencing of railways in wholly unorganised and unsettled parts of the country, such as the North-West Territories, and I move to prefix these words to the section:

When a municipal corporation for any township has been organised and the whole or any portion has been sub-divided into lots for settlement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the Minister got the consent of the member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) to this amendment?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think that carries out the views of members who were in favor of that proposal, and at the same time does not make it too stringent.

Mr. EDGAR. I quite concur in the idea that it is hardly fair to ask the railway to fence where there are no settlers, and that would be the effect of the amendments which were carried the other evening, but, if there are no settlers, there will not be any cattle, and, therefore, there could not be any cattle killed.

Mr. THOMPSON. But that amendment made it obligatory on the company to fence.

Mr. EDGAR. It made them liable for damages.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is a severe penalty under which they were liable if they did not fence.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I know that in New Brunswick, on what are known as ranche lands, some people farm right up to the railway, and are willing to relieve the company from damage. I think, if the owners request the company in writing not to fence the lands, they should not be under any obligation to fence. I know many cases where the parties have requested the company not to fence.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). In moving my amendment, I had no desire to impose any unnecessary conditions upon the railway companies which are showing so much enterprise and doing so much good in this country, and I think the amendment suggested by the Minister of Justice will accomplish what I endeavored to attain, and at the same time will reduce the impositions upon the railway companies within narrower limits than I submitted the other night, and, if the committee is agreeable, I am quite willing to let it go in that way.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. I desire also to refer to section 200. Sections 200 and 201 were re-drafted from the old Act, but the concluding words of section 201 really belong to section 200:

Persons for whose use farm crossings are furnished, shall keep the gates on each side of the railway closed when not in use, and no person whose cattle are killed by any train, owing to the non-observance of this section, shall have any right of action in respect of the cattle being so killed.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). As I understand this, if any cattle are killed it exonerates the company from all responsibility. It matters not whether the party owning the crossing leaves the gate open or not, if by any neglect a railway employé leaves them open the farmer is refused compensation for the loss of the cattle.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see that the Act necessarily imposes the duty on the person for whose use and benefit the farm crossing is made, to keep the gates

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

closed; and the natural result of that is that if he fails to perform his duty, he shall not have right of action for his cattle if they are killed in consequence. The Act distinctly imposes that duty on him and I take it the result at common law would be, that he would be held guilty of contributory negligence, and therefore not entitled to recover.

Mr. EDGAR. What my hon. friend means is, supposing the gates are opened by an employé of the company, the clause would still exonerate the company from liability. But I fancy the doctrine of contributory negligence would cover that case.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I move that the following be added as a sub-section to section 250:—

2. Any person being on a train, and liable to pay a fare, who fraudulently evades payment thereof by giving a false answer, or by travelling beyond the place to which he has paid, or by leaving the train without paying, shall be liable to a penalty of not less than five dollars nor more than twenty dollars, to be recovered under the provisions of the Summary Convictions Act:

3. No person shall loiter or remain without right within any car or station house of any railway company, or upon a platform or ground adjoining any station, after being requested to leave the same by any conductor, station master, or other officer of the company, and any person refusing to leave after such request, shall be liable to a penalty of not less than two dollars and not more than ten dollars, to be recovered in like manner;

4. Every railway company shall cause to be posted up in a conspicuous place at the stations on their line a printed copy of the foregoing sub-section;

5. All fines and penalties imposed and recovered under this section shall be paid to the railway company upon whose railway or ground the offence has been committed.

I may say this is taken from the Railway Act of Maine, and my attention has been called to it. Parties go on a train and try to evade payment, or try to go further than they have paid for. In regard to loitering, people connected with railways have spoken to me on the subject, and complain that parties loiter around the station who have no business to be there, and become a nuisance. I have adopted this section from the Railway Act of the State of Maine, which is a very good Act, and I think the same provision exists in several other States. At present there is no power to prevent parties from hanging around the station. There is a provision that this sub-section shall be printed and posted up in a conspicuous place in every station.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that would be a very arbitrary rule, because it may be applied, if the station master was so disposed, offensively against parties who are waiting for a train.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Those persons have a right to be there.

Mr. SPROULE. What would constitute a right?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Any person who has had any experience in regard to railways, has seen people loitering about the station and interfering with the officials. A station is not a public place, and, therefore, they are trespassers. It is only persons who have business with the company who have any right to be there. I am acquainted with a railway partly in Maine and partly in New Brunswick, and it has branches in the State of Maine. In the State of Maine the clause is in operation, and the company has experienced great difficulties in consequence of a different state of things prevailing on the New Brunswick side. I think also in other States there are similar provisions in the law to enable the railway companies to have control over their stations.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose a person offensive to the station master should be at the station, he might be ordered off the premises, and if he refused he might be brought up and fined, on the ground that he had no right there. What would constitute a right? He will not be doing any business with the station master or the company, but he might be merely expecting a friend to arrive by train.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The fact that he was expecting a friend by train would give him a right, a legal right I think.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think so. I do not understand that a railway company does not own its own property the same as any other property owner. They choose to throw their stations open for the sake of doing business; at the same time they have the full rights of any property owner and can order a person off the premises. Under the proposed motion the most ignorant messenger or any one could order a person to withdraw on his construction as to whether a man had the right to be there or not.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Make it station master or conductor.

Mr. MULOCK. I would not give that right to any man. As to loitering, every man who goes to a train loiters. I hope the Minister of Justice will not allow such an amendment to be inserted in the Bill.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not think the fines should go to the railway company, but to the municipalities in which the crime was committed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid the adoption of this amendment will lead to much unpleasantness. The hon. gentleman knows that at all our country stations there are many people who make a practice of going to the station to see trains arrive and depart, a practice which is, perhaps, a little inconvenient sometimes to passengers who have legitimate business at the station. While there is a certain amount of inconvenience arising, it would lead to ignorant officials displaying a little authority and producing more unpleasantness than advantage gained.

Amendment withdrawn.

On section 158,

Mr. THOMPSON. I desire to call attention to this desistment clause, and I move the following section:—

In any case where the notice given improperly describes the land or materials intended to be taken, or if the company decides not to take the land or material mentioned in the notice, it may abandon the notice and all the proceedings therein, but they shall be liable to the person notified for all damage incurred by him in consequence of such notice, and the method of determining such costs shall be in the same manner as costs after the award, and the company may give him or any other person notice for land or material notwithstanding the abandonment of the former notice.

That confined the right to desistment in cases of lands being improperly described.

Mr. MULOCK. I appreciate the spirit of the amendment, but it is still capable of being abused. Suppose a railway company desires to expropriate a piece of land through a farm, and for some reason they imagine that the arbitration is running against the company, they may desist, and they may say we propose, instead of taking the land described in the notice, to take land a few inches on one side or the other. Such, of course, will bring them under the word "improperly." The company should know their business before they give their notices, and if having given notice there is any award, and if more is needed they should be required to enter upon a new arbitration for such additional land. Hence a company by a little management might escape any award by showing that they wanted land slightly different.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is impossible to frame a clause so as to prevent attempts to evade it, but I think we meet the point by the provisions given for reviewing the award of arbitrators and the facilities given for appeal. I intend to propose clauses requiring all the evidence to be taken in writing and filed with the officers of the court and to give the court complete control in regard to every matter before the arbitrators. Thus, if desistment be colorable and for the purpose of evading this provision, the company would be frustrated in their attempt. The committee, in

doing away with this clause, would prevent the correction of a mere mistake or change, such as this. Along a certain line of country the company conclude they will require station grounds at a certain place. They give the notice and an arbitrator is appointed. It is true the proprietor is put to some expense, but the company finds, from the information they get subsequently, that it is desirable to have the station further on. I think, from the mere fact of having given a notice, and having put the proprietor to some little expense, which the company is willing to pay, they should not be obliged to take the land also.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the Minister think it would be right for the company to exercise this privilege to desist, merely for the sake of getting rid of their arbitrator?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Why not meet the case by allowing them to amend their description during the arbitration, or say that in cases such as desistment, they must appoint the same arbitrator? This would prevent the company from improperly desisting.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. This would hardly do as they might not go on with the arbitration for a year afterwards.

Mr. MULOCK. If they desist for the sake of correcting the description, why not say they may correct the description during the arbitration, the same as under a proceeding of law? Give them the power of amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON. That would hardly meet the case if they want to desist altogether and not take the lands.

Mr. MULOCK. If they want to desist altogether give them the power, but if they want to desist without good reasons I think the ordinary powers of amendment that are exercised now in all proceedings in court, should apply here, and there should be power to correct the description. This would prevent abuse.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. At the option of the company.

Mr. MULOCK. Give them power to make that amendment, but do not allow them to desist to escape from the arbitrator they have appointed.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think there is very much danger of frivolous alterations.

Mr. MULOCK. I have seen the evil arise, and companies desisting to escape from the arbitrator.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not see how it could be met. I think we had better let this clause pass and let the hon. member frame what he thinks to be a suitable amendment. We can then take it up again as a sub-section.

Mr. MULOCK. Thank you. I will do that.

On section 37,

Mr. THOMPSON. I desire to make an amendment in this section to meet the case which is mentioned by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt). The section provides that the warden of the township shall be *ex officio* director, and in some cases the special Act provides that instead of that being the case, the municipality should have the right to elect the director and take somebody other than the warden. An opinion has been given in the case that he referred me to where the warden and the person elected both took their seats on the board, and this was not intended by the Act. I propose to add those words in the section:

Unless in such special Act provision is made for the representation of such corporation on the board thereof.

On section 245,

Mr. THOMPSON. In this section, which we passed the other evening, there are several provisions for the company being compelled to use all proper appliances for the working of the railway. I move to add the following:—

And shall as well be liable to pay to all such persons as may be injured by non-compliance with this provision, or to their representatives, such damages as they may be legally entitled to notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary with regard to such persons.

Mr. EDGAR. To what will that apply ?

Mr. THOMPSON. This prevents persons contracting themselves out of their rights, that is all.

On section 83,

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. My attention has been called by a gentleman in Toronto, who knows a great deal about the transfer of shares, to the fact that directors should have power to sell, not only shares declared to be forfeited, but also unissued shares. A company may have an authorised capital of \$5,000,000 and only \$2,500,000 subscribed, and there may be \$1,000,000 more authorised to be issued, which the directors have no power to sell under this clause. There was such a power in the old Act, but this clause changes it. I propose to add the following words :—

The directors may sell, either by public auction or sale, and in such manner and on such terms as to them seem meet, any shares so declared to be forfeited, or any unissued shares, and may pledge such forfeited or unissued shares or both for the payment of loans and advances.

And at the end of the clause I propose to add :

Provided that authority for such purpose and for the issue of such stock be first given at a special general meeting of the shareholders called for the purpose.

That is to prevent the contractors selling forfeited or unauthorised shares without authority.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. SHANLY. I wish to suggest to add to the third sub-section of section 243 the following :—

Provided, however, that nothing in this Act contained shall affect any contract between any railway company and person sending traffic by said railway by which such person agrees that, in consideration of a lower rate of freight charged, the company shall not be responsible as aforesaid.

Mr. LISTER. I would oppose that. Surely the Minister of Justice will not consent to it.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not see any objection to that. In the first place, I think that is the meaning of the clause as it stands. It is a clause compelling the trains to run at regular hours for the conveyance of passengers and goods, on the payment of the right tolls or fares, and that relates to the ordinary transactions of the company. The question has been raised, as the hon. gentleman knows, in the Province of Ontario, whether that applies to a special rate or not.

Mr. LISTER. It has been decided that it does apply to a special rate.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think Chief Justice Cameron considered that it did not apply to any special rate, and that he could not be bound by the decision previously given, because he thought it was given in error. This case does arise sometimes. A man having a perishable cargo, such as fruit or vegetables, which will not bear the ordinary rate because of the perishable nature, obtains a lower rate on the condition that the company shall not be liable for the loss caused by delay. In some of these cases a person is taken free of charge who has custody of those goods, and it seems to be hard to inflict the whole liability of the loss on the company.

Mr. LISTER. Words might be added to the section so as to provide especially for perishable property. I know of a case which happened on the Grand Trunk Railway recently, when they undertook to ship an engine from one point to another, and the contract provided specially that they should not be responsible for loss. Though the engine was destroyed through their negligence, they disputed the responsibility because of the special contract. I can understand that, when the freight is of a perishable nature, the company should be allowed to protect itself in the way the

Mr. THOMPSON.

hon. gentleman speaks of, but where it is ordinary freight which the company contract to carry they should be held responsible for loss.

Mr. THOMPSON. But suppose the owner agrees to these conditions because he obtains a special rate ?

Mr. MULOCK. We are doing away with special rates.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not altogether. A very similar question arose before the House of Lords, and it was decided that the special contract was binding. In England a condition to be binding must be a reasonable condition, and that has been held to be a reasonable condition.

Mr. MULOCK. The weak point in this is that the Governor in Council will approve of a schedule of rates which will probably be higher than the company will ever collect. The rates they will levy will, I suppose, be lower than those in the schedule, and that will be called a special contract, so that they can contract themselves out of all liabilities in the future as they have done in the past.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. So they should.

Mr. MULOCK. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say "rubbish."

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I did not say "rubbish."

Mr. MULOCK. I thought you did. I think it would be well to vary that clause.

Mr. THOMPSON. We might substitute the word "special" for "lower."

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Special contracts are made by steamboats and all carriers of every description, and, in England, contracts made with a company are held to be binding. If the party chooses to get the benefit of the lower rate, he has to take the responsibility.

Mr. SHANLY. It is a *quid pro quo*.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Yes, it is a *quid pro quo*.

Mr. LISTER. I do not think my hon. friend sees that the company will have a fixed rate, and everyone who wants to ship will have to make a contract by which the company will carry for less than that rate. Consequently, everyone who ships will be shipping by what they will call a special rate.

Mr. MULOCK. What is a special rate ? Under this Act there can be no discrimination. You cannot allow one rate to one man and another rate to another man under the same conditions, but I think that the clause which is now proposed puts the whole railway law back to the same position in which it has been for many years past, which practically affords no redress. Every shipper by steamboat knows that there is no contract in commercial life to-day which is more one sided than the contracts with steamboats to which my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) has referred. It is a standing grievance and it has come before my notice year after year. There is scarcely a loss which happens by sea of goods which were intended to be imported into Canada, in which there is any recovery of damage, simply because of this special clause.

Mr. DENISON. I think, if there is a fraction of reduction in the rates charged, the company could claim that that was a special rate. I think the clause had better be allowed to remain as it is.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose this as section 102 :

A company may, for the purpose of constructing or operating its railway, take possession of, use, or occupy lands of another company, with the approval of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, which approval said committee may give if they think it reasonable, but, in regard to any such application, the Railway Committee may make such provisions as to them appear just and in the public interest, and all the provisions of the law applicable to the taking of lands and the compensation therefor shall apply to these lands.

Mr. EDGAR. I thought it was agreed that you should limit the application of that to the former provisions which were within the powers of the Council.

Mr. THOMPSON. I attempted to do it the other night by defining it, but I think it was made more vague than it is now.

Mr. EDGAR. Then put in the compensation and leave out the limit. The Minister the other evening had drawn the clause, and it was carried.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, it was objected to, and I allowed it to stand. However I have no objection to put them in.

Mr. MULOCK. The way they work it is this: There is no finality to the rights of a company with regard to its own property. The Railway Committee to-day may say that one company may acquire certain lands of another company. Then the arbitration takes place, and thereupon the lands claimed pass to the other company. Then if the company that lost its lands happens to have sufficient influence with the Railway Committee, it may turn round and say that they want those lands back again, they want to grab the lands of another company, and so they come to the Railway Committee again and the committee makes the change; and so the thing may go on, and whenever a company happens to have the most influence, whichever company can get, for the time being, a decision from the Railway Committee in favor of its acquiring the lands of another, thereby acquires them upon going through the form of an arbitration. Under this clause it is possible for that Railway Committee to enable a railway company to expropriate all the lands of another company with the sanction of the committee; all that has to be done is to pay for them. Under this clause one company may absorb another. It is the most extensive power that could be used by any set of men, and I do not think you ought to endanger property by placing it in the power of any railway committee to say: You owned this property at one time, we now declare this property shall go to another person. The Minister of Justice may say the Railway Committee is not likely to sanction such an expropriation, but I do not think any set of men should be entrusted with power that ought not to be exercised. I think there should be some limitation for the protection of the company in possession.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think there can be no limitation further than the provisions adopted in this section. The mistake the hon. gentleman makes in his argument is in supposing that the Railway Committee is going to decide these matters on mere influence, and his argument is founded on the principle that it is unsafe to confer powers on anybody which may be improperly exercised. It would be just as reasonable for him to object to conferring jurisdiction on a court, on the ground that the court may decide in favor of the wrong party. It would be just as cogent for him to argue that we should not trust the arbitrators' decision on the value of the land, because they might decide the wrong amount. Now, these powers must, in the public interest, be given to somebody. At present no individual has a right of property, so final or absolute that it may not be expropriated by a railway company. Is there any reason why property which has been acquired by a railway company should be any more sacred than the right of an individual? Experience has shown everywhere that it is absolutely necessary that some one should occasionally have these powers. I admit they are very great powers. They must be entrusted to some tribunal to control, and we have thought that the Railway Committee is, for the present, the best tribunal to have such powers; if not, we must vest these powers in some other body of a like kind, as in the United States, where they are vested in three individuals and are absolutely incapable of review.

Mr. MULOCK. Would you object to putting in some words like these: "but so as not to materially interfere with the working of the company?"

Mr. THOMPSON. That would be very vague. For instance, one railway company desires to cross a lot which is occasionally used as a shunting ground by another company. It may be that a suitable shunting yard can be got in another place, but that the cost of the change is \$10,000 or \$15,000. Now, it would materially interfere with the operation of the other company when it does so to such an extent. But that is a matter capable of compensation, and the committee should not lose its jurisdiction in that case. It seems to me that wherever a matter is capable of compensation, the power should be capable of being exercised; and that where it is not, it is a case in which the Railway Committee clearly would exceed their duty if they ventured to authorise the expropriation.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. We must credit the Railway Committee with some common sense and common fairness, to see that no material injury is done to the company whose lands are sought.

Mr. SHANLY. I beg to move an addition to section 255. This section is designed to protect the travelling public against the danger of smoking and carrying explosives. I do not think it goes quite far enough, as I happen to have some experience of the great recklessness of men who are employed in carrying explosives. I have known a man who was in charge of explosives, to put a small quantity into his carpet bag and travel in a second class passenger car. I propose to add after the word "left" in the 17th line, the following:—

Or who shall carry or take on any railway train, such material as is mentioned above for the purpose of having the same carried by the said railway train.

It is to prevent any person from smuggling, as it were, such dangerous articles in his carpet bag, and I think it provides for greater safety.

Mr. EDGAR. It says no person shall carry.

Mr. THOMPSON. It says that no person shall carry, but it does not provide a penalty.

On section 277,

Mr. THOMPSON. At the end of line 11, we end with the word "but" and strike out the words "nothing in" and "and contained." It is done that this shall not affect the powers or rights which any company in Canada now possesses by virtue of any special Act. We add the word "Canada" after the words "United States of America."

Mr. MULOCK. Why not make it uniform?

Mr. THOMPSON. They have that right now. The original Railway Act was passed long ago and we have since given certain companies the power to hold stock in other companies. If we pass the prohibitory enactment at the present time it makes it unlawful for them to hold those securities. I propose to make it uniform and to apply to all, except those companies which already have those special rights.

Mr. MULOCK. You do not interfere with contracts already entered into.

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. MULOCK. I know of a case where a company has extensive powers, and if they are allowed to have those powers they might use them.

Mr. SHANLY. We gave a charter of that kind this Session.

Mr. MULOCK. I think you did an unwise thing. Unless you limit the exercise of that power to all companies, you might as well strike it out.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). You cannot take away the powers the companies have under a special Act.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to call the attention of the committee to section 293, which I think is exceedingly unfair and severe. We have, in section 217, already given the railway companies power to inflict penalties not exceeding \$40 upon any of their employes for breaking any of their regulations; and that is a sort of domestic arrangement which the company can carry out themselves. But here is a clause aimed at the officers and servants of the company, which provides that for breach of by-laws, rules or regulations, they shall be subject to punishment by fine or imprisonment or both, the fine not to exceed \$400 or the imprisonment five years; and it is not necessary that the rule or regulation should even be served on them.

Mr. MULOCK. Will any court give the punishment in such a case?

Mr. EDGAR. We should not provide for it if the courts will not. This portion of the section should certainly be struck out: "or which has been posted up or open to his inspection in some place where his work or duties, or any of them, are to be performed." It is unheard of that a person should be liable to such penalties even when no damage is done. I do not know how that provision could have got into the statute, because I think it is exceedingly severe and unreasonable, and that the limitation of the fine and the imprisonment should be reduced.

Mr. MULOCK. I cannot agree with my hon. friend at all. There is no case that I have any recollection of in which any servant of a railway company has been unduly punished. On the contrary, they have escaped punishment in some cases where the most serious consequences have been the result of their disobedience of orders. Every employe of a railway company knows or ought to know that it is his duty to read the general regulations applicable to his conduct, and it ought not to be necessary to serve him personally with a copy of these rules as a person is served with a writ. The clause leaves it entirely in the discretion of the court to impose a nominal fine or a nominal sentence, and I am in favor of the most stringent regulations in order to enforce absolute obedience.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am in favor of the most stringent regulations being imposed on the servants of the railways, inasmuch as they hold, so to speak, our lives in their hands. At the same time, I cannot help thinking it unfair to demand the infliction of punishment on a railway servant simply because he did not happen to see some notice that might be posted up or open to his inspection. A placard of that kind might have been posted up and torn down. I think it is right, when a man enters the service of any company, that the regulations of the company should be handed to him. That is all I want done. If a man enters my service, I should acquaint him with the regulations under which he enters upon it, and every employe of the railroad should have handed to him a copy of the regulations by which he is to be guided, so that he will not have to find out in some dark corner some regulations which may have been passed and to which his attention has never been drawn, and for the infraction of which he is to be subjected to a penalty. I do not object to the penalties, because these men who hold the lives of people in their hands should be punished for non-observance of the regulations, but care should be taken to enable them to be fully acquainted with the regulations.

Mr. EDGAR. I move that the word I have quoted be struck out.

Mr. LISTER. I do not think that will impose any hardship on the company. The Grand Trunk Railway hand the men copies of the regulations.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. SPROULE. It will have this effect: that the servants of the company will confine their attention exclusively to the regulations handed them in connection with their own special business; but there are other duties to which these employes have to attend, and there are other regulations which it would be well for them to learn, and these they learn when the general regulations are posted up at every station. If you take this provision out of the law, a great many of them will not take any trouble to learn any regulations which do not specially apply to their own particular work, and will not make themselves acquainted with any regulations concerning which they have not been served with a particular notice.

Mr. MULOCK. I agree in the spirit of the remarks of the hon. member for Centro Toronto, but I think his suggestion will defeat the whole provision of this clause. Take the Grand Trunk Railway. There are about 5,000 hands employed on that road. Are you going to have a person going from end to end of the line serving notices and making affidavits and memo. of service, so as to be ready to prove a case against any of these men? If you can prove that the notice was posted up and accessible to the employes, you cast upon them the onus of knowing what these notices are. To prove personal service will impose on the company an obligation that they will not be able to perform. This section has been on the statute for years, and we have not yet heard of any case of hardship arising under it.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. An order is sent out from Mr. Hickson's office to the employes to do a certain thing. It is impossible to deliver that order to each of the whole 5,000, and it is posted up at all the stations along the line. The only way a general manager has of communicating with his employes is by posting up these notices.

Mr. EDGAR. Are not the employes paid every week, and what difficulty can there be in handing them on pay-day a copy of the regulations relating to their departments? The working men are entitled to that. Merely sticking up a general notice in some part of the work, is no notice to an employe of the complicated obligations under which he acts, and for the violation of which he is to be punished so severely. He is in the position of a galley slave. Even if he be not punished with the full force of the law, why insist on this provision?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The provision to post up notices should be retained. The chances are that in nine cases out of ten, it will be shown that the employes actually read the notice. I do not think any hardship can arise under this. It is the duty of the railway employe to acquaint himself with the regulations from day to day. With regard to the other amendment, it should be confined to cases where there has been actual loss of life or damage to property.

Mr. McNEILL. This is a very stringent clause, and we should give the employes every possible advantage and chance. There ought to be no difficulty in furnishing notices to the men. Trains are running over the lines daily, and at different stations copies of these notices can be left. It is very well to talk of 5,000 men, but you must take the different localities and you will find that there are not many men employed in each. Looking at the thing in gross, the number seems very large, but looking at it in detail, I do not see why there should be any difficulty at all. If you impose heavy penalties on the men, you ought to take every possible care that these men have received notice.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Does the hon. Minister of Justice know of any hardship or abuse under the law as it is?

Mr. THOMPSON. I have not heard of a single prosecution under it. The law appears to be harsh, but that it has been so long in operation without any particular hardship

having arisen under it, is a strong argument in its favor. I think the fact that it has been in operation so long and has not operated harshly is strongly in its favor, but the strongest argument is that which has been brought forward by the hon. member for York. As to the impossibility of proving this years after, that can always be proved by the books of the company.

Mr. EDGAR. How could you prove that a man got his wages?

Mr. THOMPSON. By the receipts.

Mr. MULOCK. As a rule, they do not take receipts for wages.

Mr. THOMPSON. I should prefer to have the notice hung up in the place of business to giving a book containing the regulations, probably of three or four years before, which in all probability the man would not have the ability to study.

Mr. EDGAR. The company are bound to put up the regulations now.

Mr. SHANLY. I do not think this clause should be changed at all. It has stood upon the Statute-book for years, and has worked well. I think it is absolutely imperative that the rules and regulations should be posted up where everyone can see them. The regular rule which exists is that every foreman of a gang, every engine driver, and every man who has men under him, has the rules; but, in addition to that, every laboring man who has not the book in his pocket should have the opportunity of reading the posted rules and regulations. I think the clause ought to stand.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think this matter should receive the consideration of hon. members. It is true, as the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) says, there may be a difficulty in regard to the employes when they enter the service of the company as to the by-laws. I do not, however, apprehend the difficulties which he seems to apprehend in regard to the employes being supplied with the by-laws of the company. At each station they could be supplied with any new by-laws as they were issued, so that each employe would have an opportunity of studying and learning his duties, and so would be able to do his duty with a better regard to the protection of human life, as well as to the company itself, than if these regulations were merely posted up. I do not see that there will be any such difficulty as the Minister of Justice speaks of in regard to proving this, because, if it was the duty of some one man to deliver these, he could be called upon to prove it. A man may be employed to-day and sent on the road almost immediately, without any opportunity of learning the various by-laws and regulations and what is required of him, and he may be fined very heavily for some breach of those regulations. We know that the railway companies have the power in their own hands to punish their employes if they do not perform their duties efficiently. Perhaps it is because of this control which they possess that we have had no convictions under this law. Is it proper, however, for this Legislature to put a law upon the Statute-book which will do a violence to many thousands of laboring men in the country? If there have been no convictions, there is no necessity for the law, as the companies have the power to manage the men without this law, and it is a harsh law to place on the Statute-book. I hope the Minister of Justice will see his way clear to adopt the amendment that the by-laws shall be placed in the hands of the employes. Further on in the Bill a great injustice is done to the men. If there has been no damage done, no risk incurred, still, if any of the servants of the company has violated any of these by-laws or orders of the company, he is liable to a fine amounting to 30 days' pay, and not less than 15 days' pay.

Mr. MULOCK. We are not on that section.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). These two clauses will act very harshly and will do an injustice to the employes. It has not been shown that they are necessary for the protection of property or human life at all, and I think it is right that the proposition which has been made by various members to relax this stringent law should be carried out.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Justice and other members have referred to the difficulty that might take place in requiring the company to serve the copies of the regulations on all the employes. If that is a real difficulty, we will have to go back and repeal clause 221, which provides for that very thing.

Mr. THOMPSON. That only relates to the duty of the officers as towards the company, and if the company failed to supply them with the regulations, they of course would fail to enforce the \$10 penalty against these officers, but this is an indictable offence, and relates entirely to the public.

Mr. MULOCK. Section 295 is the material section dealing with wilful negligence and disobedience of orders. I do not agree with section 296, which I think is unnecessary and might go out. Section 295 provides that, where there has been wilful or negligent disobedience of orders and where there has been risk to life or property, the penalty shall ensue. Section 296 is of a different character altogether, and I should recommend that it should be dropped.

Amendment to strike out the following words from section 295, in line 12, after the word "him," negative on division:—

Which has been posted up or opened to his inspection in some place where his work or his duties, or any of them are to be performed.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose it must have been a mistake that there was left out of this clause after the word "company" in the third line, the words "lawfully made and in force."

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no objection to add that.

Mr. MULOCK. I move that section 296 be dropped.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not see why any person who is not an employe should be put in a much worse position, in one respect, than those who are. In section 295, all officers are guilty who "wilfully or negligently violate;" and here people are guilty whether they do it negligently or not. The words "wilfully or negligently" ought to be put in.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no objection.

On section 368,

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose the Minister of Justice is aware of the decision of Justice Street, with regard to the Act of 1833, declaring these local works for the general advantage of Canada. I think he recently held that where a company was incorporated by provincial charter, and thereafter brought under Dominion jurisdiction by the legislation of 1883, the company no longer has the power of expropriation. I think the question may yet arise whether railways incorporated by the Parliament of Canada have the right of expropriation.

Mr. THOMPSON. I did not see that decision.

On section 310,

Mr. THOMPSON. After the passage of the two sections we have just adopted, there were enactments in the Province of Quebec and in the Province of Ontario, conferring borrowing powers on some of the provincial companies that

were brought under the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and there is no doubt that they require validation. Some of the powers have been enacted on and mortgages given.

Mr. EDGAR. But this gave legislative power to the Governor General in Council?

Mr. THOMPSON. To proclaim them.

Mr. DENISON. In the absence of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I wish to bring before the Committee Bill (No. 5) for the better protection of railway employés. I have had some alterations made so that the sections can come in as section 263a of the Railway Act, with various sub-sections. Sub-section number 2 is with respect to the packing of frogs. In this connection I desire to read a paragraph respecting an accident with frogs which occurred at Barrie, in the very constituency represented by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The paragraph states:

"BARRIE, May 14.—A young man named William Elate, while engaged in shunting in the Grand Trunk Railway yard, at Allendale, this afternoon, got his foot caught in a frog and was run over and instantly killed. He is a single man, of about 23 years of age. His parents live in Manitoba."

This is further evidence, if such were required, that something should be done regarding the packing of frogs. I move the adoption of the following:—

The expression "packing" means a packing of wood or metal or some other equally substantial and solid material of not less than two inches in thickness, and which, where by this Act any space is required to be filled in, shall extend to within one and a-half inches of the crown of the rails in use on any such railway, shall be neatly fitted so as to come against the web of such rails, and shall be well and solidly fastened to the ties on which such rails are laid.

On every railway at all times after the coming into force of this Act, the space between the rails in each railway frog extending from the point thereof backward to where the heads of such rails are not less than five inches apart and the space between each wing rail and railway frog, and between each guard rail and any other rail fixed and used alongside thereof, and between all wing rails where no other rail intervenes, shall (save only where such space between the heads of any such wing rail and railway frog as aforesaid, or between any such guard rail and other rail fixed and used alongside thereof as aforesaid, or between the heads of any such wing rails where no other rail intervenes as aforesaid, is either less than one and three-quarters of an inch or more than five inches in width) be filled in with packing.

Mr. SHANLY. The filling of frogs should be kept entirely distinct from the filling of wing rails, and I, therefore, move in amendment the following:—

That as regards frogs, the space behind and in front of every railway, frog or crossing and between the fixed rails of any switch where such spaces are less than five inches in width, shall be filled with packing up to the underside of the head of the rail.

Mr. DENISON. I do not accept the amendment, because it is intended to save the employés a little work.

Mr. SHANLY. And it may save passengers from very serious accidents.

Mr. LISTER. Will the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) explain how his amendment differs from the sub-section proposed?

Mr. DENISON. As I understand the amendment of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly), it is the same as the provision proposed by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in reference to the frogs, saving as to winter rule. He proposes that the frogs can be taken up in the winter time and the snow swept from end to end, with a broom, I suppose. It is only a question of a little extra work for the employés.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. SHANLY. I beg to move as follows:—

The space between any wing rail and any railway frog, and between the guard rail and the track rail alongside of it, shall be filled with packing at their splayed ends so that the whole splay shall be so filled with it where the width of the space between the rails is less than five inches; such packing not to reach higher than to the underside of the head of the rail, and provided that it may be in the discretion of the

Mr. THOMPSON.

Privy Council to allow such filling to be left out from the month of December to the month of April, both months inclusive.

He said: This has been taken from the statute of Ontario and has been found to work very well there. The only difference is that I leave it to the discretion of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to say whether the packing can be taken out in the winter.

Mr. HICKEY. I should say that the wing rail is more dangerous than the frog, for if a man gets his foot between the wing rail and the main rail he is held there. If a man gets his foot in the frog he can take it out.

Mr. SHANLY. The foot would need to be very small to get between the wing rail.

Mr. EDGAR. I am of opinion that the danger will be just as great in the winter as in the summer time.

Mr. MULOCK. This is suspending the provisions of the Act for four months. I think the time could be made shorter than that.

Mr. SHANLY. It leaves it optional with the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. MULOCK. The option would be sure to be availed of.

Mr. McNEILL. It seems difficult for members of this House who are not experts to deal with a question of this kind. Looking at it simply as one who is not an expert it seems to me that the packing might be made movable, so that the difficulty in the cleaning out of the snow could be got rid of by removing this packing. It is for the House to say whether it is worth while to run the additional risk during four months in the winter, to save the railways the trouble of removing a little snow and ice.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that the danger at the wing rails is not so great as at the frogs and fixed rails. But the hon. member for Grenville has stated that if the snow and ice is allowed to accumulate at the wing rails, there will be risk of derailing the trains. When he has pointed this out, I think it is better to adopt the course his experience has suggested, and leave the Railway Committee to grant the permission.

Mr. THOMPSON. I wish to make a suggestion with regard to running boards. The House heard a good deal of discussion when Bill No. 5 was up for a second reading, and I think it was understood at that time that it would be unwise to adopt immediately the provision it contained. There is every disposition, I am sure, to make every possible provision for the protection of railway employés who have to use running boards; but there was this practical difficulty suggested, that it would perhaps be unwise in Canada to adopt now a provision for a running board 30 inches in width, because many American railways have narrower foot boards. I do not say that the House should refrain from adopting a provision of that kind unless we are prepared to put something in its place. Therefore, I propose to insert in section 10, which confers powers on the Railway Committee, this sub-section instead of sub-section c:

To make regulations with respect to the method of passing from one car to another, either inside or overhead, for the safety of railway employés passing from one car to another, and for the coupling of cars.

This will enable us to adopt that provision and any other appliances, as soon as it can be done with safety.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I certainly feel that this is hardly what we might expect at the hands of the Minister of Justice. It is certainly delaying the matter indefinitely. That is not what the employés of the railroads are demanding at the hands of the Government. If we take into consideration the number of lives which are lost, the serious injury which is

done, and the hardships which are endured by a class of men whose calling is a dangerous one at the best, it is hardly fair that the Government are not prepared to make any provision in the way of a running board for Canada or other means to protect the lives of the men employed on the railways. He says we cannot make a running board of a certain width, 30 inches, because some of the railways in the United States have not as wide running boards. I ask you if that is a reasonable excuse? The running boards on the cars in the United States are as a rule much wider than those on the cars in Canada; but even if they were not, and it were necessary that a broader running board should be placed on the cars for the protection of the men employed in Canada, we should require the cars to be made with a wider running board. It is useless for the hon. gentleman to say that because one car happens to have a wider running board than another, accidents are more likely to happen. That is not the case. If a number of the cars have a broad running board, there is less danger to the employés than there is when they are all narrow. With regard to the frogs, it is an absolute necessity that they should be filled in, although I am afraid the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Grenville will almost nullify any good effect that might have resulted from the packing of those frogs. I regret exceedingly this committee should have felt justified in accepting this proposition. Looking forward to the use of automatic brakes upon these cars is a fallacy, and the assertion that that is a sort of Rip Van Winkle legislation, shows that the party who made that remark did not fully understand what he was talking about. You may have all the automatic brakes you can place on those cars, the men will still be obliged to go on the top of the cars. Almost every day these automatic brakes go astray, and if you have a train of thirty or forty cars heavily laden, and your automatic brakes will not work, you have no means of controlling them unless you have some men placed so that if they go astray they can at once set the brakes with their hands. The assertion that you will be able to do away with these brakemen is arrant nonsense; for so long as we have cars made as they are, these unfortunate men will be compelled to run from one end of the car to the other. Hon. gentlemen talk about the great parliament of engineers devising some scheme for overcoming all the difficulties, but every one knows full well that for years attempts have been made to grapple with this difficulty, and so far without success, and let the parliament of engineers be as wise as it may, we will have the same difficulties to overcome in the future as we have had in the past. The hon. Minister of Justice said that we should defer dealing with this, and let the Government take power to attend to it. But we know full well that the Government will be influenced by the railway corporations, and we might as well have no clause at all as have a clause of this kind. We should not leave these men, who are compelled to take their lives in their hands in performing their daily work, at the mercy of the Government, leaving it to the Government to bring in a measure to protect them whenever the people on the other side of the line may happen to take a step in that direction. Are we to suffer our people to be destroyed because the Americans have not advanced as rapidly as they should? Now that we have the opportunity of placing on the Statute-book a provision in the interest of railway employés, it is our bounden duty to do so; and if we adopt a two and a half or a three feet running board, and that is found beneficial, the people of the United States will follow our example. If we compel the railway companies to have their running boards project a certain distance from each end of the car, and it is found beneficial, the people of the United States will follow suit. Look at the cars of our own railway trains, and you will find in some of them the

end of the running board broken off, so that the brakemen have frequently to step, while the car is in motion, a distance of three feet or three and a half feet. If we can overcome that difficulty, why should we delay doing so? 200 or 300 people are killed every year in Canada on account of the neglect of this House in not compelling railway companies to look more carefully after their men. The number of men who lose their lives on account of the running boards is much greater than those destroyed on account of the frogs. It is not in the interest of the railway men that the Government should take power to act when they feel disposed, and I would strongly urge upon the Government to at once take a different course and protect the lives of these men.

Mr. HESSON. I am sure we are all in sympathy on this question, which is one of very great importance indeed. I think the brakemen are entitled to all the facilities that can be given them in the difficult work they are pursuing—a work which is dangerous under the best of circumstances. I think there is a difficulty still to be overcome in reference to the difference in the heights of the cars, but I am glad to say there is now a brake which is used on the Lehigh Valley Railroad, called the electric brake, the power being produced from the engine. This brake can be applied to each freight and baggage car, and no matter if even the train breaks it can be made up immediately. The cost is slight, but \$6 on each car, and \$75 on each engine, while the cost of using the automatic air brake is \$300 an engine and \$75 a car. If these brakes on the Lehigh Valley Road are a success, they can be made a success here. There is a Mr. Fuller, a director of the Grand Trunk Railway, who sent me all the particulars in regard to that, and I placed them in the hands of the hon. Minister of Railways and of the Chief Engineer and asked them to give attention to them. I think it is a matter of the greatest importance to our railway men, especially to the brakemen who undertake that dangerous duty on the top of the car. There is a difficulty in regard to one suggestion the hon. gentleman has made as to the width of the running board. If the brakeman thinks he is about to tread on a board 30 inches wide, while it may be only 18 or 20 inches wide on the next car, which is the present ordinary width, there would be greater danger to him than if the width were not increased. There is another difficulty caused by the difference in the height of the cars. Sometimes a brakeman comes to a car 2 feet higher than the one he is on, and he has to get to that in the dark without knowing the difference in the height, and that is very dangerous. I think many improvements might be made. I think the hand rails should be adopted, and I think the appliance for that purpose which the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) showed here on the Table of the House some time ago would be a very valuable improvement. I suggest to the Government the adoption of this electric brake, which has been so very successful on the Lehigh Valley Railway.

Mr. SHANLY. I think this amendment ought to pass. It is very unwise to legislate absolutely as to what you must do in the way of mechanics. The true plan is to give the Government power to adopt the very best thing, because what may be the best thing to-day may not be the best thing next year. There are constant improvements going on, and I think the true policy is that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council should have the power to see that the railways, from time to time, adopt whatever is in the public interest.

Mr. DENISON moved in amendment that the following words be added:—

The oil cups or other appliances used for oiling the valves of every locomotive in use upon any railway shall be such that no employé shall be required to go outside the cab of the locomotive while the same is in motion for the purpose of oiling such valves.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no provision for oil cups, but I am informed by gentlemen who know that this cannot be adopted at present.

Mr. SHANLY. That again looks as if you were legislating for the benefit of patentees or for some syndicate which has been purchasing patents. I do not know of any engines now where the fireman is compelled to go out of the cab to oil the valves. They either oil the valves from within the cab, or by the automatic process, so that there is no necessity for this amendment.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the hon. gentleman is laboring under a mistake. The system of compelling the fireman or the engineer to pass out along the running board and go to the front part of the locomotive, and oil the cylinders from outside, has been in vogue for a number of years. On the Canada Southern, now the Michigan Central, nearly all the locomotives were so built that they had to be treated in that way, and a number of men were killed on account of being compelled to oil the cylinders from this cup which was placed outside. The hon. gentleman need not trouble himself in regard to patentees, because the patents are generally for the purpose of saving the expense of oil to the company and the oiling has to be done in the ordinary way. I think the cylinders should be oiled from the cab, and, if the Minister would incorporate such a provision in his Bill, that the oiling shall be done from within instead of outside, in accordance with what my hon. friend says is now the usual course, I shall be quite satisfied. All that the amendment asks is that the men shall not be compelled to go outside and along the running board. What I complain of is the men having to go along six or eight inch boards at all hours of the night and in storms and every kind of weather, to pass forward to the cylinder in front, where they have no support, because one hand is holding the oil can and with the other they have to raise the cap in order to pour in the oil, so that they have nothing to hold on to. That being the case, and many lives having been destroyed on that account, if it is true that nearly all the cylinders are now oiled from the cab, it is very easy to put that provision into the Bill, and I hope the Minister will accept the amendment.

Mr. SHANLY. I am afraid my hon. friend is a little behind the times, or that the railway that passes through his section is behind the times, because there is no railway of any note now that does not oil either from the cab or by the automatic oilers outside. It is a surprise to me if the Michigan Central is so far behind the times. I think it would be a mistake to make such a cast-iron provision as that which is proposed. Let us have the best which is possible at all times.

Mr. DENISON. If the engines are now oiled in this way, I can see no objection to the amendment being adopted, and if they are not so oiled, the companies should be compelled to adopt that plan.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that the Michigan Central is behind the times.

Mr. SHANLY. You said so, I did not.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). He says that the other railways have automatic oilers. It was in vogue for a length of time, and a great number of men were killed, and representation after representation was made to me by the employés of that road, and so urgent were their demands that I had to have an interview with the principal officers of the road to induce them to yield to the men, and to put on the oil from the can instead of these oil cups.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the hon. member will excuse me, I think there is no objection to the section as it now reads:

Mr. DENISON.

Oil cups or other appliances used for oiling valves on any locomotive used on any railway, shall be such that no employé shall be obliged to go outside of the cab while the same is in motion, for the purpose of oiling the valves.

Another point the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has raised, can be met by a sub-section to section 13, as follows:—

Whenever, after due notice of application therefor, the Railway Committee shall decide that it is necessary in the interest of any municipality that means of drainage shall be provided, or lines of water pipe or other pipe should be laid, or streets made, through, along, across or under, any works or lands of the company, it may, after hearing the parties, direct how and on what terms such drainage may be effected, or water pipes, or other pipes, laid, or streets made, and thereupon it shall be lawful for such municipality to construct such works necessary to carry out such direction, but only under the supervision of such official as the Railway Committee may appoint, and the cost of constructing such work, the cost of supervision and the continued maintenance of the same, shall be paid by such municipality, unless the Railway Committee direct that the company bear some proportion thereof, in which case the company shall bear such proportion as the Railway Committee may decide.

The hon. member for Quebec suggested that a clerk of the peace was not a suitable officer with whom to deposit plans, books of reference, and soon, and we will strike out the words "clerk of the peace" in those sections where they occur, and insert therefor "registrar of deeds."

Mr. MULLOCK. This Act does not apply to Government roads, and I think this provision about the packing of frogs should apply to all roads.

Mr. THOMPSON. It will not do to amend this Bill by making an amendment to the Government Railway Act. This precaution about frog packing will be adopted on the Government railways.

Bill reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That this House meet to-day and also on Friday and Saturday next at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, and that Government measures shall have precedence over all other measures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not propose to object to this motion, although it requires notice, but I think we must have distinct understanding that if we are to meet at 1 o'clock the House will not sit past 1 o'clock in the morning. It cannot be the desire of the Government to deprive the members of an opportunity to consider the Estimates, and if the House sits till 1 o'clock and continues till two, three or four on the following morning on successive days, it becomes physically impossible to consider the Estimates at all. Members cannot remain here for 12 or 14 hours consecutively. If that motion is adopted it must be on the understanding, to which I hope the hon. gentleman will not object, that the House does not sit past 1 o'clock in the morning.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are as much disposed as are hon. gentlemen opposite to leave the House at a reasonable hour, but perhaps without making a promise, I may say we will do our best in the matter. We may find on Friday night that we can do much by remaining an extra hour so as to finish on Saturday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that is possible at all. My position is simply this: the House should not as a mere matter of decency keep such hours as to make it physically impossible that members can be present to consider the Estimates. Members cannot begin at one and continue for even two successive days to stay for 14 hours to get through the business—the thing cannot be done. I need not tell the hon. gentleman that we do not want to prolong the Session; I need not tell him that if there was the slightest disposition to detain the House unnecessarily, it is the easiest thing in the world to do so on the Estimates. I want this matter to be distinctly under-

stood. Nothing will be lost by agreeing to a proposal of this kind.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no doubt we will lose nothing by an understanding of this kind, and we may come to that understanding. We rely on hon. gentlemen opposite to help us carry the business through as rapidly as we can decently do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not in the least degree desirous of postponing in the least degree the business, but if this arrangement were not arrived at, it would be physically impossible for members to do their duty by the Estimates.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2.10 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 17th May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DEBATES TRANSLATORS.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved the adoption of the third report of the Committee on the Official Debates of the House of Commons. He said: Notice of this motion has been given. The object of the report is to recommend the appointment of Messrs. Montpetit, Boisvert and McLeod as permanent translators, at a salary of \$1,000 each. It is recommended that the salary of Messrs. Montpetit and Boisvert should be counted from the beginning of the Session, and that of Mr. McLeod from the 20th April, last. Mr. McLeod is appointed specially to translate from French into English, and the three translators have proved themselves to be very efficient in their work.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Have they been appointed on the same terms as those who were dismissed?

Mr. DESJARDINS. They are appointed to replace them.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Is it understood that they are not to meddle with politics at all?

Mr. DESJARDINS. They are under the control of the Speaker.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I understood that one or two of them were writing for Tory newspapers.

Mr. DESJARDINS. They are under the control of the Speaker.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to oppose the adoption of the report of the Debates Committee; but before it is adopted, I wish to move, seconded by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), the following amendment:

That the said report be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to the said committee with instructions to enquire whether it would not be right and expedient that an indemnity should be granted to Messrs. A. E. Poirier, Kémi Tremblay and Ernest Tremblay, who were dismissed from office.

I need not, Sir, return to the discussion raised by those dismissals, the House having approved of your decision; but as a matter of justice to those gentlemen, who had come here to discharge their duties, and especially as no complaint

has been made as to the quality of their work, I think it would be fair that the committee should recommend to grant them an indemnity, which the committee could determine and report to this House.

Mr. AMYOT. I think these young gentlemen have received a very severe punishment from this House, and that now we ought to deal with them as we would deal with other officers. They were not aware that their services would be dispensed with. They may have refused some other paying work because they wanted to be here at the disposal of the House during the sitting of the House. They were taken by surprise in regard to their dismissal, and they were here waiting for the decision of the House. If they were ordinary employés of ordinary citizens, no one would think of dismissing them without giving them an indemnity. I am not discussing the justice of the decision of the House as far as they are concerned, but, now that they have received their punishment, I think we should give them an indemnity, so that they should not suffer any harm for the time which elapsed at the beginning of the Session, which they spent here. Surely nobody would refuse to reimburse their travelling expenses. They had to be here like the other translators. They had to pay their expenses up and down, and their board during the time they were here, and I think they should be indemnified for it.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry the Government have nothing to say on what I consider a very proper motion. Whatever may have been the fault of these young men, it is well known they are no more guilty than many others in the service, but I will not enter into a discussion on that point. It is to be remembered that the complaint against these gentlemen was made during the last Session, and no action was taken for some five or six months, and consequently they believed their services would be retained, especially since they had given an explanation. They came here at the opening of the Session, expecting they would be employed as usual in the post to which they had been appointed. Therefore, in being dismissed summarily, they lost the opportunity which they might have had of seeking for other employment during the recess. When they came here the first thing they knew they were informed that their services were dispensed with. Under such circumstances it seems to me that since the House has visited them with punishment which seems to have been considered sufficient, that punishment should not extend beyond the dismissal, and that, as a matter of justice, they should receive some compensation for the services they performed, and for the expenses that they incurred.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is exceedingly unadvisable—and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me—to revive a discussion on this matter.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not wish to do so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand the hon. gentleman waives that point. I will not say one word as to the justice or injustice of the claim made in this resolution, but I think it is an inopportune one, and had better be dropped. If the report is sent back to the committee, it will prevent the men who have been employed since, from being paid. That report cannot possibly get through if it is sent back; and I think it would be better that, early next Session, the hon. gentleman should press this motion before Parliament, if he desires. But at present, it answers no good purpose, and will, perhaps, prevent the men who have been doing the work, from getting their pay.

Mr. LAURIER. Since the First Minister has made a suggestion, that this matter can be brought up again at the opening of next Session, I would advise my hon. friend to withdraw his motion.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) After the utterances of the hon. Premier, and owing to the late stage of the Session, I am ready to withdraw my motion.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec Centre). I think there is one point deserving attention, in view of the hon. First Minister's suggestion. I understand these translators had commenced their work, and it was only after the Session had begun that they were informed their services were no longer required.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will not make any promises, but we will consider it before the next Session. It is quite open to the hon. gentleman to move next Session in the matter.

Mr. AMYOT. I wish to say that the work actually done by the translators is very well done indeed. We have men in that office who are most competent, and the salary of \$1,000 a year is not sufficient for men of their merit. I think the Government should devise some means of employing them during the recess so as to increase their salary, and thereby avoid spending large sums paid for doing translating outside. They would then secure to the House the services of very competent men, and prevent them from engaging in politics.

Main motion agreed to.

CLERKS IN THE OFFICE OF HIGH COMMISSIONER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:

Resolved, That the provisions of "The Civil Service Act" and of "The Civil Service Superannuation Act" shall apply to the officers and clerks employed in the office of the High Commissioner for Canada in the United Kingdom, under the authority of the Governor in Council.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will not this have the effect of rendering all these gentlemen pensioners upon us, whereas at present they are not so? They entered their offices under no such stipulation. It may be that hereafter it will not be found expedient to continue that particular office, and in that case I fancy we would have to provide for a number of gentlemen whom, as matters stand, we could dispense with, at any rate, by a moderate gratuity. It seems to me rather inexpedient to take this step. There is a great deal of feeling all over the country over the superannuation list that has already swollen to nearly a quarter of a million a year, and I do not like the idea of unnecessarily adding to it. These gentlemen, probably, could not be employed in Canada, a good many of them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt something in what the hon. gentleman has said, but I think the time has come when it is very desirable these officers should have the same position as the other officers in the Civil Service. I may say here from personal knowledge—and there is an hon. gentleman sitting on the left of the Speaker who, if he were here, could corroborate me in saying that it would be difficult to find in the public service of Canada, gentlemen more deserving, and better qualified, or more assiduous in the performance of their duties. I may also mention that the salaries paid at the present moment are less than the salaries paid in that office in the year 1883-84. There has been no increase in the charge on the public service in that direction; and the \$50 additional that would be added to their salaries by their being under the Civil Service Act, it will only bring the amount of salaries to the point where they were in 1883-84. I do not think it is at all likely that the contingency will ever arise which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, because I believe the experience of the House and of the country has been that the institution of the office of High Commissioner in London has

Mr. LAUBIER.

been a very valuable one in the public interest, and that from the day that appointment was first made, down to the present time, the country has had good value for the money spent in connection with that office. I am quite sure that if the hon. gentleman will investigate what has been done in that department, he will consider it is not at all likely that the office will be dispensed with in future, or that the arrangement that has been so undoubtedly beneficial to Canada, will be changed. But in that contingency I can tell him that there is not an officer in that office who could not be transferred to Canada, and who would not be able to take his place in any department of the public service at Ottawa with great advantage to the service. They are men of unexceptional character in every possible way, they are devoted to their duties, and it is not at all an infrequent thing to find the whole staff there until sunset, and sometimes many of them are employed in the evening. They show the most cheerful readiness in the discharge of their duties.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Might I suggest that if we bring them under the Civil Service Act that will be all changed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think so; at all events, it would be very ungracious to reward devotion to public service by assuming that such would be the result.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have heard the explanations of the Finance Minister, and while I have no doubt that the office of High Commissioner has in the past in many particulars been of service to the country, it has not been an unmixed benefit. It has cost a good deal of money, and, judging from the proposition before the House, it is likely to cost a good deal more before we have done with it. The suggestion made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that there is a possibility of its being done away with in the remote, if not in the immediate future, is quite a possibility. It is quite on the cards; we may get sick of a High Commissioner running back and forwards between London and Canada, and while he is supposed to be doing the duties of High Commissioner he is practically in this country attending to political objects and political purposes. I, for one, am opposed to placing any more pensioners on the Civil Service list, for that is what it will amount to. Those gentlemen of whom the hon. gentleman has spoken so highly, no doubt perform their duties very well; I know nothing about them, and I have had no opportunity of judging as some others may have had; but no matter how well they perform their duties, they receive the pay agreed upon, and a good deal more. I recollect that some few days ago when the expenditure of the High Commissioner's office, as contained in the Estimates, was before the Committee of Supply, I added together items amounting to \$3,200 which one of those gentlemen, Mr. Chipman, receives. The hon. gentleman says that the salaries of that office are not so high as they were some years ago. I do not know what they were then, but they are high enough now. We should not establish in a country beyond the seas a system of superannuation of officers who can perfectly well be done without. I have heard of no difficulty in regard to those gentlemen; I do not believe they will resign their positions if they are not placed on the Civil Service list; I know nothing about those officers, except from the very flattering account given by the Finance Minister, such an account as he always gives when he wishes the salaries of his employés increased or their position advanced and improved. Whatever other hon. members may do I feel it necessary to oppose this Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If I am allowed to say a few words in reply to the hon. gentleman, I hope I may be able to induce him not to oppose this Bill. The hon. gentleman has stated that the High Commissioner for Canada has devoted his time to party politics in Canada. I may say,

and I say it unhesitatingly, that from the first hour I was appointed High Commissioner for Canada down to the time I resigned that office, that is when I vacated my seat in Parliament in 1884, upon my acceptance of the position of High Commissioner, down to the hour I resigned my office, and although I visited Canada on two or three occasions, I steadily and sedulously refused to take the slightest part in party political affairs. My mission to this country on those two occasions was in connection with the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, and the subsequent steps taken in regard to the establishment of an Imperial Institute. My visit was to the various Provinces, and on that occasion I received the hearty support and co-operation of the various Provincial Governments—those to which I was opposed—just as heartily as I did from the central Government with which I was in accord politically. I mention this to the hon. gentleman, because, during my stay in Canada, I was on more than one occasion invited to take part in political meetings, and I refused to do so on the ground that it was not in the public interest that the High Commissioner should take part in such meetings. That was the course I pursued invariably. I acted, of course, in such a manner as to carry out the instructions of the Government as High Commissioner and in sustaining their policy with the Imperial Government or with parties on the other side of the Atlantic as a High Commissioner would be expected to do; but so far as party politics in Canada are concerned I took no part in them, and I adopted that course advisedly from the very feeling which the hon. gentleman seems to hold, and which I share with him, that it is not desirable that a person in that position should be engaged in party politics. Of course when I resigned my office and was called back to take a seat in the Cabinet, the hon. gentleman would not expect me—although still supervising the duties of the office in London, from my personal knowledge and acquaintance with matters and for the public convenience—to avoid taking such action as I felt desirable to take in support of the Government. The second point made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is one which deserves some explanation. It is in regard to the amount drawn by Mr. Chipman, who is accountant and assistant secretary in the High Commissioner's office, in whose name a number of items appear, but in regard to which I will give the hon. gentleman an explanation that will satisfy him as to the entire correctness and propriety of every one of those charges. The first item is to be found at page 37 of the Auditor General's report, \$250. This is salary as private secretary to Minister of Finance, February to June, 1887, five months at \$50 per month, as authorised by Order in Council, No. 510. I have explained to the House that charged as I was not only with the duties of Minister of Finance, but asked by the Government to supervise the duties in connection with the office of High Commissioner, it was absolutely necessary I should have a private secretary equally familiar with the duties here and the duties in the office in London. The hon. gentleman will, therefore, agree as to the propriety of that charge. I may mention incidentally that I scarcely expected the question of expenditure to be raised, when I am prepared to show the House that by performing as far as I was able the duties of the office of Finance Minister and of High Commissioner for Canada, I have effected a saving of \$28,000 of money appropriated by Parliament for those services. The second charge in respect to Mr. Chipman is found at page 45 of the Auditor General's report, \$43.06. These are travelling expenses, as authorised by Order in Council governing payments to public officers for such service. The next is at page 45, \$3.50. These were official cab fares, as per details and vouchers supplied to the Auditor General. All these accounts have been paid by the Auditor General, after the most careful examination and

after having the vouchers submitted. On page 105 there is an item of \$330.95. These are petty cash disbursements as accountant of Colonial and Indian Exhibition. They consist of freight charges, telegrams, postages, railway and 'bus fares of the exhibition staff. This is not a personal charge, and details with vouchers were duly supplied to the Auditor General. At pages 99 and 109 there are items amounting to \$2,199.97. This is salary as assistant secretary and accountant in office of the High Commissioner for Canada, \$1,799.97 from Immigration and \$400 from Archives. Page 119, \$170.33. Travelling expenses as authorized by Order in Council governing such payments to public officers, and for which vouchers have been supplied. Page 119, \$146. Advance on account of contingencies of the office of the High Commissioner for Canada. At the beginning of each financial year the accountant of the London office is, in accordance with an arrangement between the Minister of Agriculture and the Auditor, supplied with an advance of £30, for the payment of telegrams and cables, messengers, railway and 'bus fares, postage, freight, &c. This practice has been in force for some years. It is not a personal charge, and a detailed statement with vouchers was duly forwarded to the Minister of Agriculture for submission to the Auditor General. Page 119, \$40.55. Income tax as authorized to the staff of the London office. The foregoing items appear in different parts of the Auditor General's report. It may be mentioned that during the financial year 1886-87 Mr. Chipman served the Government in the following capacities:—assistant secretary and accountant, office of the High Commissioner for Canada, accountant Colonial and Indian Exhibition, and as private secretary to the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MITCHELL. How much does it amount to in all?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think it is right that the hon. gentleman should ask me, when I have shown that those expenses were for the public service put down necessarily to a particular name, because of the offices he held and the duties he was charged with. The hon. gentleman ought not to ask me what it amounts to altogether, because only \$250 of the whole of the sums named in any way benefited the gentleman, and that was his salary as private secretary. I will hand the hon. gentleman the memorandum, so that he can see for himself the accuracy of the statement.

Mr. LAURIER. It is a policy admitted by all that we should have a High Commissioner in London. So far there is no intention on either side of the House to question the policy admitted some years ago, but there is in connection with the establishment of the office, and the manner in which it has been carried out, a remark that has often suggested itself to the public of Canada. It is admitted on all sides that this office should be removed from the arena of politics, and the hon. the Finance Minister has himself admitted the fact when he took good care just now to tell the House, that from the moment he has been appointed to the high office of High Commissioner he had carefully abstained from interfering in active politics, and that when he visited the continent after the appointment he guarded himself carefully, so as to be altogether removed from the feverish atmosphere of party politics. So far I commend his action, and so far his action would receive the hearty sanction of all parties in this country. But it must strike the hon. gentleman that he has not faithfully adhered to his own conviction and to his own principle. He has not adhered to what he preached some time ago as "fixed principles," because when the hon. gentleman came here the last time or the time before it, he at once engaged in party politics. He came here to run an election for the Government, and he became a member of the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; I ceased to be High Commissioner for Canada.

Mr. LAURIER. That is all very obscure in my mind. He has ceased to be High Commissioner he says, but who has been his successor in office? If the hon. gentleman has ceased to be the High Commissioner, how is it that there is no High Commissioner at London? Now, that office is necessary or it is not necessary. If it is a necessary office, then it requires a head, and the head should be at his office. If it is not necessary, then let us abolish it, and let the hon. gentleman give all his time, and valuable time I admit, and everybody admits, to his party and his country. We entirely object that we should have the dual system of having the office of a High Commissioner in London and no High Commissioner at all. The hon. gentleman will not make the House believe that he has ceased to be High Commissioner. He may have perhaps in fact and in reality in a certain manner, but certainly he has not ceased actually, because if he had ceased to be High Commissioner I presume the Government would have appointed one in his place. I say that this position in regard to this office is intolerable, but I hope that we are now seeing the end of it, and that we shall return to the former practice.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No one can doubt that the hon. gentleman has discharged his public duty in connection with the High Commissionership with great ability and to the general satisfaction of the country. I myself happened to be on a visit in England at a very important time, and I heard in England of the great services which the hon. gentleman had rendered at a very critical moment to the interests of Canada in connection with the quarantining of cattle at Liverpool. The hon. gentleman on that occasion did I believe render a valuable service to his country, but the position in which the hon. gentleman has placed this appointment has tended to lead the public mind in this country to the conclusion that the office can be now dispensed with because that office has been vacant for several years, while the hon. gentleman who formerly filled it has discharged his public duty in this Parliament and to this country. I do not pretend to say that the hon. gentleman has not the right to resign his position there and take another position in this House, but I do say this, that the hon. gentleman, when he resigned that position, should have exercised his influence with the Government to place another person in the position which he vacated. It is perfectly useless for the Government or for hon. gentlemen to try to make this country believe that the office of High Commissioner is necessary when it is not filled, and the manner in which the duties have been discharged would convey the impression to the country generally that the hon. gentleman had been merely kept in that position for party purposes. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman is expecting to return there immediately, but it would look very much like as if he were performing his position here for a time, and rumor has it that the hon. gentleman intends to return very shortly to occupy the position of High Commissioner again. I have no doubt, if he does return, he will fill that office with his usual ability. I do not think, however, that the high office should be held hanging in the balance as it were for years and years, just to suit the convenience of the Government, or any hon. gentleman who may desire to take it. Let the office be filled, or vacated, or let the country understand that the appointment is to be made to it at once. Then we will ascertain the position in which we stand. The hon. gentleman says he never interfered with political life during the time he held the High Commissionership. I am afraid that my hon. friend has a short memory, or that he sometimes at least has a very convenient memory. My hon. friend will remember that at a very critical time in the position of the Government, he left his position in London and came out to Nova Scotia. He visited Antigonish and he "arranged an ar-

Mr. LAURIER.

range," which has become a familiar term in Nova Scotia, in connection with a transaction some years ago which is doubtless familiar to the older members of this House. I repeat he "arranged an arrangement" by which the present distinguished Minister of Justice was taken from the bench in Nova Scotia and transferred to this Parliament. The hon. gentleman on that occasion did not remember how loudly he denounced a similar transaction in Ontario, when a judge was taken from the bench to lead the Government in that Province. He took the Minister of Justice from his position as a judge in Nova Scotia, and carried out this arrangement to a conclusion by which we are indebted to the presence of the hon. Minister of Justice in this House to-day. I think the hon. gentleman will not venture to deny that, because it is familiar to everyone in my Province and in his Province, and we know that but for that arrangement at that time the hon. the Minister of Justice would not be here to-day. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman can hardly say that he has kept aloof from politics during the time he was High Commissioner. Now, to return to this Bill. There is, I admit, something in what the hon. gentleman has said, I think he has a very good staff about him in London, and when I was there I found them very obliging and very anxious to do everything they could for Canadians visiting London. If possible I think the salaries should be fixed so that there would be no discussion of these details in this House. I believe Mr. Chipman is a very deserving and hardworking man, and I dare say the explanations the hon. gentleman has given will be satisfactory to the House. But I would suggest that these expenditures should be entered in such a way so that they would not appear as payments made to him. But I repeat that the hon. gentleman should either resume his position in London or the Government should appoint some one else to fill it.

Mr. TROW. I notice that Mr. Chipman received nearly \$2,000 from the Immigration Department. What is that for?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may explain to my hon. friend that the salaries of all the officers in the High Commissioner's office are charged to immigration; they belong to that department, and that is the entire salary of that officer from that department.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot allow this addition to the public expenditure to pass without raising my voice against it. A very short time ago a deputation waited on the First Minister and strongly urged that the system of superannuation should be done away with altogether. I think the country is alive to the fact that it is quite unnecessary. The civil servants of this country draw very respectable salaries, and they should be able to invest their surplus means like other people and provide for themselves; and I think that this superannuation expenditure, instead of being increased, should be wiped out. When the office of High Commissioner was before the House a short time ago, the hon. First Minister stated that the Finance Minister performed the duties of the double position of High Commissioner and Finance Minister, and only drew the salary of Finance Minister, and that the country was indebted to him for doing so. I have gone through the items in the Auditor General's report, and I find that the amount voted last year for contingencies of the High Commissioner was \$2,500, and in the first six months of his term he spent \$2,748.48, or a little in excess of the amount voted for the whole year. He has drawn for travelling expenses, as Finance Minister, \$943.43, and for cab hire, \$170.73; he has drawn as salary as High Commissioner, \$5,639.92, and as salary as Finance Minister, \$3,010.78; he has drawn on account of expenses connected with the Colonial Exhibition, \$900; he has drawn on account of immigration, \$187; and he drew his indemnity last year; making a total amount of \$14,557.34 which

he drew during the financial year ending the 30th of June last. The First Minister led the House to believe that he was only getting \$7,000 a year as Finance Minister, but I find that he has drawn very nearly double that amount.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In reference to the remarks made by the hon. leader of the Opposition and the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), I may say that I recognise great force in what they have said, and in the position which has been taken in this House on various occasions in reference to the dual offices. The office of High Commissioner and the office of Finance Minister are both very important offices, and it could only be under very exceptional circumstances that the House could approve of the duties being discharged by one and the same individual, whatever saving might be effected to the country. I feel the full force of the objections raised, and I beg to state on behalf of the Government that the state of affairs to which they refer has arisen from entirely exceptional circumstances. In the judgment of my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, it was desirable that I should resume a position in the Government as Finance Minister, and I was called upon to resign the office of High Commissioner and take the position I now hold. What would naturally follow that act under ordinary circumstances would be the appointment of some other gentleman to the position of High Commissioner; but it so happened that there were a number of very important questions in regard to which I had been in communication with Her Majesty's Government in the capacity of High Commissioner, and my right hon. friend felt that under the peculiar circumstances it would be better for me to continue to supervise the duties of that office, not as a permanent arrangement, but for a comparatively short period, than to appoint a new officer who would not have the advantage of the same personal acquaintance with those questions, and not be able to deal with them in the same way.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How long is the present arrangement to continue?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend will have patience, the difficulties on that score will be very speedily removed; I say that in very strict confidence to him. Now, I may say to my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that not one shilling has been drawn by me, either as salary or contingencies for the office of High Commissioner of Canada, by any direct or indirect action, from the hour I resigned the office down to the present time. The hon. gentleman has been misled by confusing payments made for an anterior period which do not apply to the present time. If the hon. gentleman will go to the office of the Auditor General, I will ask that officer to give him the fullest evidence that from the hour I resigned the office of High Commissioner down to the present time, not one farthing of the \$2,000 voted for contingencies for the High Commissioner, has been drawn; nor could it be with so vigilant an officer as we have for Auditor General, even if there was a disposition to do it. The hon. gentleman knows that I had occasion to go to London as Finance Minister during recess, and to spend several months there, and although I supervised the duties of the office of High Commissioner during that time, no charge was made. If the hon. gentleman will compare the travelling expenses which he has referred to with those of any other Minister, he will find that they are exceedingly moderate. The amounts voted and the payments made for salaries and contingencies since 1883-84 were as follows:—

Year.	Amt. voted.	Amt. paid.	Amt. saved.
1883-84	\$14,000	\$ 5,045.00	\$ 8,955.00
1884-85	14,000	12,000.00	2,000.00
1885-86	12,000	12,000.00
1886-87	12,000	6,849.60	5,150.40
1887-88	12,000	12,000.00
	<u>\$64,000</u>	<u>\$35,894.60</u>	<u>\$28,105.40</u>

So that the saving effected during those years while I was connected with the office, have been no less than \$28,105.40.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would not have drawn the attention of the House to this matter had not the hon. the First Minister attempted to lead the House to believe that the salary of the High Commissioner was only \$7,000; or at least that he only drew the salary of Finance Minister, and that his salary as High Commissioner was saved to the country. I am glad to find that the hon. the Minister of Finance admits that my statement is correct. The only item I will now draw the attention of the House to is the item of contingencies for which we voted \$2,000 last year. But although the hon. gentleman only occupied the position some six months, I find that estimate has been exceeded.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 136) to amend chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the High Commissioner for Canada in the United Kingdom.

Bill read the first and second times, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. Who compose the staff?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Colmer, the secretary to the office of High Commissioner; Mr. Chipman, accountant; Mr. Just, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Howard and Mr. Luko, third class clerks. There are two messengers who are not proposed to be included in the civil service, but are simply employed.

Mr. LAURIER. Under this section you are taking very large powers. You are giving the Governor in Council power to increase the staff at will. I do not believe that in this case public officers should be appointed without the previous consent of the House, which consent is exacted in all other cases.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No doubt the hon. gentleman is quite right in principle; but we cannot treat these officers in the same way as you can others in the Civil Service. I have given the hon. gentleman the evidence that, so far as these officers are concerned, even with the addition of the \$50 from the 1st July last, the expenditure will not be increased beyond what it was in 1883. The hon. gentleman knows that the Government must come to the House more especially under this Bill than now. At the present these officers are connected with the immigration staff, and paid out of the immigration fund, and the object of this Bill is to bring under the supervision of this House, every addition to the salary of these officers.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has not answered the objection. We have not such great confidence in the Government as to give them this unlimited power of appointment.

Mr. LAURIER. We are going to put these officers on the same footing as other officers in the employ of the Government, and, under such circumstances, we should follow the practice of being informed in advance how many officers should be employed, and their positions and salary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that there will be two chief clerks and four third class clerks.

Mr. LAURIER. You have the power to make the number eight or ten or any number you choose. Have you not power to appoint ten officers under that provision?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You would not have any money to pay them. You cannot pay them any longer out of the immigration funds. You must get a vote of Parliament for the purpose.

Mr. MITCHELL. That would not trouble you at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A series of Governor General's warrants would settle the difficulty.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see why there should be any special suspicion in regard to the Department of the High Commissioner, because this language is used in regard to every other department. Of course we know that the Governor in Council may appoint as many officers as he likes, but they must work gratuitously until Parliament votes their salaries. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) says that Parliament will vote whatever the Government propose. We cannot help Parliament having sufficient confidence in us to vote what we propose.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman is not initiating this very vicious practice—I will do him the justice to say that—but he is simply following a very bad example.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Which the hon. gentleman religiously carried out.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is one point in regard to this to which I desire to call attention. These officers in the High Commissioner's office are exempt from examination under the Civil Service Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That, as I explained, is also a necessity.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If my hon friend will allow me to finish, I was about to say that this applies to their appointment in London, but, supposing they came out here, would they also be exempt?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, they would be dealt with under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That should be provided for.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If they were transferred it would be different. They are only exempt as officers in the High Commissioner's office, and that exemption ceases the moment they are called upon to act here.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Bill does not say so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That follows as a matter of course, because the exemption would be gone.

On section 3,

Mr. COOK. Are the present officials all natives of Canada?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The secretary, Mr. Colmer, is a gentleman of exceptional ability and has shown great devotion to his duties, as I think my hon. friend (Mr. Cook) knows, because he had an opportunity, I think, of making the personal acquaintance of Mr. Colmer. That gentleman went over from Canada with my distinguished predecessor, Sir Alexander Galt, when he was first appointed High Commissioner. Mr. Colmer was then living in Montreal. Then there is Mr. Chipman, who is a Canadian, who was born in this country and has always lived here, except when he was away in connection with his duties in that office. Mr. Howard is also a Canadian, and I think there are three of the third class clerks who are not.

Bill reported.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. To-morrow.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I should like to know, Mr. Speaker, if the Orders of the Day have been called?

Mr. SPEAKER. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then how does this Bill come up at all for the third reading?

Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. LAURIER. It is not to be read a third time now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It comes on the resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems that the irregularity which attaches to the dual office of High Commissioner must extend to all the matters connected with that office, and I suppose we must let it slide.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to ask where is that mortgage which was promised us in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway? It was agreed that it should be laid upon the Table.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I asked my hon. friend the Minister of Justice to expedite that as much as possible, but he informs me that the pressure on his department has been so great that it has not been possible to have that finally executed. I hope, however, that it will be possible to get it finished so as to lay it on the Table.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would remind the hon. gentleman that that was a positive pledge, that we should have that laid upon the Table before we separated, and it was on that account that the Bill was allowed to leave the House without a good deal of further debate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is quite true.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So I presume it will be laid upon the Table for our information, even if it is only in manuscript.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Every effort will be made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was another document which the Minister of Justice promised, and that was the letter in regard to which we had some discussion last night. Where is that?

Mr. THOMPSON. I am sorry that I was not in the House when the reference was made to the mortgage, or I would have asked my colleague not to make a binding promise to lay that on the Table so soon. The delay is not in consequence of time required to draw the mortgage, so much as to consider a number of details which require very careful consideration and adjustment before they are finally approved by the Governor in Council. I will endeavor to bring that down before the close of the Session.

FISHERY REPORTS.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia when he will bring down the papers in reference to the superannuation of Sergeant Valiquette? He promised to have those papers submitted to the House some days ago, and it will be necessary to have them submitted before that motion is assented to. I would also enquire again from the hon. Minister of Marine what has become of his reports? In a day or two, no doubt, we are to be called upon to consider the estimates for the fishery branch of his department, and I shall feel it my duty to challenge every vote in that department, and divide the House upon it, if there is no other way in which I can show the feeling we have as to the extraordinary want of attention in his department in bringing down the reports. It is unpardonable, and it is impossible to consider these items properly unless we have these reports.

Mr. FOSTER. I have already made two explanations in regard to that report and I have nothing further to explain. It is not on account of any laxity or dilatoriness on the part of any of the officers of my department. This is a report which comes up to the end of the year. The inspectors make up their reports to the end of the year, that is to the 31st December. We do not get those reports, at

the earliest, until the middle of January. Then they are compiled in the Department, and the compilations are very long and intricate. This year these reports were in the hands of the printers as early as they were last year, or as they have been generally, and the department has not been one iota guilty of delaying the report. The hon. gentleman is quite aware of the peculiar state in which our printing stands at the present time, the contract having been renewed for a year or until the printing bureau is built. I cannot get any proof from the printers. I have not had any proof for three weeks. In consequence of my report finishing with the calendar year, it gets into the hands of the printers after all the other reports are in. The reports of the other departments get ahead of my report, and there are departments that get their reports in early which have not yet received from the printers those reports for distribution. I cannot get mine from the printers; I cannot do the work myself, and the officers of my department cannot do it. I know that it is too bad that this delay should take place, and I am very sorry for it, but I will not take the fault on myself, because it is not my fault or the fault of the officers of the department.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Would it not be better for the hon. Minister to change the date of the issue of his report, and instead of making it the calendar year, make it to accord with the parliamentary year. Let us have the book at the proper time. I do not wish to find fault unnecessarily, but the hon. gentleman will see that the book coming down to-day, we will have to go into the discussion of these estimates without having had an opportunity of examining it.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend forgets that the fishing season commences at the beginning of the summer or the end of the spring, and to have the report issued in the middle or in the first month of the fishing season, would be awkward and unsatisfactory.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The fishing season does not differ from the crop season.

Mr. TROW. The excuse given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the delay in the printing of his department, is certainly not founded, because there is a tacit understanding between the Government and the present contractor that his contract shall not expire, at all events, till next October, if not till December. He is going on with the work as usual, and has been for the last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Not as usual.

Mr. TROW. There is no reason why his report should not be printed as early as any other report.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend disputes the assertion that I make in my place, that is all right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is exceedingly unfortunate that the Government business is conducted in such a fashion at this. There is no possibility of discussing these estimates intelligently or intelligibly unless we know what has been done with the money that has been spent during the last year. Whether the fault is with the printer or the Government, we find ourselves in this extraordinary position of things, that perhaps on the very next item, we shall be called upon to discuss appropriations involving a large sum of money, absolutely without any information before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is not correct, because the explanations have been made of the expenditure in the Fisheries Department for the last calendar year.

BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I promised yesterday to state what measures would be proceeded with, and what

would stand over. In the first place, the third reading of the Act to amend and consolidate the Railway Act, will be taken. The Bill (No. 88) to abolish Forfeitures for Treason and Felony, the Minister of Justice says does not press, and in consequence of the lateness of the Session, he will allow it to stand over until next Session, when he will introduce it early in the Session. We will go on with Bill (No. 38) to amend the Act respecting Patents of Invention; also with the resolution to provide for the appointment of a Deputy Commissioner of Patents of Invention. Bill (No. 100) respecting the application to Canada of the Criminal Law of England, will stand over, by consent of the Minister of Justice, until next Session. We will proceed with the resolution respecting the salaries of Judges of Provincial Courts, also with Bill (No. 17) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act; also Bill (No. 123) to amend the Criminal Procedure Act. We will not go on with Bill (No. 124) to amend the Copyright Act, which will stand over until next Session. We will proceed with the Bill (No. 125) to amend the North-West Territories Representation Act; also with Bill (No. 131) to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

THE RAILWAY ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved third reading of Bill (No. 24) to amend and consolidate the Railway Act.

Mr. LISTER moved in amendment that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to committee with instructions to add the following clause as section 311:—

No railway company incorporated under any Act of the Parliament of Canada, shall grant a complimentary pass to any member of the Senate or Commons of Canada.

Motion negatived on division.

Mr. EDGAR. In reference to clause 295 of this Bill, I propose to offer an amendment. By that clause very severe penalties are imposed upon officers and servants of a railway company for breach of the by-laws and rules and regulations of the company. The penalties extend to \$400 fine and to imprisonment for five years. When we look at the nature of the crime or misdemeanor which is referred to in the clause, we see that the violation of these rules and regulations of the company which causes injury to any person or party, or exposes any person or party to a risk greater than would have been incurred without such violation, even although no actual injury resulted, is a misdemeanor for which very severe punishment in this section is provided. It is safe on the whole to allow a very severe penalty, although I do not think if the House was fixing one for the first time they would agree to such a heavy penalty as this. Certainly we should take care that we are not making the employes of the railway liable to those heavy penalties, without making it perfectly clear that they have notice and information in regard to those regulations. While it is perfectly true that ignorance of the laws of the land does not excuse anyone, it is also true that ignorance of the by-laws and regulations of the railway company should excuse the employes. We should, however, take care that they have the information placed in their hands, and they should be notified in a proper way before they are made liable to those severe fines and penalties. The clause provides that a copy of the rules or regulations must be delivered to the employe, or it must have been posted up in the premises where he is employed. So, under the clause as it stands, it is not necessary to give the means of actual knowledge of the offence to an employe, but simply to post up the regulations, which, I suppose, in the case of some of the large companies, will amount to almost a volume, in some remote part of the works of the company, where any of the employe's duties may take him at any time. When that has been done he is supposed to know

the whole contents, and be liable to be sent to the penitentiary for five years for a breach of those regulations, even if no injury occurs from the breach. I do not think that is fair; and I propose, not to reduce the penalties, not to alter the nature of the crime, but simply to provide by altering the word "or" into "and" so that in addition to delivering those copies to the employés, notices should also be posted up in the places where they work. It was argued on a former occasion in committee on this Bill that it was not fair to call upon the companies to deliver copies of the regulations to their servants, that it would be too much trouble to the companies, and that it was the business of the railway employé to go and find out the regulations and read them on the wall in some remote part of the premises. That cannot be so, because under another section of this Bill it is already provided that all those by-laws and regulations of the company shall, so far as they relate to the conduct or service of employés of the company, be given to every officer, servant and employé affected. I therefore move:

That this Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending section 295 therein, by striking out the word "or," which occurs in the sixth line, and inserting "and" in place thereof.

Mr. THOMPSON. This matter was very fully considered in committee last night, and there was no disposition to force too stringent a rule with respect to the violation of the by-laws and regulations; but I feel bound to present to the House this afternoon the reasons which justify, I think, the retention of the clause. In the first place, the section has been in the Railway Act ever since a Railway Act was adopted by this Parliament, and in all probability before that and when the enactment was the enactment of the Provincial Parliament. It has never in any one instance been found to be oppressive in the slightest degree. It is purely for the protection of the travelling public, and it is necessary, in the interests of the travelling public and for their safety, that no officer of the company should wilfully neglect or disobey regulations made by the company, the Minister or the Railway Committee for the safety of life and property on the road. It is only in respect to officers of that kind that the penalties can be inflicted, and then only for wilful or negligent disobedience of orders. While it is true that the penalties may be severe, notwithstanding that no injury might occur, under the circumstances it is absolutely necessary to have severe penalties. The penalty actually inflicted may be but a very light one; on the other hand, it may be a severe one, although no actual injury ensued, because it may have been a wilful disobedience of orders in consequence of which the safety of life and property along the road was jeopardised. The procedure is the very best and most liberal in the interests of the officers that can be devised. The offence is a misdemeanor; the offender has to be indicted and to be convicted by a petit jury, before punishment can be inflicted. Under the circumstances the provision is well guarded. I think, generally speaking, it is in the interests of the officials that notices should be posted up, because many of them are cautions and indications in regard to the daily work of the officers, and if we require in addition, before an employé can be held responsible for wilful or neglectful disobedience of orders, that the company should prove the serving of the orders upon him, the possibility of ever putting the clause into operation will be very remote indeed.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not imagine that the argument advanced by the Minister of Justice is sufficient to induce this House to do that which would be an injustice to any employé of any railway. I think that the statement made by him, that although this clause had been on the Statute-book for a number of years and that it is not in force or has not been enforced up to the present time, is no reason why

Mr. EDGAR.

it should be any longer on the Statute-book. It certainly is a very severe clause. It is a clause that might in the case of some railways be used with a good deal of injustice to those who are compelled to follow the calling of an employé on the railroad. What is more, I think the reason why this clause ought to be amended in the way my friend said is this: that we find, if we look through the clause, that it is not necessary on the part of the company to see that their employés have the notices placed in their possession. The company merely posts them up upon some portions of the building around the station, and the attention of the employés not having been called to such alterations or change in the article, the employé may not know his duty, which he would know if it were placed in his hands. Under the present law it will be held that he has negligently done his duty on account of not being constantly looking for the regulations and by-laws. I say this is a gross injustice to the employé. If the Government had consented to amend the Bill so as to place those by-laws in the hands of the employés there would have been some excuse for this remaining as it is, and it would give a certain amount of protection to the employés, which they do not possess now. I do not suppose that the Government desire to do injustice either to the employé or to the railway company. The desire of this Parliament ought to be to try and treat fairly and justly all alike, but it will be felt by those who are the employees of these companies, that the Parliament of Canada is dealing out to the different classes different kinds of legislation. They will feel that there is one legislation for the classes and another for the masses. Therefore, I feel it would be to their interests, as well as to the interests of the employés, that they should consent to this amendment being incorporated in the Bill.

Mr. McNEILL. I think there is a great deal of force in the argument raised by the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. So much was I impressed with the force of it that I supported the proposal last night, but after thinking over it, it occurs to me that there was a great deal of weight in the objection that had been urged against it, as to the very great difficulty of serving by the company on each of the employés all the regulations which might from time to time be put in force. I thought that all we desired would be secured if this clause itself were served upon the employés, so that in that way their attention might be called to the danger in which they stood, and that they should be so warned to read the notices which were posted up. I think it would be sufficient if this clause were posted up with all the other regulations that were necessary, and if it were personally served on the employés, calling their attention to the peril in which they stood if they did not comply with the regulations which were posted up, and which it was within their power to read if they pleased. I do not think there can be any possible objection to that, for I think it would be a simple matter to serve a notice of this kind.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that my friend the Minister of Justice did not rightly comprehend the amendment which has been made by the member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar). I quite agree with him that the amendment does not at all controvert the principle, and I agree with him further that there should be a most severe penalty inflicted on the employé who wilfully, or indeed even negligently, breaks a rule which is devised for the safety of the travelling public. No one can object to that, and as far as that goes the penalty in the Bill is not a severe one. At the same time, the hon. gentleman I am sure would not inflict such a penalty upon an officer who had no opportunity to see the rule against which he had contravened. The object of the clause, and the object of this amendment as well, is the safety of the public, and the clause is just in the same

spirit in which the amendment is framed. This amendment is calculated to make it doubly sure that the company will see that the employes are properly notified, not only technically by the posting of the notices, but also directly by handing to the employe all the rules which he has to obey. It is no hardship to inflict this obligation upon the company, and to force the company whenever they issue a new rule to have it not only posted on the walls of the office, and call upon the employes there to go and read it, but to hand every employe a copy of those rules, so that he may know them.

Mr. McNEILL. That would mean all the rules heretofore published. Why not hand the employe a copy of this clause? I think that would be sufficient.

Mr. LAURIER. Let the employe be handed such rules as he has to obey. The company would have to give a copy of the rules to each of their employes, but as the provision is at present instead of doing that they have a book in the office as we all know, which may be as thick as the statute we have in our hands. Do you expect that each employe will in his turn read all those rules? No, it cannot be expected. But place in his hands a copy of a book which contains the rules; and this can be done whenever a new man is appointed. When the employe comes to be paid he can be handed a copy of the rules at the same time, and if he has been notified of what is expected of him, and if he breaks the rule, let the punishment be as severe as it can be against him.

Mr. CURRAN. I have listened with pleasure to the remarks of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and more particularly with reference to the first object aimed at in this clause, wherein he states that he thoroughly agrees with the Bill, inasmuch as "wilfully" and "negligently" are both cases in which the public should be protected. In that, of course, he is not in unison with what other gentlemen on that side of the House, who have already spoken, have said. I must say that I also agree with him in regard to the alteration that has been made by the suggested amendment. The fact is, I think that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice apprehends that greater difficulty will be caused than actually can be caused in cases of this kind. We know that railway companies are organised in a peculiar way, and that each branch is superintended by a foreman. Now, it would be the duty of the foreman in each case to hand to each man working under him a copy of any rules and by-laws that may be passed in a general way. He would take note of the time of the delivery of this book containing those rules and regulations; that he had handed over such a copy of the rules and regulations, and in like manner any subsequent rule or by-law, to each of the persons in his charge; taking a note of the time of delivery. I can hardly conceive that the difficulty of making proof of service would be so great as my hon. friend the Minister of Justice anticipates. Under these circumstances, I am satisfied that the law would be just as easily enforced, the public would be as well protected, and even the semblance of complaints would be removed from those in whose interest this amendment is being urged. It is in the highest degree desirable that no class of the community should have even a sentimental grievance, and in this case I think the change of the word from "or" to "and" would satisfy all parties, and would not impair the efficiency of the law or the protection to which the public are entitled.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it would take away entirely the slight measure of protection which the public have now. It is all very well for us to debate this matter from a sentimental point of view, and to consider how reasonable and how fortunate it is, if we can please, by a few amendments, the sentimental views of classes who, perhaps, are a potent

influence in this country. But, Sir, the travelling public, who exercise no influence in the passage of this Bill, ought to be heard likewise, and we ought to consider, not the sentimental grievances or the sentimental wants of a particular class, but the interests of those who pass over these roads year after year, with no possible protection to their lives and property except what this Legislature gives them. Now, I venture to say that with such an amendment it would be almost an absolute impossibility to secure a conviction for the grossest wilful disobedience of regulations entailing the risk of a large number of lives. The hon. member who leads the Opposition suggests that a copy of the rules and regulations should be given every month to the persons who come to receive their wages. He probably knows that many of these officers change almost weekly in various places, and that the employes of some of these companies number thousands. One company was mentioned last night as having at least 5,000 employes, and if every one of these had to be given a copy of the regulations every month, the company would have to distribute 60,000 a year. And it is not a mere question of serving a copy of by-laws on an employe, but a question of proving the contents of those by-laws and the correctness of the copies produced in court in case of a trial for an offence under this Act; and everybody knows that when it comes to a question of proving that the copy delivered was an exact copy of the by-laws, all chances of conviction vanish into thin air; especially as we have to deal with the cases of 5,000 every month, or perhaps every week. The objection is not only a sentimental one, but it is absolutely without any practical force whatever. The provision of the clause requires, as I said, before an indictment and conviction, that there must be proof that the officer has disobeyed wilfully or negligently; and down to this hour no conviction has taken place. The clause, acting as a menace, has given some protection to the public, and has not been required to be enforced.

Mr. LISTER. There is a great deal of force in what the Minister of Justice says; but with regard to his statement of the difficulty a railway company might have in furnishing to each of its employes a copy of the rules and regulations, I will point out to him that it is not necessary that 60,000 copies should be given to the men every year. We all know that the companies have their rules and regulations printed and bound in small book form; and if there is any change made in them—and my information is that changes are not frequent—all that would be necessary would be to give the officers copies of any additional rules when these are adopted by the company. So that there would be no great hardship thrown on the companies, and the men would be certainly informed what their duties are and what the consequences would be of non-fulfilment. It is all very well to say that the public ought to be protected. That is correct; but you ought not to protect the public by doing an injustice to the large body of men who are working on the railways of this country. It is their right to know what the laws governing them are, and the only way you can be certain that they do know or ought to know is by bringing those rules and regulations distinctly under their notice. If there is no such provision, they may see the rules or they may not; but if they are given these rules, and do not acquire a perfect knowledge of them, they ought to be held liable for the consequences. I think the amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) ought to be accepted by the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is quite possible to meet this case both in justice to the railway companies, in justice to the employes, and in justice to the travelling public. When a person is employed on a railway, he

knows, from the nature of his duties, that he has to be on the alert, and to inform himself as to what is required of him. What is required of him by this section is not something merely in the interest of the company, but in the interest of the whole public. Now, it might be possible to impose a duty on the railway company as well, which will meet the case. I have drafted a clause which, perhaps, the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Justice, will view favorably. It is as follows:—

The company shall at all times keep posted up in conspicuous places, convenient to where the work or duties of any employees are to be performed, and accessible to such employes, copies of all by-laws, rules and regulations of the company, touching the duties of such employes; and every such employe shall be entitled to demand to receive from the company for his own use a copy of every such by-law, rule or regulation.

Under that, when a man enters the service of the railway, he is told that he has certain duties to perform. There is within his reach a copy of the by-laws, which he may peruse if he desires to do so; but as it is not likely he would have the time or the convenient opportunity to do so, I would place it within his power to demand for his own use, copies, and if the railway company makes default in supplying copies of these rules and regulations, it shall be subjected to severe penalties, under the penal clauses of the Act. Thus we have a penalty on a company for not placing in the possession of the employe those rules which ought to guide him in the discharge of his duties, and we also have the obligation on the part of the employe to obey those rules. If, under this Act, this amendment is adopted the employe has at once the right to obtain a copy of these rules and regulations, and having that right, it is not too much to call on him to ask for the copies. If he declines to do so, I do not think we can excuse him for not taking that much trouble. Where there is a general manager or a small executive and a vast army of employes, we must call upon all to contribute a little towards the common end in view.

Mr. EDGAR. The objection I see to that is this: that it throws upon the employe not only the liability to know what these rules and regulations are, but also the liability to hunt them up himself.

Mr. MULOCK. To ask for them.

Mr. EDGAR. Well, that is an additional responsibility thrown on the employe. More than that, the objection has been raised that it is too much to ask the company to deliver these to the employe. This does not get over that difficulty, as it still requires the company to hand them to all the employes when they ask for them; and if it is to be of any use they should all ask for them. The responsibility should be thrown simply on the company to furnish their employes, who are not so very numerous, with these copies, and to post them up besides.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would call the attention of the hon. member for North York to the provision already contained in the Bill on this subject. According to section 221, "a printed copy of so much of any by-law, rule or order as relates to the conduct of any employe of the company, shall be given to every such employe." So that it is the duty of the company to give the notice, and the employe cannot be punished unless it has been given to him. As regards the suggestion of the hon. member for Bruce, with regard to the propriety of bringing by-laws to the notice of the employes, I think that before any by-law is assented to it should be made a condition that it should be posted up. It would not be desirable that we should debate again on the third reading of the Bill all these amendments which were proposed in committee, and be obliged to go back into committee. I would be glad to give the most patient and careful consideration to the Bill again, but we have really

Mr. MULOCK.

reached a stage of the Session when it is almost impossible to delay any longer.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there anything in the Bill requiring the company to post up the notices?

Mr. THOMPSON. An employe cannot be punished unless the notice has been posted up in a conspicuous place.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It is to be regretted that this Bill was not introduced at an earlier stage. When the Bill was in committee I was inclined to favor the clause as it stood. I thought the penalty, where there was no actual loss of life or property, was too severe. If that was eliminated, I would propose to leave the clause as it stands. It is rather hard upon the employes that because a notice is put up, they should be amenable to a penalty. The hon. the Minister of Justice said it was difficult to serve a large number of employes with notices, but they are scattered over all the different stations, and each station master should see that the men under his supervision were served with these copies. I have changed my view, and I think that before making any railway employe liable to a heavy penalty it should be shown that he was notified of the by-law.

Mr. McNEILL. Would it not be quite fair to call the attention of the employe to the danger in which he stood, and to the by-law within his reach?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The practice of railway companies is to serve all the by-laws on the employes.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is not only a practice but it is the law, and there are heavy penalties if the companies do not do it.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Edgar :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Edwards,	McMillan (Huron),
Bain (Wentworth),	Eisenhauer,	McMullen,
Barron,	Fiset,	Meigs,
Beausoleil,	Fisher,	Mitchell,
Béchar, d,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Perry,
Borden,	Guay,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Purcell,
Bowman,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Brien,	Jones (Halifax),	Rowand,
Burdett,	Labrosse,	Ste. Marie,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Landerkin,	Scriven,
Casey,	Lang,	Somerville,
Cockburn,	Langelier (Quebec),	Trow,
Cook,	Laurier,	Turcot,
Curran,	Lister,	Watson,
Dessaint,	Livingston,	Weldon (St. John), and
Edgar,	Lovitt,	Wilson (Elgin).—54.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bergeron,	Girouard,	Masson,
Bergin,	Godbout,	Mills (Annapolis),
Bowell,	Gordon,	Montague,
Boyle,	Grandbois,	Montplaisir,
Brown,	Guilbault,	O'Brien,
Bryson,	Guillet,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Cargill,	Hale,	Perley (Ottawa),
Carling,	Hall,	Porter,
Carpenter,	Hesson,	Prior,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Hickey,	Putnam,
Chapleau,	Jamieson,	Reid,
Chisholm,	Joncas,	Riopol,
Choquette,	Jones (Digby),	Robillard,
Cimon,	Kenny,	Roome,
Cochrane,	Kirkpatrick,	Skinner,
Coiby,	Labelle,	Small,
Corby,	Landry,	Smith (Ontario),
Costigan,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Sproule,
Coughlin,	Laurie,	Stevenson,
Coulombe,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Taylor,
Daly,	Macdowall,	Temple,
Daoust,	Mackenzie,	Thompson,
Davis,	McOulla,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Dawson,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tyrwhitt,

Denison, Desjardins, Dickinson, Dupont, Ferguson (Renfrew), Ferguson (Welland), Foster, Freeman, Gigault,	McDougald (Pietou), McGroevy, McKay, McLellan, McMillan (Vaudreuil), McNeill, Madill, Mara, Marshall,	Yanasse, Wallace, Weldon (Albert), White, Wilmot, Wilson (Argenteuil), Wilson (Lennox), and Wood (Westmoreland— 93.
---	---	---

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. member for North Norfolk has not voted.

Mr. CHARLTON. I paired with the hon. member for South Norfolk.

Bill read the third time and passed.

PATENTS OF INVENTION.

Mr. CARLING moved second reading of Bill (No. 38) to amend the Acts respecting patents of invention.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose the hon. gentleman intends to give the commissioner of patents, whom he is going to appoint, charge of the copyright branch as well as the trade marks branch, because I do not think it is likely that when there is a Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Patents, as is proposed there shall be, the administration of the copyright law and the trade marks law will remain with him.

Mr. CARLING. The patent branch of the department has grown so much that it is necessary to have someone of legal knowledge to look after it. The number of patents issued by the department some ten years ago was 1,258, now it is 2,850, and the receipts now are \$76,000, which pay the expenses of all the officers of the department. As there are a great many legal points which come up connected with the issue of patents, it is important that someone with legal knowledge should be at the head of that branch.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is this the position to which it is understood the late Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is to be transferred from the one he so unworthily filled before?

Mr. CARLING. It is thought necessary to have a gentleman with legal knowledge, but who will be appointed I am not able to say.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is pretty well understood that Mr. Pope is to have the position.

Mr. CARLING. He may or he may not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is a partial admission, at all events. He is to be taken from the office where he disgraced himself, where he violated his oath of office, either of his own accord or by the direction of the Government or some members of the Government, and put himself in a criminal position, although the real criminals were on the Treasury benches, and he is to be rewarded by the passing of an Act for his particular benefit and under which he will have a larger salary. I cannot for myself allow such an Act to pass without expressing the very strong views which I entertain in regard to it, and I must oppose such a provision, unless I felt that the office was to be filled by someone in whom the public could have confidence, as certainly they cannot have confidence in Mr. Pope in any office that he might occupy.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Agriculture tells us that the deputy is to be a professional man, a member of the legal profession, I suppose, but there is nothing in this clause to assure that he should have that qualification. Is it intended that he shall have this qualification?

Mr. CARLING. That is the intention.

Mr. EDGAR. Why is it not put in the Act? I should also like to ask whether this officer is to deal with copyrights in addition to patents, or whether copyrights are to be left to the Deputy Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. CARLING. I think I have already mentioned to the hon. gentleman that this appointment is confined to the patent branch.

Mr. EDGAR. And has nothing to do with copyrights?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. EDGAR. That remains with the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. CARLING. It remains with the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to ask if this is the department to which a gentleman of the name of Pope has been transferred, and if so, if that is the gentleman who managed to keep my return from being filed for three weeks, so that my opponent should have an opportunity of entering a protest against me?

Mr. CARLING. I do not know that Mr. Pope kept back any return. Mr. Pope is now in the Department of Agriculture, and he is certainly an excellent officer.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not ask the hon. gentleman to state whether Mr. Pope kept back the return, but I asked if this was the same Mr. Pope. I do not think it is to the credit of this Government that a man who was arraigned before this Parliament and was found guilty, should be put by the Government in an important position of this kind, involving millions of dollars. It may fall into his hands to deal with these questions of patents, and there are many cases in which people would pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to have their patent confirmed or to have the application of others rejected, and it is in a position of that kind that Mr. Pope has been put, a man who has been convicted by Parliament as Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of perverting the position he occupied in regard to the seats of members in this House. I think it is a disgrace to this Government to put such a man in that position, and it certainly will not create confidence in the country in regard to this Government if such a man as that is put there, for what purpose I do not know, though the Government may.

Mr. COOK. The return for East Simcoe was held back, and the return for North Simcoe was gazetted immediately after it was received in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. As to East Simcoe, I know that they were hunting for evidence up to the very day when the time for presenting the petition would lapse. They had not sufficient evidence to unseat the candidate, and this gentleman, I suppose by the advice of some hon. gentlemen of the Government, kept the return until their friends in the county of East Simcoe could get evidence to unseat the successful candidate. If it had been necessary to file a petition on the other side, if it had not been for a disagreement in the Tory ranks, and if it had not been that I did not care about settling the Tory differences there, I would have filed a cross petition, and could have shown that they spent from \$15,000 to \$20,000 in that election. I know that in one township they expended \$3,000. I did not feel inclined to do that, because I rather desired to allow the Tories to skin their own skunk, and I did not propose to do it for them. I was seriously injured by this man in regard to my election, and, as has been stated, he perjured himself in regard to this, and it is most objectionable that such a man should be appointed to occupy a position where matters involving thousands of dollars will come before him, in regard to which he will have to adjudicate, because, if he will disregard his oath in matters of this kind, there is no guarantee

that he will not accept money in regard to these other matters.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I was surprised, though perhaps I should not have been surprised, at the remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture. He says that Mr. Pope is a very efficient officer. He occupied a position prior to the one he is now occupying, and no doubt the Government found him a very efficient officer, and also a very useful officer in their interests; and, for the course that he pursued, for his conduct toward a portion of the members of this House, we find the Minister of Agriculture making arrangements, not only to pay him the salary which he formerly received, but to increase his allowance as a public servant; and yet the Minister of Agriculture coolly asks the members on this side of the House, who were treated in that way by that officer, to cease opposing the promotion of this officer to a better position than he occupied before. The Minister of Agriculture knows very well why some of these returns were delayed one, two and three weeks. He knows that the return for the east riding of Elgin was delayed for a long time, and he knows why. Other members of the Government, as well as the hon. gentleman, know full well why that return was delayed. The reason was to give every opportunity to search the riding from one end to the other in order to find something, if possible, by which they could unseat me. I do not mind fighting my battles in the riding in a fair fight, but, when not only the Government but also the civil servants of the Government come down to my county, I think it is time to prevent those civil servants from fighting the battles of any party. Do the Government mean to say now that they did not know that these returns came in, and that this man was doing the work in the manner in which he was doing it? I venture to say that no member of the Government will get up and deny that statement. Still we are called upon to give this man a better position. If ever there was a disgraceful transaction in any free country, it was that transaction of which Mr. Pope was guilty in his position as Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. There is not language too strong to condemn the man. Yet what do we find this Government doing to reward the unmanly act that he committed?

Mr. McNEILL. I rise to a point of order. I think this discussion is not in order. The Minister has stated that there was no intention to appoint this man; that he might not be appointed. The question is whether a discussion of this kind is in order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is thoroughly understood that this is a job to reward Mr. Pope for one of the most disgraceful acts that was ever perpetrated by any civilised Government, and we are not going to allow that most dishonorable man to be rewarded for that most dishonorable act, without putting on record our opinion of the man and of the men who are rewarding him.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). If I am out of order, I can very easily put myself in order. No doubt the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill), with his sensitive feelings, and the peculiarly nice nature that belongs to him, with the finer type and finer development of the human race which characterises him, no doubt it grates upon his feelings when we are telling nothing but the simple truth about one of the officers of the Government. I say without any hesitation, that I believe that every man in the hearing of my voice—and no doubt they all hear me—will agree with me that a transaction of this kind is to be condemned by every member of this House. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to consider it well. Suppose, in the near future, and it will be in the near future, that they were placed in the minority, how would they feel to have a Clerk of the Crown in Chancery act towards them as he has acted

Mr. Cook.

towards the members on this side of the House? Many hon. gentlemen know the inconvenience, the annoyance and perplexity of an election trial. I have gone through it; and although a thorough investigation was made, lasting from day to day, not a tittle of evidence could be found against me. Yet, Sir, on account of the conduct of this man, I had to go through all this annoyance and trouble, and when I attempt to place my grievances before the Chairman, who is fair, who is upright and just in giving his decision, I am told that I am out of order. I cannot allow things of this kind to go on without raising my voice against them. I say, if the Government do perpetrate, as they are about to perpetrate, this wrong upon hon. members on this side of the House, it will be an act to their lasting disgrace. Sir, I am bitterly opposed to this man being promoted. I say he is not competent for the office in which he will be placed. There is another place where he ought to be, and the sooner he is put there the better it will be for the morality of the people of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Carried.

Mr. McMULLEN. Last Session—

The CHAIRMAN. Under the circumstances I shall persist in ruling that the motion is carried. It was distinctly declared so before any hon. gentleman arose.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then it was carried very violently. The hon. member beside me was standing up when you declared it carried.

The CHAIRMAN. If that is the case, certainly I did wrong. But I saw no one standing up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was no hon. gentleman standing up.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was standing up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. member for Northumberland and I rose together. I am quite sure, Mr. Chairman, that you wish to do what is perfectly fair in this matter, we have had abundant evidence of that. All I can say is, that everybody knows there is no use in trying to head off a discussion on this matter. It has got to come, and it may just as well be had now as on the third reading of the Bill. But as a matter of fact, my hon. friend beside me had risen at the exact moment I rose.

The CHAIRMAN. I certainly should not have made that declaration if I had been aware that any hon. gentleman had risen to speak. I may say that perhaps I was a little more prompt in declaring the motion carried, for the reason that we have to go back into committee again on this same question in consequence of another resolution which has to come up, so that hon. gentlemen would have lost the opportunity of speaking.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rose at the moment in order to endorse the statements made by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson). I want to say, however, that it is well to remember that when a motion is declared carried, whether from the Chair you occupy or from the chair occupied by the Speaker of this House, it does not necessarily follow that the discussion is closed. That is done for the sake of the dispatch of business; you ought not to be strict in shutting off hon. gentlemen who desire to speak, because the Chairman does not happen to perceive them rising.

Mr. McMULLEN. The First Minister will remember that last year when the question of increasing the salary of this man was before the House, it was done at the very closing hours of the Session. On that occasion the Opposition took pointed exception to the increase of salary and to the position in which this gentleman was placed, owing to the injustice which he had done us in the general election, because it was proposing an increased remuneration to this

man, and putting him in a position beyond the reach of the House, in a position somewhat similar to that of a judge. Now, if there is anything that is sacred to the people of this country, and to every candidate who offers himself for election, it is the right to be treated with even-handed justice, no matter whether he is a Conservative or a Reformer. In the last general election, undoubtedly an advantage was taken of us. In my own section, every Conservative member elected was gazetted one or two weeks, and in some cases three weeks, before I was gazetted. I made strict enquiries with regard to the time the returns were sent in, and I found that the returning officer performed his duty and made the returns at the proper time. Now, for a person to say that my election should be held back two or three weeks and not gazetted, while the Conservative members all around me were gazetted from one to three weeks before I was, to say that was a mere accident, to say there was no intent on the part of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, is to say what no one believes. No man could accept that as an excuse for the irregularities that took place. Now, Mr. Chairman, if we allow actions of that kind to pass without entering our solemn protests, why, we may have another election, and at every election, little arrangements of this kind will be concocted and carried out to our detriment. It is our duty to resent such things, and to lead the Government to understand that if these technical advantages are going to be taken with us, by men in the honorable position of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, by gazetting certain men early and holding back the gazetting of others, so that the advantage of protest may remain in the hands of the Conservative party, and that they may have a longer time to file petitions than we have, then I say it is a piece of gross injustice to which we are not going calmly to submit. Every time this question is before the House I think a majority, at least on this side, have entered their protest against that gross injustice, and against granting any increase of salary to this man, or putting him in a position beyond the reach of any Government. He will be virtually placed in a similar position to a judge. Hon. gentlemen cannot expect that we will submit quietly to such a course as this, by which a gross injustice has been done, and we wish to impress on the House and the country that if these things are perpetrated we will resent them, and that if officers perform their duties in a one-sided fashion they may expect to bring down upon their heads the criticism and condemnation which they justly deserve.

Committee rose and reported.

House resolved itself into committee to consider a proposed resolution (p. 125) to provide for the appointment of a deputy commissioner of patents and inventions.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. CARLING moved second reading of Bill (No. 38) to amend the Act respecting patents of inventions.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and considered in committee and reported.

THE CRIMINAL PROCEDURE ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 123) to amend the Criminal Procedure Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This Bill, I suppose, is intended to prevent, what does appear to be an injustice, the taking of a man from one Province to another Province to try him. I presume the fact that the editor of the *Empire*

is one of the victims has not disinclined the Government to carry out this reform in the law.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will relieve me from any such imputation when he is aware that nearly all the papers in Canada disclosed the fact that I promised the year before to introduce this Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has promised a great many things the year before, but he has not carried them out the year after. The Bill is an excellent one, and I am very glad to see it introduced. The only addition I should desire is a provision that an editor, after a trial is closed, shall not be committed to gaol for commenting on the judges who presided at the trial.

Mr. DESJARDINS. When a newspaper has established an office in one of the Provinces, so as to make it a centre for distribution, the offence of which he is alleged to be guilty, should be tried in the district where that office is located.

Mr. LAURIER. There is force in that objection. There is no reason why we should depart from the general rule that an offence should be tried where it is committed, and I do not understand why a newspaper should not be tried where it is published. The doctrine prevailing hitherto, and against which this Bill is intended to apply, was that the newspaper editor could be tried in any part of the Dominion. Now, you say, by this Bill, he shall be tried in the Province where the paper is published. Should not the Bill go a little further and set out that the offence should be tried wherever it is committed?

Mr. THOMPSON. The whole object of the Bill is to establish a different principle in regard to newspapers from that which prevails in regard to any other class of publication, and the justification of that principle must be based on the exceptional character of a newspaper. The reason why the newspaper editor may be brought to any part of Canada for trial is that the publication, in a legal sense, is committed wherever his paper goes, and that therefore an editor, who in the Province of Nova Scotia publishes a libel, and sends his paper to the Province of British Columbia, may be brought there for trial, because there his paper, in a legal sense, is published. But considering that newspapers have a general circulation, and that that must necessarily be more extensive over the country than any other medium of communication, it is considered fair that they should not be held to the strict sense of the term "publication," but that the place where the paper is in the popular sense published—that is wherever the paper is printed or wherever the editor resides—shall be the place of trial. I think that is fair on the general principle as regards publication, but if we are to hold that any place where a newspaper has an agency, is to be considered its place of publication, and that the publisher may be brought there for trial, we would be giving no relief to the newspaper editor at all; especially to the large organs, which are, perhaps, the more deserving of protection because they are best conducted, and which have agencies all over the country.

Mr. LAURIER. Would not this Bill, if it becomes law, expose the newspaper to very queer consequences? Now the name of the *Empire* has just been cited, and the *Empire* is, as I understand, in the meshes of the law. According to this Bill, the editor of the *Empire* which is published in Toronto, can be brought to Algoma or to any other part of Ontario for trial.

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the clause cannot be read otherwise. It says:

Every proprietor, publisher, editor or other person charged with the publication in a newspaper of any defamatory libel, shall be dealt

with, indicted, tried and punished in the Province in which he resides, or in which such newspaper is printed.

Then the editor can be tried anywhere in the Province as I understand. Is not that the principle of the Bill?

Mr. THOMPSON. The place of trial must be within the Province, but when we come to that the Criminal Procedure Act provides what part of the Province he shall be tried in. The object is to prevent a person being brought from one Province to another.

Mr. LAURIER. If you bring this Act within the general law that would be all right and I have nothing more to say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know before we pass this Bill, does it in any way affect cases actually pending?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume the general provisions of the law would not cause the Act to do as I stated, but I was not quite certain from the phraseology.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

DOMINION LANDS ACT—CROFTER IMMIGRATION.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved second reading of Bill (No. 131) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act (from the Senate).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the purport of this Bill?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say that this measure has been introduced at the instance of Her Majesty's Government. The hon. gentleman may have seen in the public press that a vote of £10,000 sterling had been made by Her Majesty's Government in aid of emigration, and there is also a sum to be added to this State aid. The fund is to be managed by commissioners, and those commissioners are to have the powers given to persons and companies under our general Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So, in fact, you may take a mortgage exclusive of the homestead provision. Is that the purport of it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is making those four commissioners a company which can loan money on mortgage; the same as is provided for other companies under our law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The object is a good one I believe, although the sum appears to be exceedingly small, except it is to be as a mere tentative experiment. Ten thousand pounds will not go very far in relieving the congestion in the crofters settlements in the Highlands, if I know anything about them. Is there any limitation as to the rate of interest or is it left to private agreement?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is left to our law. Six per cent. is the maximum under the Dominion Lands Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rather assume that in the case of those persons who are chiefly English, the actual rate will be considerably less.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the hon. gentleman has no information about that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say that I have no information. I gave my papers to my hon. friend who has carried them to the Upper House and they are not returned. We need not have the third reading until to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not wish to delay the Bill but I should like to know this for my own information.

Mr. LAURIER.

Does the hon. gentleman remember what number of families are to be brought under this scheme?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is left, I suppose, a good deal to themselves.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The reason why I asked that is that I think our Government will do well, if they are anyway concerned in making land grants, to make sure that a sufficient sum shall be granted to start those poor people fairly. It would be more for the interests of the people of Canada that 100 families should be started well, than that 200 or 300 families should be started so imperfectly and with such a small amount of capital at their disposal, that they would be likely to fail. I dare say that in many parts of the North-West the crofters would prove extremely valuable settlers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take blame to myself for not having the papers, but I will have them to-morrow. The subject is an experiment and one which ought to be encouraged. The hon. gentleman is correct in his ideas that those crofters would make valuable settlers. The crofters who have been sent out here by Lady Cathcart have been very successful.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Those are all about the Moosomin Station?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, somewhere there. Their condition is in the highest degree satisfactory. The arrangement is that each head of those crofter families shall get a quarter section like other settlers. There is to be a house put up for them, and they are to be set on their way in the world as Lady Cathcart did in respect to her crofters, and security will be taken for eventual payment. I believe there is to be no interest charged for the first two years, and at the end of two years, if they are successful, there will be a moderate rate of interest charged, according to my recollection, but I cannot state positively not having the papers before me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will make one suggestion to the hon. gentleman. I have seen those crofters, and I have formed a favorable opinion myself of their capacity and aptitude. At any rate, I thought the younger men would undoubtedly become valuable settlers. Looking at the habits and qualities of those crofters, I believe that if the Government would make a point of seeing that they were settled tolerably close together, it would greatly add to their probable chances of success. The Government have received from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company six or seven million acres of land, and my suggestion is that for the sake of this experiment, the checker board principle by which a mile is interposed between the settlers should be done away with. The experiment is worth trying for its own sake.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The suggestion is certainly worthy of consideration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I shall ask the hon. gentleman at the third reading of the Bill, whether he has considered it and intends to act upon it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I shall perhaps be able to answer that question to-morrow.

Committee rose and reported.

SUPPLY—THE BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. EDGAR. More than a week ago I gave notice to the Government that on going into Supply I would bring before the House the grievances of the settlers at Bresaylor in the North-West Territories. I will as briefly as I possibly can lay before the House the serious grievances and the deep wrongs which I think have been inflicted on these people, and will show the House what great distress they are suffering from the treatment they have received. The story is a tragic and touching one, and I sincerely hope that bringing it before the House will be the means of obtaining for those people tardy justice at the hands of the Government. The Bresaylor settlement is situated on the north branch of the Saskatchewan, about 25 miles above Battleford, and the settlers there are mostly Scotch half-breeds of a very high order of intelligence and respectability. They were originally farmers at Headingly near Winnipeg. They had the intelligence to sell out their farm lands when the boom in Manitoba was at its height, and they went up to their new settlement in 1883 and 1884, taking with them a very considerable amount of money. Numbers of them were possessed of property worth \$5,000, and Mr. Charles Bremner, who seems to have been a leader among them, was possessed of about \$20,000 worth of property, as he had a large store and was engaged in considerable trading with the Indians. To show the House what position these people are in to-day, I will read a short extract from a letter which was written by a leading citizen of Battleford on the 12th of March last, while this House was in session. Referring to them, he says:

"These people are starving, and to use Mr. Bremner's words to me to-day, he said: 'I would a thousand times rather die than to go through what I have this winter—family half clothed and not half fed.' It is really too bad, and if trouble comes of it the Government are to blame."

And again:

"The settlement people are living on one another, and only bannock at that. They have killed all the animals they had, and are now so discouraged and disheartened that many would prefer death in almost any other shape than starving."

The writer of this letter is a well known and always loyal citizen of the town of Battleford. Now, I would just enquire briefly why things are in the present condition. When the rebellion broke out, these settlers were living on their lands. Some settlers near them went into the fort at Battleford, and these settlers were advised by a missionary priest, the Rev. Father Cocbin, who was a resident among them, to send a messenger down to the fort, to ask the commandant whether they should go in or not; and the priest wrote a letter for them, which was sent to the commandant. No answer was received by them. The commandant says an answer was returned by him, but the messenger was intercepted by the Indians and never reached the settlers. There were two Indian reservations lying between this Bresaylor settlement and Battleford—Thunder Child's reservation and the Moosomin reservation; and Poundmaker's reserve was seven or eight miles from them in a southerly direction. That being the case, the settlers did not think much harm would happen to them, and delayed going into Battleford until they were captured, as the evidence shows, by a couple of hundred Indians from Poundmaker's reserve, their goods being largely plundered and they themselves being taken away to Poundmaker's reserve. It was a pity they delayed going into Battleford as they did, but there they were, and they were taken away, no doubt in order to prevent them fighting with the police and the volunteers who were at Battleford. It does not seem to have been contemplated by the Indians who took them that they would be allies in their fight against the Canadian Government. But they were taken there and allowed to remain there, as a sort of half prisoners. There were fourteen or fifteen families of them altogether. They were allowed to retain their own arms; and after they consented to go with the

Indians, without fighting, their property was no longer disturbed, and they were allowed to take with them four or five cart loads of valuable furs. I do not wish to go into all the details, but I would say that these half-breeds allege that on two occasions, they sent communications from Poundmaker's reserve to the fort of Battleford and never got a reply. When they heard that the Indians were likely to be attacked, they sent a messenger to say that they would put up a white flag on their canvas tents, which were separate from the other tents, and that they were not going to take any part in the fight. They put up their white flag, but it appears that some of the cannon shots of the volunteers came among their tents, and they then withdrew with their families off the field altogether. It does seem that two or three of them, when they were fired at by Col. Otter's forces, took rifles, and engaged in the fight with Poundmaker, in self defence, as the Indians threatened to kill them if they did not fight and the volunteers were shooting at them. They, however, restrained the Indians in many ways and many times from committing excesses. I have gone through the large volume which was laid on the Table early in the Session, and could establish that claim if necessary, but I do not think it is necessary. The commission which considered the claims for rebellion losses disallowed the claims of the settlers on the ground that they were parties to their own losses, or, in other words, that they had not been loyal and took part in the rebellion. Well, I have read the evidence of these claims, which is not very long, and certainly it leads me to the opinion that while there were suspicious circumstances such as those I have given, there was a very complete answer made to the charge of disloyalty in that evidence; and I think that while the commissioners had some ground to go upon in their general conclusion, still, on the whole, they came to a wrong decision. Since then, a petition has been sent in to the Government by these settlers. It was dated the 25th August, last year, and was presented up there to the Minister of Interior on the 25th August by the settlers. This petition is a rather long document, and I will confine myself to stating its substance. The petitioners show that they were made prisoners by the Indians and forced into the Indian camp, that since the rebellion the Government has indemnified all the settlers except them for the losses they sustained; that, on the supposition that they joined the Indians of their own free will and acted as rebels, indemnity was unjustly withheld from them, and they strongly protest against such a course because they are British subjects and should be considered innocent until proved guilty. They say they can establish fully, if given opportunity, the genuineness of their loyalty on that occasion. They allege that:

"Towards the 18th of April, a few days before the battle at Out Knife Creek, we sent during the night one Samuel Denison, with instructions to proceed to the barracks and inform Capt. Morris that we were prisoners of the Indians; that if they were to come to fight not to shoot at us; that our camp would be at one side and could be easily recognised by our square canvas tents, while the Indians had tepees; that if a favorable occasion offered during the battle we would join the troops and fight the Indians."

"On the following day the Indians taking notice of Denison's disappearance, became suspicious about our intentions. They held a council and decided that we should remove our tents to the centre of the camp. On our refusing to comply with this order they rode around in a threatening attitude, yelling and firing, Indian fashion. We showed that we were determined to fight them rather than comply, and seeing that we could not be intimidated we were finally allowed to remain where we were encamped."

"On hearing the firing of the cannon on the morning of the battle, Charles Bremner put up a white flag to indicate to the troops the position of our camp. The Indians wanted us to pull it down, but we resisted, and to avoid a possible conflict we had to assure them that it meant nothing."

"Notwithstanding our message to Captain Morris through our messenger Denison, firing was kept up at our camp by the troops during the battle. Incensed at what was considered a breach of faith or an unpardonable distrust, a few amongst us—two or three—decided to take part in the fight against the troops, saying: 'Since the police do not

take any notice of our letters and messages we are not to remain exposed to be killed by both the Indians and the police."

"Your petitioners are ready to substantiate these facts before a court of enquiry, and we feel that if such an opportunity is offered to us we will be able to dispel all doubts about the loyalty of our intentions, and prove besides that our firm attitude and our influence over the Indians has been instrumental in saving lives and in preventing cruelties of any kind on prisoners and on the bodies of the soldiers left on the battle field."

They pray, therefore, to be indemnified for their losses on account of the rebellion. There are none who are better able to judge of the honesty of these people's claims and their loyalty than the settlers of the town of Battleford, and in support of the petition of these half-breed settlers, there is an endorsement on this petition to the Minister of Interior:

"We, the inhabitants of Battleford, take the liberty of recommending to your favorable consideration the within petition of the Bresaylor settlement."

"Though we looked with some distrust at the doings of the petitioners during the rebellion we firmly believe them to have been led astray owing to the intense excitement and general distrust then prevailing, and we do not hesitate to admit that subsequent developments and a better understanding have dispelled the erroneous impressions we had formed on their loyalty. Though some still retain the belief that a few amongst them took part and acted as rebels, we are fully convinced that the greatest number never ceased to be loyal in mind and in action."

"That the facts as stated in the within petition are in substance true, and that the granting of the conclusion of their petition would be an act of justice to which they are entitled, and your petitioners will never cease to pray."

This endorsement is signed by some thirty of the resident settlers of the town of Battleford. Among them I see the name of a former member of this House, Mr. Richard, who was member for Megantic, John Hogg, Presbyterian minister at Battleford, the Rev. A. H. Bigonese, Roman Catholic missionary, and Father Cochin, also a Roman Catholic missionary, who was there the whole time, and who shows that these settlers, from the time they were taken prisoners until the time they were taken to Battleford, were loyal to the Government. And I also find the evidence of the Rev. J. S. Pritchard, a Church of England minister at Battleford. If that alone were presented to the Government, I think it would make a case for a reconsideration of the claims of these men. But there is a very great deal more in it than that. These petitions were evidently referred by the Government to Mr. Young, the secretary of the commission, who examined into the losses, and I have here an enormous mass, amounting to 162 pages, of a report which has been made to the Government by Mr. Young on the subject of that petition. The whole effect of this report is to justify the finding of the commissioners on the ground of evidence obtained from a number of other sources, which was not before the commissioners when they made their award. However, perhaps the Government may have been right in asking for that information, but, although that has been obtained from the Department of Justice, from the Mounted Police Department, and from several other sources of information, and the extracts which have been made seem to support the finding of the commission and are against the claims of the settlers, I think I could undertake to point out to the Minister of Justice, if it were necessary to do so, that even from that very report which was made to him, he can find perfect answers to almost everyone of the charges made against the settlers or against the half-breeds. I do not intend to take up the time of the House in discussing or arguing that question, because I do not propose to put the case upon that ground entirely. In the claim which has been put in by these half-breeds, there is the claim of Mr. Charles Bremner, which is a specific claim for \$4,000 or \$5,000 worth of valuable furs. That was thrown out by the commissioners in the same way as the claims which were made for injuries to property when that was first plundered by the Indians. I contend that this claim for the furs of the half-breeds rests upon a very different footing and a higher footing than other claims, and it is to that I

Mr. EDGAR.

particularly call the attention of the House. These men came in at the close of the rebellion and surrendered themselves or came to Battleford, at about the same time as Poundmaker came in. They brought in four cart loads of furs belonging to Charles Bremner, which were worth from \$4,000 to \$5,000. What I state now is not contradicted by any document whatever. I would like to read to the House briefly some statements in regard to those furs which have been made under oath. I would first read the statement made by Louis Caplette, of the Bresaylor settlement, dated the 9th November, 1885, and therefore a very short time after these occurrences. He says:

"At the time of the arrest of Charles Bremner referred to in his affidavit, I was his clerk, and in possession of the furs as set forth in schedule A of his affidavit this day sworn, and I know the contents of the four cart loads of furs referred to in his affidavit. The said schedule A referred to in his said affidavit is a true and correct statement of the furs then owned by the said Bremner. About that time, the soldiers commenced pillaging the furs, and I went to the military authorities to ask for protection. These authorities took possession of the furs and placed the same in the police barracks at Battleford."

That refers to the occasion when brought into the fort by the half-breeds themselves. He goes on to say:

"I have seen the furs several times at the barracks since then, but I have noticed the pile of furs upon each visit growing less, and the authorities refuse to deliver them up. I believe the furs are worth the amounts set forth in the said schedule A."

Then I would refer to the evidence given by Charles Bremner himself before the commission. He says:

"The furs were at my place in the carts, and went with us to the Indian camp, but the Indians did not take possession of them. Middleton gave orders to put the furs in a safe place. I have not seen it since. I enquired for it but have not recovered it."

Then he says:

"The furs were in my carts, and I brought them with me along with the Indians. I cannot say what became of the goods, but my furs were brought in here—"

That is Battleford—

"At the time of Poundmaker's surrender, and were delivered to the police here then."

Then he says:

"The furs in exhibit B are the furs I lost. I cannot say if I had counted them all. I had counted what was packed. I made out my lists from memory as soon as released, when I went to Winnipeg, and I have not recovered any of them. Personally I cannot say who took them."

Then he gives an account of how he got these furs from the Indians. Louis Caplette gave very much the same evidence on the 8th of June, 1885, when he was examined before the commission, and there is no dispute whatever about that part of the matter. There is no dispute that these furs were brought in by Bremner, and were placed, by General Middleton's order, in the custody of the police at Battleford. I wish to read to the House a statement which has been very recently made by Charles Bremner on the 10th March, 1888, and has been sent to me. He says:

"In connection with my claim for losses and my petition to Hon. Thos. White, I beg to submit the following:—In the winter of 1884 and 1885, I was trading with the Indians and had accumulated a lot of furs, the amount claimed by me was about \$7,500. After the surrender of Poundmaker, I was with all the half-breeds of our settlement to camp, near the barracks, having the fur in my possession, was arrested and placed in guard-room. In the evening General Middleton came to our camp in company with Col. Otter. The soldiers for some little time had been trying to take furs from us by force and had succeeded in carrying off a few. Caplette here asked General Middleton if his soldiers had authority to take the fur. Middleton said no, and asked to whom the fur belonged; being told, he said he would send two or three men to protect; a short time after three men came with a team and removed all the fur to the barracks without our permission. We were taken to Regina, tried for treason, not proven guilty and let off on our own recognisances. On returning to Battleford, I at once went to Col. Morris, of the N.W.M.P., and asked for my fur. He replied that he had had a telegram from General Middleton telling him to give the balance of the fur he had left to certain parties mentioned in his telegram, and that most of the fur was gone. I afterwards went to Winnipeg and engaged lawyer, of Archibald, Howell & Co. We went to see Hon. Caron about my fur, but he did not give me any satisfaction, saying

it was outside his department. Mr. Howell asked to whom would we go for information and the Minister replied to go to General Middleton. We went to see Middleton but he said he knew nothing about the fur and said that he had never commanded that Bremner or his party should be arrested, and in reply to a reference to his telegram to Col. Morris, he denied having ever sent him a telegram on the subject. We left Middleton in that manner without any satisfaction.

"On returning from Winnipeg I went again to see Morris and asked for the balance of my fur, he said it was all gone, and on my referring to Middleton's denial of having sent a telegram to Morris re furs, Morris again asserted that Middleton had sent the telegram and he could prove it. This was said in the presence of Louis Caplette.

"I put in a claim for the furs but have not received any compensation for them so far nor for any other losses."

Now, the statements of Charles Bremner with reference to the furs which were claimed by him, are absolutely unanswered, and are perfectly conclusive; and show that these men came into the barracks, their furs were taken possession of by agents of the Government, and they were held by the agents of the Government as trustees for these men. I do not care whether these men were rebels ten times over, this was their private property, and it was taken possession of by the mounted police, under General Middleton's directions, and they have not got any portion of these furs yet, nor have they been paid a single dollar on account of these claims, and they are starving for want of that money. That point is absolutely clear, and I think it is a disgrace to the country that it should be so. These men may be rebels, but do not steal their furs. The question with reference to these furs was raised twice in this House last Session by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) when the House was in Committee of Supply, and he mentioned the names of high dignitaries of the Government as being charged with having received possession, personally, of these furs; he mentioned the name of General Middleton, he mentioned the name of Mr. Bedson, and he mentioned the name of Hayter Reed, as being charged by reliable parties with having taken those furs, that somebody has taken, and that have disappeared. Now, I say that after that statement was made by an hon. gentleman from his place in this House, it is a most extraordinary thing that we have heard nothing more from the Government; it is a most extraordinary thing that, in order to clear the honor of these gentlemen from that foul stain, they have not demanded an investigation and made the whole thing public. I hope that after to-day, at any rate, we will have an investigation. It is absolutely proved that these furs were brought into the possession of the Government, and the claims of those people should be opened up; and I say that on that account, without going into anything else, the decision of the commissioners was wrong, and should be opened up. Then, I say it is the duty of the Government to pay these people for the value of their furs; more than that, it is the duty of the Government, after what has been charged by these people, to trace up these furs, and see where they have gone. More than that, Mr. Speaker, I do not care who the guilty parties are, it is the duty of the Government to bring them to justice, even if it should send somebody to the penitentiary. Now, we see by this statement which I read from Charles Bremner that General Middleton denied to him having taken these furs, and that he also denied the statement which appears to have been made by Capt. Morris, that he had some telegrams from General Middleton. Very well, I hope that is true, and if it is true, how easy it is to prove it. Now, the hon. member for Bothwell, as I say, mentioned the names of two other Government officials as having really taken these furs; those were the names of Mr. Bedson and Hayter Reed. I hope they are free from blame, but I think after what has been said, the matter should be investigated. It is only fair to them and to the Government that the House should know what I am sure can be proved if the enquiry is properly and fairly opened. I believe it can be proved by credible

persons that on the 5th July, 1885, the following letter was received by Quartermaster Warden, in the police barracks at Battleford. The letter was dated at Fort Pitt, 4th July, 1885, and it is addressed "Dear Warden":

"Gen. Middleton has instructed and authorised me to send you the present letter, desiring that you put up bales of furs for the under-mentioned: Two bales for General Middleton, one for S. L. Bedson, and one for myself. Please select the best, and pack them down, as we will be down there to-morrow by boat.

(Signed) "HAYTER REED,
"Assistant Commissioner of Indians."

Now, this letter was shown after it was received to several parties, and a copy of it was obtained, and I have read what purports to be a copy of it, and what I believe is a true copy of it. Now, these bales were packed up in accordance with the directions, and the furs were chiefly, as I said, Charles Bremner's. On the 6th July, the boat arrived down the river with General Middleton and Mr. Hayter Reed on it. I do not know whether Mr. Bedson was there or not. Mr. Reed, I am instructed, saw the furs as they were packed, but wanted some better ones, and had in addition to these, some boxes filled with choice furs, bear skins and so on, and these bales were sent with the boxes to the boat and they disappeared. Now, that is all I know about where these furs went to; but I take the responsibility in my place in the House of saying that I believe this statement and that letter can be proved when the enquiry is made, for I should be very sorry to make a statement to this House which could not be proven. Now the delays have been very great in this matter. Mr. Bremner's affidavit, which I read, showing that he had these furs, and that they were given into the possession of the officials of the Government, was made as long ago as November, 1835, and this poor man and his family are starving to-day, without a dollar in the world, according to the letter which I read in the beginning of my remarks. Yet, with the evidence in the hands of their officer, and with the delays from that time onward, the Government had full notice of this from time to time, and the delays have been unaccountable and cruel. As Government officials took charge of those furs the honor of the Government of Canada is pledged to finding out who stole them and where they are and what became of them; and not only finding out where they are, but finding out who plundered them. This matter having been brought before Parliament, it cannot permit people, no matter how high in office they may be, to rob even the poorest people in Canada. These people are far off and are ignorant and friendless, and it is a cruel wrong that people who have been plundered in this way, and when the case is as plain as day, should be ignored as they have been ignored for years past. For the honor of the volunteers of the country who went to the North-West this matter should be cleared up; the volunteers who so bravely went there and took part in suppressing that rebellion should have that matter cleared up in order to vindicate their own honor. There are gallant members of this House, generals and colonels, and you also, Mr. Speaker, who were also in the North-West, and you should see for your honor that a charge of this kind against the force should be cleared up. I would be the last person to say anything against the volunteers at Battleford, and I will not say anything against them. I must admit that when Col. Otter made his attack on the Indians on Poundmaker's reserve, it was a great mistake. I do not say it was a mistake of military tactics, but it is an unheard-of thing, even in the United States, for troops to attack Indians when on their reserve. Now that this has become a matter of history it is right that a statement should be made in Parliament that we repudiate such attacks in the future. I have nothing to say against Col. Otter himself. I have admired him as a Canadian soldier ever since I was a private in the ranks of the Queen's Own

with him, when he was a private too, and I trusted Col. Otter enough to send up there as a private under him in the Queen's Own at Battleford, one of my own sons. So that nothing that I say is against Col. Otter as a soldier; but I make this statement, that it is impolitic and wicked to attack Indians when on their reserve. And more than that. These half-breeds who remained with Indians when on their reserve, must have known they were out of the reach of having to fight with the volunteers or with the police, because they knew that an Indian reserve is a sacred asylum, a city of refuge, where no Indian is attacked in the United States; and if they went there they would be keeping the Indians away and they would be doing good service to the country. This is not and cannot be made a party question. It is a matter on which I felt that, as the facts were placed in my hands, my responsibility as holding a seat in this House rendered it necessary I should bring it before Parliament, and not only rendered it necessary, but I never value a seat in Parliament more than when I have the privilege of bringing such a case as this before the Government and ask them to redress the wrongs done to poor people. It is the duty of the Government—I leave it to them to say what they are going to do about it—to investigate this matter further, to pay these men the value of their furs, to follow up the offenders who took the furs and punish the guilty parties no matter where the punishment may fall.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the hon. member has no doubt been moved by very commendable feelings in bringing this matter to the notice of the House; at the same time, I think that the view which he expressed with respect to the strength of the evidence in support of the claims is altogether an exaggerated one. I will not insinuate for a moment, as he closed his remarks with a disclaimer of any political feelings, that that exaggeration is due to political bias. The hon. gentleman has undoubtedly been actuated by strong sympathy in favor of the petitioners whom he understands are poor, whom he is inclined to think are oppressed, and he has forgotten some very important characteristics in connection with the investigation which has taken place with regard to these claims. In offering one or two observations in reply to the hon. gentleman I do so precisely in the spirit in which he desired the matter to be considered by the House as entirely separate from any political or party question, as one to be dealt with altogether from the point of view connected with the administration of the affairs of the Department of the Interior. The only thing I have to complain of in connection with the presentation of a case like this to the House is that when claimants in any part of the country assert a demand against the Government, there is too much disposition on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, at once to consider the Government in the wrong, and to consider that the Government is actuated by some kind of prejudice against claimants, instead of being, as they have been in this case, desirous simply that perfect justice should be done to the claimants, and actuated by a desire, at the same time, to protect in every fair and proper manner the Treasury from improper and unjust claims. In the discharge of that duty the Government had to deal, as the hon. gentleman is aware, with an immense number and an enormous amount of claims arising out of the late rebellion in the North-West. They had to deal with claims made, by those who were immediately injured by the rebellion itself. Those claims it was impossible for the Government to investigate in the ordinary departmental way, and they adopted the best mode possible, the mode of issuing a Royal Commission which would take evidence on the spot, hear the claims, see the witnesses and report to the Government. The constitution of that commission has never been assailed in any way so far as I know to this moment, the commission was constituted in a manner to

Mr. EDGAR.

merit the support of all parties and to secure the confidence of the claimants themselves. Among others the claimants from the little settlement of Bresaylor were presented to that commission. The commission laid down a rule, the justice of which, I suppose, will hardly be disputed, that parties who had aided in the rebellion were not entitled to any compensation from the public Treasury for the losses which resulted from disturbances which they had created or assisted to carry on. To have adopted any other principle would simply have been offering a premium to persons to disturb the public peace and create riot in the hope of being able perhaps to obtain some advantage by the successful results of the disturbance, and if the disturbance failed to be successful, they would at all events have their losses indemnified out of the public treasury. Bresaylor is a small settlement about 25 miles west of Battleford, between Battle and Saskatchewan Rivers. The settlement, as the hon. gentleman has stated, is composed of a number of families who removed some years ago to that place from different parts of Manitoba. During the rebellion of 1885 these settlers at Bresaylor were urged, as a matter of precaution, to go to Battleford. One reason why they were urged to go to Battleford was that they would be better protected there than they could possibly be at a distant settlement, and in so small a settlement as theirs was. In the second place it was thought they should be at Battleford where there was a considerable force of police, because there was not the best assurance in the world that the settlement was a loyal one. The apprehensions that existed on that latter point turned out to be pretty correct. The settlement was not wholly disloyal, but it was not wholly loyal, and instead of its being a fact, as the hon. gentleman has supposed—his mind being influenced by the strong impressions of sympathy which he has in favor of those people who at present he says are afflicted—instead of its being a fact that they did not receive an invitation to go to Battleford, a large portion of the settlement acted upon it and went to Battleford. Not only was that so, but some of those who went to Battleford engaged actively in the loyal forces which were preserving the peace of the country. Some of them enrolled in the home guards and assisted in the defence of the place. As to these loyal settlers who went to Battleford for protection and for assisting in the defence of the country, there were claims as well. In consequence of their deserting their homes at Bresaylor their houses were destroyed, their furniture was burned, and all their property was pillaged. The result was that their claims, under these undoubted circumstances, were allowed by the commissioners, and have been paid. The other portion of the settlement; and it is the claims of that portion which the hon. member has brought to the attention of the House this afternoon, refused to remain at Bresaylor or to go to Battleford, and they went into camp for awhile at the place of Charles Bremner who was with them. While they were encamped at Charles Bremner's place they had a consultation with the hostile Indians and with rebel emissaries from Batoche, and as a result of those consultations they removed, with all their animals and movable property, to the Indian camp, in or about which they remained until the surrender of the Indians to General Middleton. Poundmaker, in his letter of 19th May, 1885, speaks of these very persons as some of his men and asked that they should be dealt kindly with, as being part of his force. They had this advantage in going into the rebel camp—their houses were not burned, they continued to control their animals and property, they were armed, and so far from being prisoners or semi-prisoners, as the hon. member supposes, they were armed all the time in the Indian camp, and had perfect freedom there. But there was more than that. They accompanied the rebel scouts from time to time, armed and mounted,

They were found accompanying the rebel scouts, armed and mounted, miles from the camp, and they assisted—those persons who were supposed to be in a state of imprisonment—in the capture of loyal prisoners, on whom they fired while in pursuit. They also captured and seized Government and private property. Some of them on their own admission took part in the battle of Cut Knife Creek and were fully recognised at some 30 paces distant as firing on the troops. They were present in the Indian council tent when letters were received and read from Riel, they followed the dancing tent of the Indians and they had to submit to the usual discipline and regulations of the warpath, and that is the only measure of restraint they were under, for they were just the same as the Indians on the warpath. After the surrender to General Middleton, these people were found to be in possession of stolen property and animals, belonging to their loyal neighbors who went to Battleford, and in one case a Government rifle, the property of a man who was killed on duty, was found in their possession. They were themselves responsible for the loss they had sustained. They went into the rebel forces for the purpose of minimising those losses; they were culpable in regard to the pillage and destruction which the rebellion caused in that country, and it seems to me that the commissioners were perfectly justified in applying to them the rule that rebellion should not be made profitable, as the evidence clearly brought them within the operation of that rule. Their claims for losses, alleged to have been severe in consequence of the rebellion, have been consequently rejected by the commissioners. No claim was allowed except on the strongest evidence and the commissioners felt, in carrying out their instructions, it was their duty to be liberal wherever it was possible to be so and to be just. Let me show what the contention of these men is with regard to this, as arising from the evidence. Their contention is that they were loyal, that they were unwilling prisoners in the hands of the rebels; that while prisoners their property and animals were stolen from them by the Indians, and that they were left destitute. They said they did not come to Battleford like their loyal neighbors because of the dangers of the road, because their horses were not at home, because they were surrounded by hostile Indians and subsequently forced to go to the camp. These contentions were all fully considered by the commissioners in deciding on the evidence of the claimants.

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps the Minister will allow me to say one word. I do not want to interrupt him, except that he will observe that I carefully said I was not going into discussing that, and I am sure that if I had discussed it I could correct a great many of the statements which the hon. Minister is reading to the House, from the evidence itself. I do not rest the case upon that, but upon the matter of the furs.

Mr. THOMPSON. I did understand the hon. gentleman to discuss it. I have no doubt that he, with his mind influenced in favor of these claimants, would point out particulars in the evidence on which we would suppose a different result should have been arrived at. I am stating, of course, as a matter of deduction from the evidence, what I conceive to be that which the evidence establishes. If I do not understand the hon. gentleman as putting this claim on the ground that these people were entitled to compensation because they did not participate in the rebellion; if I am to understand the hon. gentleman that they were fairly within the operation of the rule, which excluded persons who participated in the rebellion from claiming for rebel losses, I shall not say anything further with reference to their action in the rebellion.

Mr. EDGAR. I contended that the commissioners had certain grounds for making the report they did. The

Minister knows that the evidence he was reading from was not taken before the commission, and I have gone through the whole of that evidence most carefully—but it was taken from other sources, and other departments, and reported after this late petition came before the Government. Even in that evidence, from which the hon. gentleman is quoting, I see there is a great deal that throws doubt upon the disloyalty of these men. They may have been somewhat disloyal, and, perhaps, the commissioners were right in their finding from that point of view; but as to that I contend, that, upon the petition of the residents of Battleford taking up the reconsideration of their claims, it would have been reasonable for the Government to open those claims anew. I came to the question of the furs afterwards; whether they were rebels or not is another question.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am speaking to the general question of these claims. Then the hon. gentleman and I understand each other to this extent, that there was evidence before the commissioners from which they fairly came to the conclusion which they did. I was about to state what that evidence consisted of, but it is not worth while to press that point, as the hon. member concedes it. The question then arises, how far are the representations in the petition from the residents at Battleford entitled to weight as against the evidence which shows that these people participated in the rebellion? I have to say this at the outset, that it is not a question as to how far the evidence casts the stain of rebellion on these claimants. They were taken, most of them, *in flagrante delicto*; there can be no doubt that they were seen under arms, that the property of loyal men, their neighbors, was seen upon them, and that they engaged in the field and had Government arms in their possession. All these points are beyond question. But it is true that a number of residents at Battleford afterwards presented a petition to the Government representing that they had misunderstood the position of these men, and recommending their claims to the consideration of the Government. That petition was signed, as the hon. gentleman says, by about 30 persons. We all know the facility with which signatures can be obtained to petitions in favor of claimants, and the people of Battleford, pitying the circumstances of these people, would readily give them their signatures. If we need any further evidence on that point, it is afforded by the fact that thirteen of the persons who signed that petition were not in the country at all when the disturbances occurred. It further transpires that of the whole number of signatures to that petition only one was from an individual who could by any possibility have had personal knowledge of the facts which the petition was based on. The hon. gentleman has called our attention to some names which ought to give great weight to representations of that kind. One of them was that of a missionary, who I think, he said, was in the vicinity of the settlement at the time, and would have knowledge of the facts. That is so, and he is the only individual who had knowledge of the circumstances at all. The rest of the signatures might as well have been replaced by those of citizens of Toronto or Montreal, as far as any knowledge of the facts was concerned. But the hon. gentleman called attention to the fact that this petition was signed by the Rev. Mr. Hogg, the Rev. Mr. Pritchard, and Mr. Richard, who was, I believe, at one time a member of this House; and he thought that the signatures of these three gentlemen gave weight to the statements in the petition. These three gentlemen, whose opinion is certainly of weight, all came into the country after the rebellion was over. Now, let me call the attention of the House for a moment, in corroboration of the evidence with regard to the position of these men in relation to the rebellion, to some facts which were stated in the Saskatchewan *Herald* of the 1st of June, 1885:

"The army of half-breeds from the upper settlement who lately lived in Poundmaker's camp posing as prisoners came into town on Tuesday with their flocks, herds, household effects and families. The

appearance of the procession as it crossed the bridge gave the lie to their story of captivity, because on almost every waggon were some articles of furniture, such as bedsteads, tables, chairs, and sewing machines—proof conclusive that they had been allowed plenty of time to prepare for their entrance into bondage. They wore a very jaunty air as they rode into town, with nothing of the bearing we would expect in men just regaining liberty. They were put into camp a little west of the barracks, and a search of their outfits instituted by the police. In every outfit and nearly every waggon, were found quantities of Government property, consisting largely of arms and ammunition. The latter were chiefly taken from the teamsters captured a short time ago, but in every one of the outfits were found many articles of personal property belonging to other settlers who were bearing arms in defence of their country. Indeed, most of the waggons, horses, and cattle were also recognised and claimed by them; and when asked by the authorities where they got them, the reply generally was: 'I bought it from an Indian,' or, 'I found him.' The caravan was also gone through for arms and ammunition and a large quantity taken, embracing every variety of arm, mostly of a superior quality. It was never believed that they were in reality prisoners, and Poundmaker set the matter at rest by saying they came into camp of their own accord, at the request of Delorme and Trotter, and that Baptiste Sayer was one of the captains. Most of the men of the party have been arrested on various charges, principally appropriating property belonging to others, and are being daily examined before Inspector Dickens, sitting as a justice of the peace. The deposition of their cases will be found in another column."

Then, the evidence shows—I forbear, however, going minutely into it, in consequence of the admission the hon. member makes—active participation in the rebellion, and disguise while under arms for the purpose of concealing their identity. I admit, however, that in the case of the claims of people who are poor and in a distant part of the country, the avenues of justice and mercy ought never to be closed; and at any time that the hon. gentleman can bring to the notice of the Government facts which should induce a different conclusion from that arrived at by the commission, they ought to be considered. The Government have made a most careful and thorough inquiry into all the transactions since the petition was presented and the endorsement from Battleford came to hand. The result has been to confirm to the fullest extent the finding of the commission, and to corroborate by an overwhelming mass of testimony the evidence given before the commission, on which it based its conclusion. I do not mean to say that this conclusion is absolutely final. I state it simply as the conclusion the department has been forced to as the result of an enquiry made in consequence of that petition. The hon. gentleman will see that there has certainly been no want of attention on the part of the Government to the claims the settlers of Bresaylor have presented. With respect to the claim for furs, that has been presented simply in the shape of a demand on the part of Mr. Bremner, and the facts connected with the presentation of his claim, justify the finding of the commissioners with regard to it. Mr. Bremner was a very prominent and active rebel in the field. I do not think the evidence is at all so clear and satisfactory with regard to his furs and the quantity of them, as the hon. member has stated. It appears that he presented claims of various kinds. In the first place, he presented a claim for furs of the value of \$4,530; when he next presented it, the amount was \$6,070; and when he presented it the third time, the amount had swollen to \$20,358.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman is wrong about that. That was his total claim. One claim for furs was \$4,300, and the other, \$5,000. The rest is for property and cattle.

Mr. THOMPSON. These claims were all filed at different dates. They may have included other things than furs. But, among the items which go to make up these rejected claims, is one for furs. The first schedule represents them as worth \$4,374. The second schedule represents them as worth \$5,364. In the first place, the commissioners had evidence before them that the prices were excessive; in the second place, they had evidence before them that the number of skins claimed exceeded even those which were in the stores at Hudson's Bay posts of considerable size; and, in

Mr. THOMPSON.

the third place, they ascertained by the evidence that there was no fur trade at the settlement, where Mr. Bremner was, which could have possibly furnished such a store of furs as he claimed to have. The contention is, in reference to these furs, that they were the produce of his trade at Bresaylor and at another point during the winters of 1884 and 1885; when the rebellion broke out, he and his neighbors went into camp near his store, where he loaded these furs into carts, that he went to the Indian camp, that he took these furs along, and retained possession of them from that date until the date of the surrender to Gen. Middleton at Battleford. I want to call the attention of the House to a significant circumstance, as throwing some discredit upon his claim and upon his evidence. It is this: that while he claims for large rebellion losses, in addition to the furs, he bases that claim on the ground that the Indians pillaged and robbed him; and yet, although he was pillaged and robbed by the Indians, he packed up and took into their camp, as he says, a large quantity of furs, to the value of upwards of \$5,000. In the language of the *Saskatchewan Herald*, "he was making abundant preparation to be captured." After the surrender, he said that he noticed his furs were being interfered with, when he complained to the general, who ordered them to be put into the police barracks for safety; and that at different times his clerks and others visited the barracks, and found at each visit that the furs were decreasing in numbers, and he has not since been able to recover them. The commission rejected his claim for losses, because they decided that, upon the evidence, Charles Bremner himself was proved to be a party to his losses, and responsible for all he had really lost during the rebellion, that he was present in the Indian camp, armed, with liberty of action, and that he frequently assisted the rebel scouts in their expeditions into the settlements; that he was present, armed and mounted, at the chase of Ross and capture of Fontaine, both loyal scouts, and also at the capture of the Government teamsters; and that, at the surrender, a Government rifle was found in his possession, which, he said, he, when a prisoner, had purchased in the Indian camp; that this rifle had been in use by Constable Elliott who was killed a few days before while on patrol duty from the barracks. In the first claim, Bremner does not claim for the loss of any goods, animals, or household property, lost at Bresaylor, but only for the furs and the value of one horse and \$395, the value of some goods, lost by Antonius Falcone, his agent. In his third schedule, he increases his furs in value by about \$1,000, and adds \$15,000, not previously mentioned, for animals, goods, and household property. It came out in evidence before the commission that not only was Bremner armed and with freedom in the Indian camp, but that he also had absolute control of his furs, carts, and tents, and of his goods and provisions as well, and that while in the camp, he and James Bremner purchased stolen Government rifles from the rebels. I mention these circumstances, which it appears to me are to his discredit, simply on the question of credit. Now, I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that a foul stain has rested upon the persons whose names were, I think, rashly mentioned to the House two years ago in connection with the loss of these furs. I think we should discourage the assailing of men in high positions, who had hitherto borne good characters, on the statement of a person who was not only disloyal, who was not only found with stolen Government goods in his possession, but who was found armed with the rifle of a recently slain public servant; and I think to have assailed men in high position, on the statement of a person who made, as this person undoubtedly did make, claims grossly exaggerated against the Government, only reflected discredit upon those who rashly did so. Now, the delay has not been so great as the hon. gentleman thinks it was. It is true that these claims were presented in 1885. The Government

were unable to dispose of them, and they had to be referred for investigation to a commission; and I think it was only about a year ago that the commission made any report at all. It is true that representations have been made since with regard to the losses of the furs. The hon. member reminded me that the hon. member for Bothwell called our attention to this matter two years ago. He did so in this way—and the circumstances will recur to the hon. gentleman's recollection when I mention them: In discussing the penitentiary estimates, the hon. member for Bothwell asked me across the House if I knew that the warden of the Manitoba penitentiary had stolen somebody's furs, and I think he mentioned General Middleton's name in that connection. I had never heard of the furs or of the claims, and that was the first intimation I had of Mr. Bedson's name being connected with the matter. I said I did not, and last Session, before this commission had reported, at any rate before there was an opportunity of examining the evidence, the same question was repeated across the House in a rather more exaggerated form, and the charge of theft was distinctly levelled against these officers, who are not here and have no opportunity of answering any imputation of that kind. I want to sum up what I have said. It is this: That while I should not take the responsibility of saying that there can be no further enquiry as to the claims of the Bresaylor people—I am leaving the question of the fur claims for the moment out of consideration—I do say this: That the result arrived at by the commission is a fair and proper one in view of the evidence before it; that the Government gave all proper consideration to the petition which came for relief; that they gave a careful and painstaking investigation into the truth of the statements then made, that the result of that investigation is a confirmation of the conclusion at which the commissioners arrived, and that there is nothing in the evidence which could lead us to arrive at a different conclusion now. As regards the furs, I think the claim for them stands on a different footing. I do not, for a moment, put against the claim for furs which may have been deposited with officers of the Government, the mere fact that they belonged to persons who were implicated in the rebellion. I know, from the personal intercourse with my late colleague the Minister of the Interior, that a very short time before I had to be absent from this city, previous to the sitting of the House, he was pursuing a careful investigation with the view of arriving at a conclusion which would be strictly just. Unfortunately, I am not in a position to state to the House, owing to the lamentable circumstance of his death, the conclusion he arrived at, or even to know from himself the stage which the enquiry had reached. I ask the House, therefore, to understand that, as regards that claim, the enquiry has not been concluded and will be pursued.

Mr. LAURIER. There are two different aspects to the question which has been brought up by my hon. friend beside me. First of all, there is the case of the Bresaylor settlers, and then there is the peculiar case of Mr. Bremner, whose claim stands by itself. As to the settlers in general of the Bresaylor settlement, the hon. gentleman has stated, and I am not disposed at this moment to contradict his statement, that the claims were investigated by the commission, and that so far as he could see the conclusion reached was a fair and exact conclusion. I must say at once that, comparing the statements made, it must be evident there is room for discussion; it must be evident that it is not beyond possibility of doubt that these men were not rebels in the full sense of the word. He must take into consideration, in the first place, that I have always protested, not only after the event but before the event, that these men were not rebels. That, at all events, appears to be true; for, when they were invited to go to Battleford,

they preferred to remain where they were. The reason which induced them to act as they did came from a statement made by the council themselves, advising them to remain at home and protect their own property. They had reason to fear, and the result proved that their fears were justified, that, if they left their property, it would be destroyed by the rebels or the Indians; and it is in evidence, as has been already stated by the hon. gentleman, that the property of those who took part at Battleford was destroyed. It was very natural for men, who had reason to fear that their property would be destroyed if they left it, to remain at home to guard it. But, afterwards, they are found with the band of Poundmaker. Here there is a conflicting statement. One statement is that they were there of their own accord, and the other is that they were taken prisoners by the Indians. Even if the first statement is correct, that cannot be made an act of rebellion, because those Indians were on their own reserve, and as long as they remained on their own reserve, none of their acts could be construed as an act of rebellion. The hon. gentleman has quoted from the *Saskatchewan Herald*. I find a statement in that paper which does not convey the impression that these men were rebels, but, on the contrary, that they acted in a manner which goes to their credit. We have the evidence of a scout named Fontaine who was taken prisoner, and he says that he was threatened with death by the Indians and was only preserved by the half-breeds. He says:

"Fontaine was taken to the Indian camp, where he says the Stoneyes clamored for his life. The half-breeds protested, telling the Indians if they shot Fontaine they would have to shoot them as well."

These facts should go in their favor, and, moreover, I would lay down this rule at present upon which I think the Government should act. I agree with the rule adopted by the commissioners that no one should be entitled to compensation who had been an actual rebel, though I have always taken the ground that those who took part were excused, to a certain extent, by the neglect of their claims by the Government; but still everyone must admit that they committed a crime against the laws of the country, and, if that is so, they cannot complain; but I think it would be good policy, when there is a doubt as to whether the claimant for compensation has been a rebel or not, to give him the benefit of the doubt. I think the Government should be lenient in that matter, and should take a generous view of the case, and, wherever it is possible, to take that view as it is here, whenever there is a doubt whether persons were actual participants in the rebellion or not, the Government should be generous and should extend a merciful consideration to them. There must necessarily be a good deal of bitter sentiment among these people, and the best way to cure that and to bring them to their dutiful allegiance is to extend the best consideration to them which is possible. The Government and the country are sufficiently rich to extend generous consideration to a people whom the Government have admitted they have so long neglected. As far as Charles Bremner is concerned, it seems to me that his claim has been rejected for reasons altogether of a frivolous character. First of all, it was stated that he was a party to the rebellion. Suppose that was so. Then another reason is that his claims varied between one statement and another. But this point has been well explained by my hon. friend. The difference is very small, it simply varies from \$4,000 to \$5,000. He simply varied his figures, not as to the whole claim, but as to the amount lost in regard to cattle and property and so on. Let this claim be set aside. Still, when it is proved that he took certain property with him and that, in order to protect that property which he had with him, that is the furs, the general in command ordered those furs to be taken to the barracks, it is clear that the country must account for that property. It is evident that these furs were ordered by the general in command to be placed in the police barracks for safety,

and that this man has not received those furs to this day. It matters very little whether they were worth \$4,000 or \$5,000 or more. My hon. friend was quite justified in saying that the honor of the country is bound that this man should have the furs returned to him. Under these circumstances, it is not satisfactory to hear, as we have heard from the Minister of Justice, that the Government are not at present prepared to consider the question. I do not desire to place any blame on the officers whose names have been mentioned, but I do not admit, as the hon. gentleman has stated, that this is not the place to bring the charge and mention the names of the officers, because they are not here to defend themselves. This is the great court of enquiry, because this is the place where public opinion can be called to the fact, and this is the very place of all others where the charge should be made. There has been a charge made that a wrong has been committed, and the country is bound to account to this man for this property, poor and destitute as he is, and for that reason, if for no other, that the goods were really taken charge of by the commanding officer at that time, I am sure that, on the other side, as well as on this side of the House, everyone will feel that it would be a disgrace and a dishonor and a shameful act if the property of that poor man is not accounted for in some way to him. It does not do to say: You have no right to accuse this or that man. I do not accuse anybody, but I say the Government should see that ample justice should be done to this man, and that the property which was confided to the Government should be restored to him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If no other gentleman has anything to say on this subject, I shall bring forward another question of which I gave notice several weeks ago, and which I have not yet been able to reach. But as it is now but ten minutes to six o'clock, I doubt whether it will be worth while to go on with it, as I could hardly finish it in ten minutes, and perhaps we had better call it six o'clock.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 128) for the relief of Eleonora Elizabeth Tudor (from the Senate) on a division.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 129) for the relief of Andrew Maxwell Irving (from the Senate) on a division.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 130) for the relief of Catharine Morrison (from the Senate) on a division.—(Mr. Small.)

REPRESENTATION OF RUSSELL.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificate of the election and return of William Cameron Edwards, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Russell.

ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY.

Mr. BOYLE moved :

That the rules and orders be suspended with regard to Bill (No. 61) to amend the Act of the present Session intitled: "An Act to amend the Act relating to the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company," and that leave be given to introduce said Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Explain.

Mr. BOYLE. It will be remembered by members of the House who are members of the Railway Committee that some three weeks ago a Bill was before that Committee to amend the Act of the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company. This railway was first projected to run

Mr. LAURIER.

in a south-westerly direction through the villages of Bismarck, Smithville and Caledonia, and the company obtained a charter from the Ontario Legislature. This charter was afterwards amended so as to permit of the construction of the line from St. Catharines to Toronto, through or near the city of Hamilton; and, after that, legislation was obtained from this House, declaring that this railway would be for the general advantage of Canada, and a subsidy was granted last Session to the extent of \$38,000 for the promotion of the said railway. Certain shareholders who subscribed to the original project, and who were directly interested in it, came before the House this Session and asked that, inasmuch as the line for which they had subscribed had been practically abandoned and never commenced, as their money or capital was diverted to another project, either this House should order the original project to be continued and carried out, or they, as shareholders, should be relieved from any further charge thereon. This proposition was considered by the Railway Committee and without a dissenting voice an amendment was made in the form of clause 7 of this Bill, which I will read :

All original stockholders of the said company who have not assented to the present route as now in process of construction, including the proposed route by way of Burlington Beach to Toronto, shall only be liable in respect to their respective stock therein when the said railway company shall have constructed five miles of the main line of their railway from St. Catharines to Smithville with the *bona fide* intention of completing the same, provided such shareholders shall within three months of the passing of this Act elect in writing to be bound by this section.

This clause, I say, was adopted unanimously by the Railway Committee and the Bill, with this amendment, was adopted unanimously by this House. When the matter came before the Senate, that body took exception to another clause in the Bill, which they thought was of a retroactive character. The Senate, therefore, added a clause to the Bill, in these words :

Nothing in this Act contained shall affect any litigation heretofore had or now pending.

This Bill came back to this House, and was finally passed in this shape last Friday. It is now found, I believe, that this will affect not only all other matters connected with the railway enterprise but the rights of individual shareholders who have been protected by the amendment, and they now ask this House to modify that clause so that it shall apply only to clause 3 and not to clause 7 of the Bill, by adopting an amendment in these words :

Section 8 of the Bill of the present Session, intituled: "An Act to amend the Act respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company," is hereby amended by inserting after the words "nothing in" the words "section 3 of."

I may say that Hon. Mr. Abbott, leader of the Senate, has been consulted in regard to this matter and has expressed no objection to the change now asked.

Motion agreed to, and Bill (No. 137) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company, was read the first and second times.

Mr. BOYLE moved that the House resolve itself into Committee.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MITCHELL. It seems to me a rather extraordinary course to pursue to go into Committee on this Bill without sending it to the Railway Committee. Perhaps the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) will explain what is intended to be accomplished by the Bill.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. When this Bill was before the Railway Committee, as the hon. member (Mr. Boyle) has said, it was referred to a sub-committee to settle a clause to save the rights of certain shareholders who had taken stock

in this railway on the condition that it followed a certain route. That route has since been changed, and those farmers and others along the route who took stock do not want to be bound to pay their stock. Their solicitor came down here and appeared before the sub-committee, as did also the solicitor of the railway company and it was agreed that those persons who did not approve of the change of route should be relieved from the necessity of paying up their stock. The clause was drawn by the two parties who were present. In that form the Bill was sent to the Senate, but that body added a clause providing that nothing in this Act shall affect pending litigation. It so happens that there is litigation pending with respect to these shareholders, whom it was agreed should be relieved, and the effect of inserting the words, "Nothing in section 3 of this Act shall affect pending litigation," is that the litigation against the shareholders will be affected by this Act. Those shareholders who do not want the change of route will be relieved in accordance with the agreement entered into by the two parties before the sub-committee of the Railway Committee. It is to carry out the intention and agreement arrived at.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am sorry to say that the hon. member's explanation makes the thing more complex than ever. I find a very important parliamentary question arises here, as to affecting existing litigation. The object of this Bill is to remove that safety valve that provides that existing litigation shall not be affected.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. That appears to me to be a very important principle, and ought not to be dealt hastily with in this Parliament. The hon. gentleman has certainly not given a very lucid explanation.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I have given you the explanation exactly. It is to affect existing litigation, but it was done by agreement between this railway company and the parties interested.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you want it to affect litigation or not?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I want it to affect litigation commenced against those shareholders, because the railway company said if we get this power we will give up those suits and claims against those shareholders, but that agreement between the parties has been nullified by the clause which has been added in the Senate. It was an agreement made in the Railway Committee by the railway company, that they should abandon their litigation against those persons if they obtained this Act.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then that is a case for the Railway Committee, and my hon. friend's explanation is not satisfactory. It clearly shows that a question is involved in the passage of this Bill, which this Parliament and every other parliament always sets its face against, namely, that they will not allow any legislation to pass through which affects existing litigation. As I understand my hon. friend says that the clause added in the Senate is, that this Bill shall not affect existing litigation. My hon. friend tells this committee that the object of the Bill is to remove the effect of the clause added in the Senate, which prevents existing litigation being interfered with.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It is because the committee have agreed to it. We find that the clause added in the Senate would affect some suits that are pending against the railway under clause 3 of the Act. We want to protect the rights of the litigants, who are the shareholders and who are to be relieved from the effect of subscribing for their stock, according to the agreement made by the solicitor for the shareholders and by the solicitor for the company. The matter was only called to our attention to-

day by the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) who asked that this Act should be brought in, to carry out that agreement that was made in the presence of the Railway Committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend will see what the effect of legislation such as this is. Here is a Bill probably before the Railway Committee for weeks;—

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. It has passed the Railway Committee; it has been reported to this House; it is sent to the Senate and amended in a certain clause as they thought necessary in their wisdom to amend it, because they are a very wise set of people.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. They did not understand this clause.

Mr. MITCHELL. They have amended the legislation so as to protect any existing litigants who have litigation pending in the courts of law. It does appear to me that if ever there was a case in which a Bill should be sent to the Railway Committee this is the one. We do not know that the people interested in the matter know that this Bill is brought before the House. You come down at the last moment to amend a Bill that has passed both branches of the Legislature, and it does appear to me it would be a very improper course for us to pursue. If we are going to adopt this method of legislating, it simply wipes out all the Rules of the House.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. We only wish to put this Bill in the same state as it was in when it left the House. We are asking that this clause (added after much consideration to the Bill) should be put back again, and that the Bill should be put in the same state as it was when it left this House, and in which it was when it was reported from the Railway Committee. The clause added by the Senate changed the clause as passed by the Railway Committee after much consideration, and we are asking you now to put that clause back in the shape it left this House. Surely that is carrying out what the Railway Committee wanted and that is carrying out the intention of the House, although it does affect litigation, but that is what the company agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Where is the evidence?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. As one of the sub-committee I tell you that it is so. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle) was a member of the sub-committee, and the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) was another. We met together to-day, when we had our attention called to the fact that that clause which was passed by us, had been nullified by the fact of the amendment added in the Senate. We went to the leader of the Senate and he told us that if any person had stated this to him that he would not have added that clause, and he told us to bring in a Bill to add a new clause to this section 3.

Mr. BOYLE. In addition to the explanation given by the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) there is another clause to which the Senate objected, and their amendment was made for the purpose of covering that clause, but it reaches a little too far and covered the compromise amendment in the Bill, which is just referred to. The clause objected to in the Senate was clause 3, which is as follows:

The provisions of "The Railway Act," from section four to section 39, both inclusive, being part of the said Act shall apply to the said St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway, and in so far as they are applicable to the undertaking, and except to the extent to which they are inconsistent with the provisions of the said Acts of the Legislature of the Province of Ontario above recited, shall be read and construed therewith in the same manner as though forming part thereof, and expressly incorporated therewith—

And this part was specially objectionable in the Bill—

and it is hereby declared that the said provisions of "The Railway Act," from section 4 to section 39, both inclusive, have been to the extent aforesaid applicable to the said railway from and after the passing of the said Act of the Parliament of Canada, passed in the session held in the fiftieth and fifty-first years of Her Majesty's reign, intituled: "An Act respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company."

To prevent that going further, and to prevent the retroactive effect having a mischievous character they added:

Nothing in this Act contained shall affect any litigation heretofore had or now pending.

We see that that clause will cover the compromise amendment to which I have just referred. I am sure the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) as well as myself, would like to see justice done.

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel I have done my duty in calling attention to the extraordinary character of the legislation. If the hon. the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has neglected his duty in going to the Senate Committee.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I have nothing whatever to do with the Bill.

Mr. BOYLE. He has no more to do with it than you have yourself.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am merely doing it because of a public duty, and I was asked by the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) to see that the compromise carried out in presence of both parties to the Bill, should be protected by law.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have done my duty and shall say nothing more about it.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—THE CASE OF WALTER JONES.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I placed on the Votes and Proceedings of the House a notice that when the motion that you should leave the Chair and that the House should resolve itself into Committee of Supply was made, I proposed to move as follows:—

That on or about the 4th day of October, 1887, Mr. Justice Boyd held a court for the trial of the contested election for the county of Haldimand;

That the said judge declared the said election to be void, and that certain persons, including one Walter Jones, had been guilty of corrupt practices at the said election;

That the said proceedings were very widely reported in the public press, along with the fact that the said Walter Jones had been found guilty of corrupt practices;

That the said Mr. Justice Boyd duly reported the said facts to the Speaker of the House of Commons, on the 15th day of October, 1887;

That the Speaker thereupon issued his writ for a new election for the said county, and that the Government appointed a returning officer to hold the said election, at a very early date after the issue of the said writ;

That the said new election took place on the 12th day of November, 1887;

That on the 15th day of October the Government of the Dominion appointed one Robert Glenny and the said Walter Jones, reported by the said Judge Boyd as guilty of corrupt practices, to act as commissioners and valuers to decide on the rights of the occupants and the value of the improvements made by them in regard to divers voters, resident in the county of Haldimand, on certain lands belonging to the Indians of that region;

That on the 28th day of October, fourteen days before the date of the said election, the Department of Indian Affairs caused an official circular to be addressed to the several occupants of the said lands in the words following:—

"DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,

"OTTAWA, 28th October, 1887.

"DEAR SIR,—Mr. Robert Glenny and Mr. Walter Jones have been appointed by this department to examine the Indian lands in the village of Cayuga, west of the Grand River, and to value the lands and the improvements thereon. The Government have decided to sell these

Mr. BOYLE.

lands this autumn, and the squatters in possession, and who show they are legally entitled to the benefit of such improvements as have been made on such parts thereof as they respectively occupy, on investigation of their claim thereto being made, will be given the opportunity of purchasing on such terms as the Government may, on report of the said commissioners to be made in each case, consider proper. Your name appears on the list of squatters sent in by the said commissioners. If you desire to purchase the land you occupy, make written application therefor at once to the said commissioners, Messrs. Glenny and Jones, stating what lands you occupy. If your title to the improvements is found to be correct, you will then have the option of purchasing such land as you occupy. All land not applied for, or the improvements on which the squatter does not appear to have a good claim, will be offered for sale at auction or otherwise as soon as the investigation is closed.

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

(Signed) "R. SINCLAIR,

"For Deputy of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs."

That, by clause 94, chapter 8 of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, it is provided that: "If, on the trial of any election petition, any candidate is proved to have personally engaged any person at the election to which said petition relates, as a canvasser or agent in relation to the election, knowing that such person, so engaged, has, within eight years previous to such engagement, been found guilty of any corrupt practice by any competent legal tribunal, or by the report of any judge, or other tribunal for the trial of election petitions, the election of such candidate, if he has been elected, shall be void."

That the said election was held on the 12th day of November, 1887, and the candidate who supported the Government was elected by a majority of twelve votes. That the conduct of the Government in appointing the said Walter Jones, after he had been proved guilty of corrupt practices, to a position of trust and influence, in which he would be able to exert influence over a number of the electors of the said county of Haldimand, was in direct defiance of the spirit and intention of said clause 94 of said chapter 8, and was, in the highest degree, reprehensible, and calculated to encourage and promote corrupt practices at the said and other elections, and deserves the severe censure of the House.

Now, Sir, I am not going to spend a great deal of time over this, the more so that the facts are incontrovertible. Nobody in this House or out of it can deny the fact of Mr. Justice Boyd's report, and that Mr. Walter Jones was in that report declared guilty of corrupt practices; nobody can deny the authenticity of this circular letter of the Department of Indian Affairs; nor, Sir, can they question the accuracy of the clause in the statute which I have read, and which states that where a candidate employs a person who has been found guilty of corrupt practices within eight years after the time he was so proved guilty, his election shall be void. Sir, I feel a sort of reluctance to comment on the facts here disclosed; it appears like gilding refined gold or painting the lily. This transaction, Sir, as defined within the four corners of this motion, is perfectly complete in itself—*totus, teres, atque rotundus*—

"With every feature of a knave complete,
If it be honest, 'tis a dev'lish cheat."

Now, Sir, I must say a few words as to the extraordinary combination of improper proceedings which are disclosed by these facts. First of all, I say that this is a case of very gross intimidation exercised by the Government towards a number of the electors of Haldimand, who by accidental circumstances were absolutely in their power. You have to consider the date of this circular; it is dated the 28th day of October, just 14 days before the election in that county. You must remember that these persons were almost all very poor, as I am informed, and that their whole property, such as it was, was placed by this circular absolutely and entirely at the disposal of the two commissioners, Mr. Robert Glenny and Mr. Walter Jones, whom the Government appointed. Then, Sir, it is worthy of notice that this circular comes from the Indian Department, who are trustees of the Indians and are bound to get the best price they can for the property belonging to the Indians. Now, Sir, this is a very curious way to do it. They appoint two commissioners, one of whom was recently proved guilty of corrupt practices at an election, and they subject this man, as well as the people with whom he deals, to the strongest possible temptation to gain the good-will of these electors, by undervaluing the property to please them, if only they will vote the right way. Now, it must be remembered that every-

body was aware, and Mr. Walter Jones perhaps better than anybody else, that the election was likely to be very close. As a matter of fact, some half dozen votes thrown either way would have changed the fate of that election. On the defiance of public opinion, which is evidenced by these proceedings of the Government, it is perhaps not worth while to dwell. They may be perfectly right in despising the public opinion of the people of Canada. Looking at their past conduct and antecedents, I can hardly take it upon myself to say that they are not justified in saying that there is no public opinion in Canada that is worth one straw for political purposes. But still, you have staring them in the face the statute which declares explicitly that if an ordinary candidate employs within eight years a man who has been proved guilty of corruption, the election shall be void; and the Government of Canada, knowing the existence of that statute, on the very day that he is returned by Mr. Boyd to you, Sir, as guilty of corrupt practices, signified their appreciation of the statute by deliberately placing him in a position which would give him almost unlimited power to influence the decision of a very closely contested election. Now, there are several lines of defence possible to these hon. gentlemen, and I am curious to see which they will adopt. There is the line of defence they may adopt, that the department did not know of this, that the department are not bound, I suppose, to read the newspapers and to see Mr. Justice Boyd's report, and that it was a mere coincidence that, on the 15th October, 1887, the identical day on which this report was sent in, the Department of Indians Affairs chose to select Mr. Walter Jones, proved guilty of corrupt practices, to fill the position of valuator of certain lands occupied by certain voters in the county of Haldimand. It was pure accident no doubt that induced the Department of Indians Affairs, on the 28th October, fourteen days before the election which was then known to be about to take place, to issue to these thirty or forty men, squatting on these Indian lands, a circular by which they were informed that their whole properties were placed at the absolute disposal, because that is what it amounts to, of these two commissioners. Perhaps, I will be told that Mr. Jones, in spite of the trifling accident that he was convicted of corrupt practices, was a highly respectable man, who had filled many offices of trust, and peradventure, had been recommended for this post by some prominent Liberal politician. I cannot say; possibly that was the case, and possibly the circular also was conceived in the usual form. Or they may make a more hypocritical defence. They may plead that they are very sorry, but these things will happen. They may plead that it is impossible always to be on the alert; and now that the end is obtained, now that the election is decided in favor of their candidate, I dare say they will be willing enough to pledge themselves never to do it again—or hardly ever—except in a political emergency; and, perhaps, they will be willing to put in a clause—and I think some such clause was suggested on the other side—that hereafter persons guilty of corrupt practices should be ineligible to hold any office at the hands of the Government. Then there is, lastly, the defence which has been adopted before in another place. It may be called Mr. Wm. M. Tweed's line of defence. The hon. gentlemen may ask us what we are going to do about it? They may call in their majority and vote us down; or, they may combine one or more of these several lines of defence. I make them a present of the whole three. They may decide which one or how many of them they would like to take; but I ask the House, on both sides, if there is any hon. gentleman here, on either side, who entertains the slightest doubt, that a gross outrage was committed in this case, and that it was a most improper thing for the Government to deliberately appoint to a position of this kind a man who had been proved guilty of corrupt practices. I ask was it not a most corrupt act that they should place

him in a position which made him, to all intents and purposes, for the time being, practically dictator of these unfortunate squatters, whose property was entirely dependent on the report that he and his brother commissioner chose to make? It is perfectly clear that the spirit of the Act has been most grossly disregarded, if not the letter, by the very guardians, the very men, who, by virtue of their office, are bound to see that the law is enforced. Nobody who knows the situation, nobody who knows the position in which these poor men were placed, can doubt that by such a letter or circular being addressed to them, they were subjected to intimidation; and in view of the extremely small majority by which that election was carried, nobody can doubt that it was owing to that circular and to the corrupt appointment of this very man, Mr. Walter Jones, to the position of valuator of these lands, that the election was due. Now I should like to know what possible defence honest men outside of the House would think could be made of these things? I recollect that, not many months ago, a reverend gentleman, the Rev. Principal Grant, dealing with some of the facts which had been disclosed with respect to the doings of hon. gentlemen opposite, had the occasion to say that he, for his part, defied anybody to defend such things, and that you might as well defend Sodom. Now, I am curious, as a mere matter of experiment, to know whether among all the worthy and hon. gentlemen opposite, we can find as many as would have saved the original Sodom, who are willing to join with us in condemning this atrocious violation of all constitutional usage and constitutional precedent, and with that view I desire to place this motion in your hands, Sir, to-night.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am very well aware that hon. gentlemen upon both sides of this House are exceedingly anxious that the Session should come to as early a close as possible, and, therefore, I shall not make my remarks very long, and shall follow in that respect the example which has been set by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). At the same time, while he showed that he had a desire to see the Session close at an early date, I think he has, in regard to the quality of the subject which he undertook to discuss before the House, shown that he believes discretion to be the better part of valor, for it was quite evident that there was not much in the case to say a great deal upon. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have come to recognise the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite have elected a leader in the person of the hon. gentleman who sits to the right of the hon. member for South Oxford; but I am not aware whether the hon. member for South Oxford, in bringing up this matter, and various other matters that he has brought before the House, in acting, as it were, as the scavenger of the party to which he belongs, is endeavoring to usurp the place of the leader of the Opposition, or whether he is doing a kind of work which the leader of the Opposition does not care to do, knowing, as we do, the fine tastes and gentlemanly conduct of that hon. member. Hon. gentlemen opposite have a very large number of leaders among them. There are many gentlemen there who aspire to prominent places in the ranks of that party, but I think it is rather unkind on the part of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to take away the one ewe lamb of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I never expected to find the hon. member for South Oxford in rivalry with the hon. member for North Wellington as to who should be the chief scavenger of the party, but, on this side of the House, we have no fault to find with that, if it suits his taste. We are perfectly in accord with his practice in this matter, but we may be allowed to express our sympathy with the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who has hitherto, I am bound to say, so assiduously and so successfully pursued that course in his

place in this House. I hope the hon. member for South Oxford will be more successful, with that peculiar genius which the *Globe* said he possessed in this new sphere, than he has been in the financial circles of this country. I am not without hope, that in future we may find him dealing with those important matters of cab-hire, tooth-picks, and wooden spoons, and that we shall find his aristocratic turbinated bones passing over the odors of those second-hand carpets to which the hon. member for North Wellington occasionally refers, and over which the feet of vice-regal ladies have so often trodden. However, at last the hon. gentleman has found a reason why the county of Haldimand has slipped from his grasp. It is a new reason which I have not heard given before, though I have heard reasons without number. It was said in the first place that the county was lost on account of corruption. Well, they had a trial on that ground, and they tried to prove that corruption was the reason. They had me on the grid-iron there for eight days, and they could not prove anything at all in regard to corruption. Then we had it stated in a newspaper that the county was lost because the Government had the election take place on a Saturday, and that 400 Seventh-Day Baptists could not vote on that account. That would be a very good reason but for the fact that there was not a single Seventh-Day Baptist in the constituency, and so that reason went to the dogs. Then it was stated that it was because of the reconstruction of the constituency. That would be a good reason if it were not that the re-arrangement took away certain municipalities which, together, would have given me a majority of 50 or 60. The next statement was that the result was owing to a grant of \$28,000 to the Indians, who happened to live in the county, a few days before the election. No doubt that would have been a good reason but for the fact that this bad and corrupt Government had not given any such sum to the Indians, and that I never knew anything about the Indians there having any claim on the Government until after the election. Now, the hon. gentleman has found a new reason, and I think I can show that he places it on the ground that I have obtained this seat owing to the performance of my duty. I hope I shall always owe my seat to the performance of my duty. The hon. gentleman said that he felt some delicacy in bringing this matter forward, and I think there are two or three reasons why he should feel that delicacy. In the first place he should feel that delicacy because he had not a single charge to make that these gentlemen influenced in any way the electors of the constituency, and, in the second place, because this refers to the administration of an hon. gentleman who was then in charge of the Indian Department, and whose death has recently taken place, and has caused sorrow and regret from one end of this country to the other. There is another reason why the hon. gentleman should feel delicacy in regard to this matter, as in regard to other matters which he has brought forward, and that is that the protest in regard to the county of Haldimand is now before the Supreme Court of this country. I trust the hon. gentleman has too much sense to imagine that by throwing these slanders against me in this House he can prejudice my case before any Supreme Court of this country. If he thinks that, he is very much misjudging the calibre of the judges who dispense justice in Canada. Now, I may be allowed to digress for a moment, and to deal with the subject which the hon. gentleman has, on three occasions, referred to in this House, and which he has referred to in very uncomplimentary terms, and that is in reference to the returning officer who was selected to do duty at one polling place. I think I might crave the indulgence of the House in regard to this, because, at the time the subject was discussed, the whole of the facts were not in the possession of the Minister of Justice or in my possession. That is why I ask to be allowed to refer to a past debate in connection with this

Mr. MONTAGUE.

matter. I should not attempt to refer to it, if it were not connected with a private individual in my constituency. This was brought up here by the hon. gentleman under cover of his privilege as a member of Parliament, and he used language which he would not attempt to use in the presence of the man he attacks in this House as an ex-convict. Now, then let me say that last year the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) in his place, made certain attacks upon an hon. gentleman in the Upper House, and upon a certain judge in that county. What did he do? He found out afterwards that his information was false, and like the man that he is, he offered an humble apology for the statements he had made, and declared that he would embrace the first public opportunity of expressing his opinion of the information he had. The man who informed my hon. friend from West Elgin with regard to these matters, is the same individual who informed my hon. friend from South Oxford in regard to this matter; and when I have explained this matter to the House, if the hon. gentleman is possessed of those finer feelings which aristocratic birth and liberal culture should give him, he should stand up in this House and express his regret for many of the statements he has made. But when I suggested to one of my friends the other day that, perhaps, he would do so, my friend said: "Oh, no; the member for South Oxford never does anything of that kind. His tastes are rather blunt in that direction, so you need not expect he will make any apology." But, Sir, I have not lost hope entirely in the hon. gentleman yet. I do not think that the constant failure of the people of this country to appreciate the hon. gentleman's peculiar genius, has so hardened him that he will not do justice to an opponent when occasion offers itself. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has said a great deal in one of his addresses in connection with the returning officer of the county of Haldimand, and has sought to place a stigma upon that gentleman's character in this House. All that I can say is that that gentleman needs no defence of mine in this House or in this country. He is a man of the highest professional attainments, he is a municipal officer who has served long and faithfully the township in which he lives; he is a man who holds the entire confidence of political friends and foes; and he is a gentleman of whom the hon. member, removed from his cover as a member of this House, would not attack in the way he has attacked him here. We were told that when the hon. member for South Oxford became the real leader of the party, or words to that effect, he would take up an aggressive policy, a heroic policy, and that that heroic policy was to sweep the Government of my right hon. friend from power. Well, Sir, we have had a specimen of that heroism, we have had a specimen of the heroism of an hon. gentleman, decorated by Her Majesty, a gentleman who has had all the advantages of culture and of a higher education, using that heroism, standing up here under his cover as a member of Parliament, and attacking at a distance of 300 miles a solitary private individual who has only one leg. Sir, that is heroism. Now, I want to refer for a few minutes to the answer which my hon. friend the Minister of Justice gave to the hon. gentleman when he asked, with regard to one Mr. Young, who was returning officer in the election in the county of Haldimand. My hon. friend gave him three answers. In the first place he said that the Government had no knowledge that this Mr. Young had been convicted of stealing; in the second place he answered that he was a respectable man in his district, and had occupied positions of responsibility and trust; thirdly, he gave him the answer that the gentleman had been recommended for the post by a prominent Liberal politician. Notwithstanding the affidavits that the hon. gentleman has brought to this House, notwithstanding the certificates he has read, I stand in my place to-night, with the evidence in my possession, and say that as a

matter of fact the Minister of Justice was right in every single answer that he gave. In the first place, the hon. gentleman read a certificate of a gaoler and of a sheriff, that the Mr. Young in question had been convicted of theft. How did he get that certificate, Sir? He did not tell us in this House that it was accompanied by a certificate from one Charles Wesley Coulter, a gentleman whom I know in the county of Haldimand; and I suppose that certificate was sent him by Charles Wesley Coulter as well—I need not suppose anything about it, because I have the facts of the case since, not from a friend of mine in that county, but from the sheriff and the gaoler of the county of Brant, who were acquainted with this matter, and whose names were signed to the documents which my hon. friend read with such a flourish in this House. In the first place let me say to him that Mr. Coulter went to the gaol of the county of Brant and asked to see the register in which those commitments were kept. He discussed that commitment with the gaoler and with the sheriff, and they allowed him also to copy the certificate, and they signed it, supposing it to be correct; and I have their statements now that the statements made in that certificate were not correct, as written by Charles Wesley Coulter, and sent to the hon. gentleman. Now, let me read the certificate of Alfred Kitchen, the gaoler:

"I, Alfred Kitchen, governor of the gaol of the county of Brant, hereby certify that I signed a certificate with reference to the conviction of the said Charles Young, and his sentence to six months in the common gaol of the said county. He was not convicted for the 'larceny of wheat,' but according to the 'register of the gaol for the county of Brant,' 'for receiving.' If I signed a former certificate at variance with this it was done inadvertently. The certificate was drawn by Mr. Coulter after an examination by him of the said 'register of the gaol for the county of Brant,' and I had confidence that it was correct and properly made out from the said register. I have made no affidavit in this matter.

"ALFRED KITCHEN,

"Gaoler."

I am sorry for the sake of my hon. friend and Mr. Coulter that his confidence was misplaced. Now, we have another certificate from Mr. Rubridge, of Brantford, registrar of the High Court of Justice, and he bears out exactly the statements made by the gaoler:

"Office of the Local Registrar of the High Court of Justice for the county of Brant, and Clerk of Assize for the said county of Brant.

"In the matter of Charles Young, of the township of Oneida, in the county of Haldimand, a deputy returning officer at an election for member of the House of Commons of Canada.

"BRANTFORD, 7th May, 1888.

"I, Walter Rubridge, of the city of Brantford, in the county of Brant, Esq., local registrar of the High Court of Justice for the said county, and clerk of Assize for the said county, do hereby certify:

"I have read the certificate of the sheriff of the county of Brant, and of the gaoler of the said county, as reported in *Hansard* of date 19th April, 1888, which certificate is in these words:

"BRANTFORD, 4th April, 1888.

"This is to certify that from the regular gaol books kept for the county of Brant, it appears that one Charles Young, of the county of Haldimand, farmer, was sentenced by Her Majesty's regular Court of Assize on the 2nd day of May, A.D. 1879, for the offence of stealing wheat, to six months' imprisonment in the common gaol of the county of Brant, and duly served his term of imprisonment in accordance with the said sentence, and at, and during the said period he was sentenced by the County Judges Criminal Court to a similar period of imprisonment on another charge, both sentences being concurrent.

"(Sgd.) H. J. SCARFE,

Sheriff of the County of Brant.

"(Sgd.) ALFRED KITCHEN,

"Gaoler."

"2. I have been for many years clerk of Assize of the county of Brant, and I was acting as such clerk at the Brant Spring Assizes, which commenced on Tuesday the 29th day of April, 1879, before the Honorable George William Burton, the presiding judge.

"At the said Assize an indictment was preferred against one Charles Young for larceny and receiving a quantity of wheat, the property of one Elijah Walker. A true bill was found on the said indictment, by the grand jury, on the same 29th day of April, 1879, and the said Charles Young pleaded to said indictment, 'not guilty,' on the same day. Thereupon the Crown abandoned the first count of the indictment against the said Charles Young for the larceny charged against him, and he was con-

sequently discharged, as to that alleged offence, and he withdrew his plea of not guilty, as to the other offence of receiving the quantity of wheat mentioned in the said indictment.

"I make this certificate on reading the records of my office, which are carefully kept, and I say no further or other charge or indictment appears by my books and other official records in my office against the said Charles Young, except what in this my certificate appears.

"The certificate of the sheriff of the county of Brant and the gaoler of the county of Brant, so far as it varies from this, my certificate, in stating that the said Charles Young was convicted at the said Assizes for the offence of stealing wheat, is incorrect.

"W. RUBRIDGE,

"Local Registrar, H.C.J., and Clerk of Assize, Co. Brant, Ont."

But my hon. friend will say that there is a distinction; he will say that the charge of receiving stolen goods was equally immoral with stealing the goods. Well, Sir, let me tell him this, that this Mr. Young, as I am informed, to save a friend, committed an indiscretion, and pleaded guilty to the charge of having received stolen goods, and that is why a punishment was inflicted upon him.

An hon. MEMBER. That is too thin.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Hon. gentlemen with their keen, cool, legal judgment, of course will say that it is just as bad, every bit. Well, Sir, I do not say that they would be guilty of doing the same thing. I think they would let the friend take it every time, rather than suffer anything for anyone else. Then as to the next statement that this man had occupied a place of trust in the municipality in which he lived. My hon. friend contradicted that by an affidavit of some party whom, he said, resided in the township of Oneida. He may reside there, I do not know the name, but if he does reside there, I am informed he is not on the list of voters in that county. Either one of two things is true: either he has not been there very long, or else he has not been a very prominent citizen, or he would have been upon the list of voters of that municipality. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the man he is attacking in this House was deputy returning officer in the township of Oneida in 1881, that he was deputy returning officer in 1886, being years after he was committed to gaol, that he was appointed collector of taxes in 1882, and he has occupied other offices of trust in that county. I will place in the hands of the reporters a statutory declaration from a respectable gentleman in that district, who has examined the books of the township council, and who declares the facts I have laid before the House to be absolutely true. The declaration is as follows:—

DOMINION OF CANADA, } In the matter of Charles Young, of the town-
COUNTY OF HALDIMAND. } ship of Oneida in the county of Haldimand, a
To wit: } deputy returning officer at the Dominion
Election held in November, 1887.

"I, Henry B. Sawle, of the village of Caledonia, county of Haldimand, editor, do solemnly declare that I did on the seventh day of May, A.D. 1888, examine the minute-book and by-laws of the municipality of the said township of Oneida at the municipal clerk's office, and I find entries therein which show that Charles Young was appointed a deputy returning officer by the council of the said township on the 23rd day of December, 1881, and again on the 19th day of December, 1885, for the municipal elections held in the said township in January in the years 1882 and 1886 respectively; and I also find entries in the said minute-book and by-laws which show that the said Charles Young was appointed on the 18th day of January, 1882, by the municipal council of the said township of Oneida the collector of the taxes of the said township of Oneida. And I further solemnly declare that the said Charles Young so appointed as aforesaid, is the same Charles Young who acted as the deputy returning officer for polling sub-division No. 4 in the township of Oneida at the Dominion election held in the county aforesaid on the 22nd day of February, 1887, and again on the 12th day of November, 1887. I am, and for a long time have been, personally acquainted with the said Charles Young.

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of 'An Act passed for the suppression of extra-judicial oaths.'

"H. B. SAWLE.

"Declared before me at Caledonia, in the }
county of Haldimand, this 11th day of }
May, 1888.

"COLIN G. SNIDER,
"A Commissioner in H. J. C., &c."

Then, hon. gentlemen opposite grew merry and facetious when the Minister of Justice declared that Mr. Young had been recommended for the post by a prominent Liberal politician. Here is the affidavit of the returning officer of the county of Haldimand, and this is what he says. As I read it it will be seen how it bears out the statement of the Minister of Justice. It also gives a thorough history of the whole matter :

DOMINION OF CANADA, } In the matter of Charles Young, of the
COUNTY OF HALDIMAND, } township of Oneida, in the county of Haldi-
To Wit: } dimand.

"I, John Langrill, of the village of Jarvis, in the county of Haldimand, physician, do solemnly declare :

"1. That I was the returning officer at the elections of a member to represent the county of Haldimand, in the House of Commons of Canada, held in the month of February, 1837, and in the month of November, 1887.

"2. I employed Andrew Caldwell of the village of Jarvis, aforesaid, machine agent, as my messenger to post up the necessary proclamations, previous to the election held on the 22nd day of February, 1887, and I instructed him to ascertain while passing through the various polling sub-divisions the names of the deputy returning officers who acted at the previous election held in September, 1886, and where the deputies were not available I instructed him to procure me the name of some other person competent and willing to act.

"3. With very few exceptions I obtained the services of the same deputies that served in September, 1886. One of these exceptions was in No. 4 polling sub-division township of Oneida. For this sub-division the said Caldwell gave me the name of Charles Young. I also received a written application from Charles Young for the appointment and his appointment was recommended by reliable persons residing in Caledonia village, in the vicinity of said polling sub-division No. 4, township of Oneida. I had no other application for the appointment of deputy for this sub-division and I was afterwards informed that the person who was formerly the deputy returning officer at this sub-division acted as Young's poll clerk, whether by previous arrangement or not, I do not know. I had no previous acquaintance with the said Charles Young, and in fact, until his name was given me by the said Caldwell, I had never heard of him, but I knew the persons who recommended him, and relied on them. I never heard that the said Charles Young had ever been accused of, or tried or punished for any criminal offence, until Charles Wesley Colter told me so in the judge's chambers after the February election aforesaid was over, and at the termination of the recount.

"4. The said Charles Young discharged his duties as deputy returning officer in February, 1887, in a satisfactory manner, and I had no reason to find any fault with him. He was in fact one of the best and most intelligent deputies in the county.

"5. On the second day after the February, 1887, election was held the said Charles W. Colter left a message at my office, in my absence, that he desired me to get possession of the ballot boxes at once as he had information that they were to be tampered with. On being told that all were in or would be that day, he appeared satisfied, but when I asked him at a later hour that day to give me the name or names of the persons suspected he refused to do so, saying it might be only a vague rumor difficult to trace. Because of this conversation I asked the said Colter, in the chamber of the judge of the county court, at Cayuga, in the presence of the judge and of counsel, after Mr. Colter had examined all the ballot packages and every ballot-paper during the recount, and after having been present at the opening of the ballot-boxes at the 'summing up' if he had found anything wrong or anything to justify the accusation he had made to me as above mentioned, Mr. Colter replied, 'No, the ballots are all right.' He then went on to say that Charles Young was the deputy he had suspected and he supposed his reason for suspecting him was because he had served a term of imprisonment for stealing. This was the first I ever heard of the imprisonment of the said Charles Young.

"6. I subsequently and soon after had a conversation with Mr. Colter in Mr. James Mitchell's office in the Court House at Cayuga, when Mr. Colter again mentioned the fact that Young had some eight or nine years ago been in gaol.

"7. I did not then or at any other time intimate that I would not appoint Young again. Nor did the said Colter or anyone else ever, either at the conversation referred to or at any other time, directly or indirectly, request me not to re-appoint the said Charles Young, or make even the slightest objection to my doing so, although during the contest, prior to the election held in November, 1887, I frequently met the said Charles Wesley Colter in various places in this county while I was discharging my duties as returning officer, preparing for the said last mentioned election. It is not true that I appointed the said Charles Young the second time under formal remonstrance or any other kind of remonstrance. After the trial of the protest of the election held in February, 1887, I had a conversation with William Parker, of the township of Walpole, who is the secretary of the Reform Association for this county and one of Mr. Colter's most active organisers. He then told me he had heard the evidence given at the said trial and having heard it he was convinced that all the deputy returning officers had honestly tried to do their duty fairly. At this conversation among the names of the deputy returning officers mentioned by the said Parker was the name of Charles Young aforesaid.

Mr. MONTAGUE.

"8. After I was appointed returning officer for the election held in November, 1887, I received a written application from the said Charles Young to be again appointed deputy returning officer for polling sub-division No. 4, Oneida. No other person applied or was recommended for this division. In order then to enquire into the character and habits of Charles Young, I went to see James Mitchell, Esq., of Cayuga, local registrar of the High Court of Justice, and formerly clerk of the Division Court, because I learned that Charles Young had for a long time been bailiff for the said James Mitchell, and that Mr. Mitchell knew him as well as any person could. The said James Mitchell is and always has been an influential Reformer, and was strongly in sympathy with the said Charles W. Colter politically. Mr. Mitchell forcibly and distinctly condemned Mr. Colter's conduct in making the accusations and insinuations he had against Mr. Young, and he said he had found Young honest and trustworthy and had placed implicit confidence in him. I made further enquiries and found that Young had not been punished for stealing, but I was informed by persons interested in the case, the facts were that a brother-in-law of Young's and another a former hired man of Young's, stole some wheat and hid it in Young's barn. Young knew nothing of it until a bailiff with a search warrant came to search the barn, and then at the brother-in-law's solicitation and to shield them, Young claimed that the wheat was his property. This being subsequently proved to be the stolen wheat Young was convicted of concealing it, knowing it to be stolen.

"9. The said Charles Young, I am informed and believe, acted as deputy returning officer, at the time the electors of Haldimand voted on the Scott Act in 1835, and also at several municipal elections in the said township of Oneida since his imprisonment. He is a good penman and having lost a leg and having only a small farm to support his family from, he is frequently employed in small offices of this nature. Under all these circumstances and nothing improper having been done by Charles Young at the previous election, I considered him a proper person to appoint and knew of no one else to appoint for that sub-division, and I acted conscientiously and to the best of my ability in securing proper and efficient deputies throughout the whole county. And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the "Act for the suppression of extra-judicial Oaths."

"JOHN ALEX. LANGRILL.

"Declared before me at Jarvis in
the county of Haldimand this
fourth day of May, 1838.

"C. E. BOURNE,

"A Commissioner in H. C. J., &c."

I think the statement made by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice is completely vindicated as to the fact that Mr. Young had been recommended for the post by a prominent Liberal politician. Let me say, in conclusion upon this subject, that so far as Mr. Young is concerned, I have no need to say very much to-night. I think the facts which I have placed before the House go to show that the statements and insinuations made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) with respect to this man are not justified in this instance. Let me say that it is true, no one denies it, that he committed an indiscretion; but no one attempts to show that he does not at the present time lead an honest and perfectly trustworthy life, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite who are fair-minded and candid will agree with me in saying that the indiscretion committed ten years ago might well have been left undisturbed beneath ten years of honesty, ten years of trustworthy conduct, ten years of integrity, ten years of industry. I think hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will agree with me when I state that fact, and will be of the opinion that the hon. gentleman has altogether gone out of his way in dragging before this House a private individual who has had no opportunity to defend himself and who is held to be a respectable man in the community in which he lives. Now, what is the charge that the hon. gentleman brings against the Government in connection with the valuation of Indian lands? He might in making that motion have pursued that one-legged heroic policy still further, and he might have said that those persons did influence the election on that occasion. But he does not say so. Why? For this reason: The very charge made against the Government on this occasion was a charge made in the bill of particulars that was filed against me in the protest lodged against me in Haldimand. What did they do in regard to that charge? Did they attempt to prove it? No; after they had scoured the neighborhood they failed to find one jot or tittle of evidence to sustain the

charge; and having brought it in to court and having failed to establish one single iota of the charge, the hon. gentleman, the scavenger of his party, is employed to come here and bring it before Parliament where no legal investigation can take place, where no evidence can be offered and where no judicial decision can be obtained.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The person who is addressing the House has twice used the word "scavenger." I do not care what either he or any of his friends or supporters may say or think, but I think it is your duty, Sir, as Speaker, to rule whether such language is parliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman wishes my ruling, I am ready to give it, but I object to be told in that tone that it is my duty to do such and such a thing. On the point of order, I think the expression is rather unparliamentary, and it will be better for the hon. gentleman to withdraw it and not to use it again.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. gentleman does not desire to be placed in the position in which he might be a success, I leave him where he is a failure. I will only say that I beg to withdraw the statement. Now then let me say, in the first place, that the hon. gentleman makes an insinuation in the motion he has proposed against the settlers who are settled upon those lands in the county of Haldimand. He makes an insinuation that those men are corrupt and venal. Let me see why he is doing this. He is urged by a gentleman who was his candidate in the county of Haldimand to do so. He attempts to find a reason for that gentleman's defeat; but I feel sure that knowing the hon. gentleman as they do, having a record of his utterances in this House during the last fifteen or twenty years, my friends in the county of Haldimand who are settled on those lands, and who are charged with being corrupt, will not feel badly at the insinuation made by the hon. gentleman. If I mistake not the hon. gentleman has, upon various occasions, disagreed with the people of this country. If I mistake not he has on other occasions said the people of this country were corrupt. I think I heard him last Session, standing in his place in this House, say that the whole Province of Nova Scotia was corrupt, that the whole Province of Nova Scotia had offered itself for sale. He has still further to-night, with that broad expansive view he takes of the public affairs of this country, said that there is no public opinion in this country that is honest or that is pure. Let us see what he said in the past. He has quarrelled with the people before; he has expressed want of confidence in them time and again. While he has expressed want of confidence in the people, they have time and time again voted their want of confidence in him. So it is equal play. Let us see what the hon. gentleman said. He said, in the first place, they were corrupt; he said afterwards they were lazy. He did not use the word lazy, but he said, and it is in *Hansard*, that they had a notorious aversion to manual labor. That is his classical and rounded style of saying a man is lazy. Then again he has said they were foolish. He said again, and worst of all, that the people are ignorant. So the people of the country whose confidence the hon. gentleman seeks are foolish people, ignorant people, lazy people and corrupt people; but bad as they are I have pleasure in saying, Sir, they have rejected the courting of the hon. gentleman upon various occasions. So far as regards those men against whom these charges are levied, though they be poor people in the eyes of the hon. gentleman, who it would appear was born with a golden spoon in his mouth, they are not corrupt, they are as honest as the hon. gentleman is, and just as far beyond being purchased by this Government or by any other Government. Let us look back for a moment at the history of this matter. These lands years ago were settled upon by the people who are now occupying them. It is true they were poor people then, many of them are

poor people still; but no one can say anything against those people. Constantly they have asked the Government to value those lands. The hon. gentleman has said that it was purely an accidental circumstance that those people were at the mercy of the Government. Sir, it was no such thing. The hon. gentleman and his friends were in power for five years in this country, and they had a member in that constituency who was a supporter of their Administration. It was his duty, and their duty to settle that matter long ago, and it was their negligence, long before I had anything to do with the county, that left it over to myself and the present Government to endeavor to arrange it at the present time. In the first place the hon. gentleman tells us that this was done just previous to the elections, and that Mr. Jones was appointed just previous to the elections. I hold in my hands a letter of myself and Senator McCallum to whom the people for many years had gone, urging that he should ask the Government of this country to settle those matters. It is written on 26th May, 1887, months before the election was thought of, and months before we had anything to do with the second election contest, and it urged the Government to exercise its power to render the settlers every justice in their power, in order that this matter, irritating and long standing as it was, should be removed altogether from troubling the Government and the settlers. I read that portion of the letter which refers particularly to the Cayuga lands. The hon. gentleman may read the whole correspondence, if he likes.

"HOUSE OF COMMONS,

OTTAWA, 26th May, 1887."

"With regard to the land at Cayuga we have to say that it is a somewhat different position, and requires different handling by your department. The land has been occupied for years by squatters who have made improvements by clearing, cultivation and the erection of little houses. They are anxious to improve still further, but do not want to do so seeing that they have no security that either their present rights or rights created by any further expenditure will be protected, or recognised.

"As you will see the question is a most delicate one, the interests of a number of occupants being involved, and these occupants desire nothing more than the recognition of whatever rights they possess and we have no doubt that you are equally desirous that they shall lose nothing by any action of the department. What we would respectfully urge is that with a view to allow them in all fairness to have the first right to purchase the homes, which they have with no inconsiderable expense and labor improved, and at the same time to have the matter settled and quieted for all time, we would respectfully suggest that the department make a valuation of these lands in Cayuga, and that the occupants be given the first right to purchase the same, such valuation of course being made with a due regard to all the circumstances of the case. We know that the people interested are anxious to have the matter closed up, and we respectfully urge that it is equally in the public interest to have them settled. Please advise us of your opinion with regard to the matters herein mentioned."

All I can say is, that acting conscientiously in the discharge of my duty, and assisted by a member of the Upper House I endeavored to have this long standing difficulty arranged in the interests of the settlers, in the interests of the Indians, and in the interests of the Government of this country. Those two men were appointed valuers of those Indian lands. I was urging the department all summer to have this matter attended to, and the absence of the late Hon. Mr. White, who was then in charge of the Department of Indian Affairs, I have no doubt delayed it somewhat. Right from the time I began until the present time, I have been co-operating with the Indian Department, in order to have those matters arranged. If Mr. White's death had not occurred, the whole matter would, I have no doubt, been closed ere this. As it is I hope it may be all settled shortly after the Session. Now, Sir, we are told that Mr. Jones could have acted corruptly in regard to this matter. That he did act corruptly, the hon. gentleman does not state in the motion, but he states it in the address which he made to the House, and he endeavors for a moment to fasten the charge upon the Government upon a clause of the statute which he quotes

to this House. What does he charge? He charges that this Government should be condemned for supporting corruption, for endeavoring to corrupt the electors. And pray, how does he endeavor to prove it; on what statute does he place it under, when he brings it before the House? I am not a lawyer or the son of a lawyer. My hon. friend did study law once—I am informed he studied it, Sir, with very indifferent success—but as far as his position in this case is concerned, it would have been better if he had continued to study law and not to have gone into those kindly financial pursuits, in which he is employed with that special and peculiar genius which the *Toronto Globe* attributed to him long ago. His motion says:

“That, by clause 94, Chapter 8 of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, it is provided that: ‘If, on the trial of any election petition, any candidate is proved to have personally engaged any person at the election to which said petition relates, as a canvasser or agent in relation to the election, knowing that such person, so engaged, has, within eight years previous to such engagement, been found guilty of any corrupt practice by any competent legal tribunal, or by the report of any judge, or other tribunal for the trial of election petitions, the election of such candidate, if he has been elected, shall be void.’”

Now, Sir, that has a lot to do with the Government of this country. Just about as much I think as the statute which regulates line fences. I cannot see that it has anything to do with the Government of this country at all. Under this clause, if I had employed Mr. Jones as an agent, my seat would have been voided, but so far as that clause relates to the Government of the country the hon. gentleman's elementary knowledge of law, must show that has nothing whatever to do with it. I ask the hon. gentleman the question: If that is not legally wrong, was it morally wrong? The moral part of this pretension might have been urged when Mr. Jones was appointed, and before his conduct was before the people. It might have been urged at the time this gentleman was appointed, but it cannot be urged now, since that gentleman has performed his duties satisfactorily to the settlers in that district, and in such a manner that the hon. gentleman's friends, after searching for evidence against him, could not show, and cannot show, that in one single instance he had used his position as valuator of those Indian lands, for the purpose of promoting my election, or of promoting the interests of this Government. I say that if it is not legally wrong, the hon. gentleman has come too late with his moral charge against the Government, or against its officers, because this man has done his work and done it well in the interests of the settlers and in the interests of the country. The hon. gentleman said that I might adopt some particular line of defence, or that the members of the Government might. I wish for a moment to adopt a line of defence that he suggests, and it is a very good line of defence. He charges that this man is a corrupt man; he charges he had no right to be appointed; and because of the act for which he was reported, the hon. gentleman claims he was not a proper person to appoint. The people of that township have pronounced upon Mr. Walter Jones; they have elected him a number of times a municipal officer, and I claim, Sir, that it is the best test of honesty and integrity when a man can get elected to a position of trust among the people who see him every day coming in and going out, and who know him best and who appreciate him most. I trust, Sir, it is not a piece of jealousy which causes the hon. gentleman to attack this man in his own constituency. The hon. gentleman would respect him more, perhaps, if from end to end of the county he had gone for the purpose of obtaining rest for the soles of his municipal feet. I say that this gentleman is highly respected in the place in which he lives, and is universally trusted among the people who know him, and, therefore, I have no reason to go on making a defence in regard to him in this House. The hon. gentleman objects to this appointment and says it is utterly corrupt. That valuation of Indian lands went on.

Mr. MONTAGUE.

The valuator's report is now in the hands of the Government; and notwithstanding the objections which were urged by the hon. gentleman acting as I endeavored to do here in the interests of my constituents, I shall endeavor to push that matter forward until those men receive justice at the hands of the Government, and until the Government have that irritating question, to those settlers upon those lands, finally settled. I am surprised for a moment that the hon. gentleman has referred to it as a matter of corrupt intent. I know that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is an exceedingly pure individual, I know that he is very pure, but I must say to him that the sound of purity, and the sound of political honesty coming from his lips must have sounded exceedingly strange to some gentlemen with whom he is associated. I know that the hon. gentleman's memory is short. It is short with regard to these matters, but he will excuse me for a moment if I say something which will recall to his mind a series of events which have happened in this party of purity, to which the hon. gentleman belongs, and of which he is the sub leader. Does he remember 1874? Surely he cannot have forgotten the accents of my hon. friend who sits behind him when he said: “I bet you now it cost me \$13,000.” Surely he could not have forgotten his dearest friend, Major Walker, who rolled it up to the tune of \$25,000; surely he cannot have forgotten his friend from the Niagara peninsula who paid \$11,000 for missionary expenses, with a large amount of raspberry syrup thrown in. Surely he cannot have forgotten the member of his Cabinet who put up a large sum of money for the purpose of relieving poor, needy individuals, and his other equally pure friends, whose name are legion.

Mr. COOK. “Send us another \$10,000.”

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, \$10,000 and \$13,000 would be \$23,000, and there is no doubt the hon. gentleman means to correct me in my figures in regard to his election. The hon. gentleman says another ten thousand, because he has said that in a matter of an election campaign he did not take much account of a few thousand dollars. The hon. member for South Oxford has a very short memory in regard to these matters. Does he remember when he sat on this side of the House that there were twenty-eight men behind him who had bought constituencies? Does he remember that every one in four who supported him when in power was elected by the influence of money? He could be excused for not knowing this on the ground of a short memory, since it was fourteen years ago, but he cannot be excused when he pretends to forget the history of Yarmouth, Shelburne, East Northumberland, Prince Edward, Halton, Kent, Russell, L'Assomption and East Simcoe, in the last campaign.

Mr. COOK. What about Kingston?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, I do not know. My right hon. friend from Kingston is here without a second election, and I understand he has not bought off his pursuers either. An hon. friend suggests Glengarry, but I shall not mention that, because it would soil and ruffle the kindly and gentle spirit of the hon. member for South Oxford, who is so pure, and especially since in his ears still, I have no doubt, is vibrating the sound of going among the branches of the mulberry trees. The hon. gentleman from South Oxford has had no election trials himself, and I think there is a very good reason for that. In constituencies at all close, it is the other fellow who has had the election trial. And besides his party have not trusted the hon. gentleman in those constituencies in which narrow majorities are the order of the day. Where they have trusted him the results have not been encouraging. He tells us about all the corruption that existed in the county of Haldimand. When I went there almost every crime in the calendar was charged against

myself and my friends—every crime almost, except suicide, and it was asserted that I was going to commit suicide; but it proved to be homicide, and I believe this House will vote that it was justifiable homicide. If my hon. friend desires to find impurity and corruption, let him search among the ranks of his own party, and if he cannot find it elsewhere, he can find it in the county of Haldimand. The hon. gentleman has been given information from that county. He has been given information with regard to the abuse and vilification which was directed towards every man who had anything to do with the contest and was my friend? Does he say anything of the coercion of hotel-keepers by the agents of the Mowat Administration, by which they were compelled not to vote for me on pain of losing their licenses? Does he know why it was that by the agency of servants of the Ontario Government men were drugged and dragged from the polls, in order not to vote for me? Does he know that his friends encouraged perjury in order to defeat me? And finally, if it were not for the presence of ladies in the gallery, I should say that worst of all, they dragged an old woman to the polls and compelled the returning officer to give her a ballot to vote against me, and then had the hardihood to stand up before Mr. Justice Street, and demand that I should be unseated, because a woman had voted at the election. I would ask my hon. friend, when he talks about these things in Haldimand, whether he has had this information from the gentleman who has been posting him. If there is one thing the hon. gentleman should not do, it is to claim purity for his party; the five years rule of the hon. gentleman and his party in this House was a cemetery, in which their acts of legislation, &c., were the tombstones that marked the graves of broken promises and unredeemed pledges. The people of Canada might forget the blundering incapacity of those men when on the Treasury benches; they might forget their vilification of and attacks upon their opponents; they might forget their utter want of policy; but they never can forget, no matter how amiable or forgiving, the hypocrisy of those men in standing up in their high places and claiming to be the political purists of this country. Now, Sir, I come to another matter. The hon. gentleman does not like the name of land valuers; what is the reason? Well, Sir, his party have had land valuers engaged in elections for them in days that are gone. Does the hon. gentleman remember that when an election took place once in the county of Grey, one Lewis was sent up there on a telegram from the brother-in-law of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). This is the telegram:

“ December 25, 1871.

“ ADAM OLIVIER, ESQ., M.P.P.

“ Where is Lewis? He is wanted in Proton at once; most important.
“ J. K. KERR.”

Just previous to the election this man Lewis, a supporter of these gentlemen, a land valuator in the employ of the Ontario Government, of which the hon. member for West Durham was the head, was sent up there into a township owned by the Ontario Government, where these people were settled, who owed their very existence to the Government. This man was sent up there by the Hon. Archibald Mackellar, one of the members of the Government, who gave him his directions in his bed-chamber at midnight, to write “satisfactory” across the claim of every man who refused to vote against the Government. It is in memory of these land valuers in the past that my hon. friend finds fault on general principles with these land valuers in Haldimand. But the hon. gentleman will say he is not personally responsible for this act. He is, however, himself acquainted with election contests in this country. He was a member of a Government in this country; and he will, perhaps, remember himself having had a meeting with a president of a bank in this country. I do not say that it was at all a corrupt meeting, or

with a corrupt intent; perhaps it was only a matter of mere coincidence that it was just previous to an election. That bank president swears that he had a meeting with the hon. gentleman, and that they discussed the question of the deposits in the Ontario Bank. I will not say that the bargain was a venal or corrupt bargain; but I will say that many a man has been hanged in this country on circumstantial evidence which was less strong than the evidence in that case. What did he do? I will not say that he formed an agreement, but the supposition is that he formed an agreement with the president of that bank; and what did we find? We found a little while afterwards that the president of that bank sent a letter to the managers of the bank, in which he asks them to support the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member, for this very good and sufficient reason among others:

“ Because if they are sustained, our bank, and other Ontario banks, and through them the country, will have the use of the Government surplus until required.”

Then, Sir, what did the managers of the various branches of that bank do? Here is a sample sent out by a Mr. Holland, a bank manager under Mr. Simpson, with whom the hon. gentleman had his interview just a few days before an election, the election in 1874:

“ To customers.—My Dear Sir,—We are largely interested in the success of the present Government, as their continuance in office will add largely to the success and prosperity of the bank.”

What do we find following that? The normal amount of the Government deposits, which should have gone to the Ontario Bank at the time when the hon. gentleman had this coincidental, perhaps accidental meeting, with the president of that bank, was 22 per cent., and after the Government had been sustained, by another strange rule of coincidence, the deposits went up to the tune of 40, 44 and 48 per cent. If Mr. Jones, against whom not a tittle of evidence can be brought to show that he did one single ungentlemanly, unkindly or illegal act is to be charged by my hon. friend with corruption, how much more might I charge the hon. gentleman with corruption, with the facts before an election and after an election in my possession. Then, there was an election in Algoma a number of years ago, and land valuers were sent up there by the Mowat Administration; and it is, no doubt, because of the lively memory my hon. friend has of these men, that he dreads the land valuator when he stalks through the country. Here is a telegram sent by one Burden, a land valuator of the Mowat Administration, a telegram not couched in English or even in Volapuk, a telegram not couched in a language intelligible to any one save the gentleman who signed and the gentleman who received it. It was no doubt pure, and I prove that statement by the fact that it went between two Liberals. If it had gone between two Tories I would suppose it was corrupt motives which induced the hidden language in which it was couched to be used:

“ Hon. T. B. PARDEE, Toronto:

“ Absolutely necessary that we should have funds for pressing emergencies.

“ We can secure local press for \$500 half cash, half after election. It is most important that this should be done at once.

“ BURDEN.”

Here is another one:

“ Hon. T. B. PARDEE, Toronto:

“ Outlook so far splendid. Hugh at Rainy River. Stipendiary gone to Fort Francis. He and friends say we must have \$1,500 for legitimate expenses. Can you send, and to whom.

“ AUBREY WHITE.”

I do not suppose the stipendiary referred to was stipendiary magistrate under the Mowat Government. Now, I say when these gentlemen hear anything with regard to land valuers, they recollect the events which occurred in the history of their own party, and with a good deal of reason they suspect the land valuator, no matter where he goes abroad in the land.

The right hon. the First Minister is charged with having acted very wrongly and corruptly in appointing this gentleman who had been reported as guilty of corruption, to office. Let us read the history of appointments under the hon. gentleman himself. Pure as he is, dignified as he is in public matters, he made appointments which were a disgrace to the country and to his Government, and will be a disgrace to our political history. Does the hon. gentleman remember John Walker, of London, the man who spent \$25,000 against the present Minister of Agriculture, the man who had been disqualified in the courts, the man whom the judge said he could have as well believed he had been dipped in Lake Erie and came out dry as that he had not been guilty of corruption. Well, the Mowat Government of Ontario appointed that man to one of the most prominent offices in the county of Middlesex at present. Did that appointment meet with the approval of the people? I have the resolution moved, not by Conservatives, not by enemies of the Mowat Government, but by Reformers in the township of Adelaide, in which I happened to have the good fortune to be born, moved and carried unanimously at a municipal mass meeting:

"Moved by T. V. Gurry, seconded by Wm. Brook, and carried unanimously: 'That this meeting avails itself of this the first opportunity of expressing its indignation at the appointment of John Walker, the arch-briber of this Dominion, to the position of registrar, as it has brought censure on this fair Province and stultified the profession of purity by giving a premium to bribery.'"

That is the opinion of the people of Middlesex with regard to the briber appointed by Mr. Mowat to an office of importance in the Province of Ontario. Why was Walker appointed? There is no other answer than this: Because, by a free expenditure of money, he had purchased a constituency; because he had practically operated these principles of purity, which the hon. gentleman from South Oxford admires so much. But the hon. gentleman will say that he is not responsible for the conduct of Mr. Mowat. Well, if he is not, he is responsible for the conduct, at least, of the ex-Finance Minister and his Government. Does he not remember the election trial in London, when Dr. Hagarty was reported by the judge, as I find on page 176 of the votes and proceedings for 1875, guilty of nine different specific charges of bribery? And what do we find? We find that within a few years, the hon. member for South Oxford and his colleagues appointed that man, guilty of nine charges of direct bribery, to a responsible position in connection with the Indians of the North West-Territories. What do we find in the case of Mr. Jones? We find that he is charged with having spent a dollar. The judge held he was no agent of mine, and my counsel said, though we can disprove this charge absolutely, we will not go into it because it is not essential with our case now. He is charged with having spent a dollar, and, therefore, is a most venal and corrupt man, in the opinion of the hon. gentleman, and to appoint him a land valuator was a scandalous act, which deserves the righteous condemnation of the hon. member for South Oxford; Dr. Hagarty, however, the friend of the hon. gentleman, who was convicted of spending \$600, and of corruptly treating hundreds of electors; not to speak of the large number of women to whom he had paid money for the purpose of influencing their husband's votes, was appointed by my hon. friend, as a good, pure, Liberal politician, to an office of permanence and large emoluments in the North-West-Territories. If that is not honesty and consistency, there is no use in endeavoring to find that jewel in the ranks of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that I regret he has brought this matter up. He has brought it up simply because he has been prompted to do so by his friend, by a man who, for the purpose of securing his own ends, was willing to stigmatise and damage the character of every private individual in the county of Haldimand or elsewhere.

Mr. MONTAGUE.

I fear no result in that county from his attacks. The hon. gentleman was there, and addressed public meetings, and canvassed against me, and my majority was increased 1,000 per cent. When an election comes on there again, I invite him to come and discuss public questions with me, though I must be very feeble in his presence. I invited him not only to go there and assist his friends, but if South Oxford, strong as it is now in Liberal professions and votes, should, under the mysterious influence of the hon. gentleman's peculiar genius, which he uses over a county, be wafted over to the Conservative side, I should be glad to have the hon. gentleman come there as a candidate for the Liberal party himself, for I confess, though my majority has been largely increased, I am tired of having small majorities. Sir, I thank you and the House for the kind attention given me, and I cannot better close than by expressing again my regret that I have been compelled, at this late hour of the Session, to detain the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has had, I am informed, the contents of the library carted to his room during the past two weeks, and we have had the result in the speech he has made to-night. I cannot understand very well why the hon. member should make a personal attack upon me. I do not know whether he has any personal venom against me. I was not in his riding during the contest. I did nothing in regard to his election, and I do not understand why he should criticise me in the very discourteous and unparliamentary way in which he did. But I measure the hon. gentleman by what he has said. Water can never rise above its own level, and you must measure the hon. gentleman by the language which he uses, and, according to that, his standard is not a very high one. The contest in Haldimand was far from being an ordinary contest. There are many things which came into that contest which were very disreputable. The hon. gentleman says that this man has only one leg. I think that a Conservative who has shown so much activity in favor of a candidate as this man has will have a new leg procured for him, even if it is only a wooden one; and by the time the next election comes round, they will provide him with a cork leg, in order to enable him to perform the duties which he performed in the last contest. The hon. gentleman admitted that this man Young had been convicted, but he said that he did not steal wheat but was only charged with receiving stolen wheat. I look upon the one case as about the same as the other, but I think the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) sails in about the same boat as that man. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), by the motion which he has made and the proof he has brought forward, has charged the Government, in consequence of their action in regard to Indian lands and the coercion they have used, with virtually stealing the votes of the Indians; so the hon. member has practically received the stolen votes; and so he and this man are in the same boat. The man who received the stolen wheat is not more guilty than the man who received the stolen votes. I have no desire to follow the hon. gentleman throughout the rambling address he has delivered. He went back to the history of the Proton scandal, and he stirred up a number of little things in regard to the supposed scandals which hon. gentlemen have built up in the course of many years. One thing is certain. We never had any such a big scandal as the Pacific Railway scandal. We never had a scandal which involved the expenditure of \$360,000 in the way in which the money was spent then. We have never been able to build a monument of a scandal in our party as those gentlemen have done. I do not think it is well to go back to those matters. If we did go back, we might point out the huge effort which was made by the hon. gentleman's party in the Province of Ontario to upset the whole Local Government. We might point to the bribery gang which was headed

by a man named Wilkinson. We have lost sight of him for some time, but no doubt, if we went to the North-West, we would find that he is honored by the Government with some appointment there, and no doubt he is drawing Government pay to-day. Then, during the last election, we had valuers sent out along the Rideau Canal and the Trent Valley Canal to value lands which were supposed to be interfered with by the waters of those canals, and sums have been awarded on this account, no doubt in order to get these people into line in support of that party. We cannot forget the history, which is not very old, of the Minister of Finance and the Postmaster General, in the Province of Nova Scotia where there were very large sums promised during the last election, if that Province sent the present hon. gentleman into power; and we have the best evidence of that in the Supplementary Estimates, in which we are asked to vote a large amount of money which is to go to railways there, as part of the promise which was made on that occasion. In the county of Haldimand, the influences that were brought to bear on the Indians were another part of the policy carried on by hon. gentlemen opposite. They accuse us of corruption in some instances, but the great difference between them and us is that, when they bribe the people, it is with the people's own money. Whenever any charge has been made against us, we have only been charged with using our own money. A man is a double thief who uses the property which is entrusted to him by the people as compared with the man who uses his own money, so those hon. gentlemen stand doubly condemned. As I said before, I could not understand the attack made on me by the hon. gentleman. I have sat in this House a little longer than he has, and I have never attacked him, or mentioned his name in any discussion. I always endeavor to treat any hon. gentleman on the other side with the same courtesy that I would treat any hon. member on this side, with the same courtesy that I think members of Parliament are entitled to. I have never sat in this House owing to a narrow majority of 12, or a majority of one, but I have had a majority of 368 in a badly gerrymandered riding. I take the standard of the hon. gentleman according to the language he used, and, as I said before, you cannot expect any better from a man than he really is; you cannot expect water to rise above its own level. I would not have said anything on this question if the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) had not made a personal attack upon me, which I think was entirely uncalled for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that question is put, I desire to refer to a certain statement which was made in respect of certain affidavits which were laid by me before this House, and I will ask the indulgence of the House to refer to that matter, or, if necessary, I will have the adjournment moved. As to Mr. ex-convict Charles Young, the statement which I have in my hand is that the man served his term of imprisonment on a sentence which was passed upon him at the regular Court of Assize on the 2nd May, 1879, for the offence of stealing wheat; and that during the said period he was sentenced by the County Judges, Criminal Court to a similar period of imprisonment on another charge, both sentences being concurrent. I do not suppose that anyone would imagine that the judge sent Young to gaol for this term if he was innocent; but, even if that were the case, it is not possible to imagine that two distinct sentences would be passed upon this man unless he was clearly, distinctly and unmistakably guilty of what was charged against him. In addition to that, I have here a new affidavit, signed by Mr. Thomas Bridger, of the county of Haldimand, in which Mr. Bridger states that, on a certain day, the 18th January, 1882, this Mr. Charles Young was appointed a collector for the township of Oneida, but that, on the 25th February, 1882, Mr. Charles Young was dismissed because, in his own township, he could not find security for account-

ing for the taxes if he were made collector. That is the very best evidence that can be produced as to the opinion held by his fellow countrymen by the municipality in which he lives, of this person, Mr. Young. That is all I have to say on the subject of the guilt or innocence of Mr. Charles Young, ex-convict, deputy returning officer, except this, that if it be correct, as stated, that he is one of the most respectable persons in that county, it completely removes the surprise I would otherwise have felt that that county had returned its present representative.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright:

YEA:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Fisher,	McMillan (Huron),
Bain (Wentworth),	Gauthier,	McMullen,
Barron,	Geoffrion,	Meigs,
Beausoleil,	Gillmor,	Mitchell,
Béchar,	Guay,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Hale,	Peterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Holton,	Perry,
Bowman,	Innes,	Platt,
Brien,	Jones (Halifax),	Rinfret,
Burdett,	Kirk,	Rowand,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Landerkin,	Ste. Marie,
Cook,	Lang,	Scriver,
Couture,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Somerville,
De St. Georges,	Langelier (Quebec),	Sutherland,
Dessaint,	Laurier,	Trow,
Doyon,	Lister,	Turcot,
Edwards,	Livingston,	Watson,
Eisenhauer,	Lovitt,	Weldon (St. John),
Ellis,	Macdonald (Huron),	Wilson (St. John).—55.
Fiset,		

NAY:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Girouard,	O'Brien,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Bowell,	Grudvoots,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Boyle,	Guilbault,	Perley (Ottawa),
Brown,	Gillet,	Porter,
Bryson,	Hall,	Prior,
Cameron,	Henderson,	Putnam,
Cargill,	Hesson,	Reid,
Carling,	Hickey,	Riopel,
Carpenter,	Hudspeth,	Robillard,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jamieson,	Rome,
Chapleau,	Joncas,	Shanly,
Ohlsholm,	Jones (Digby),	Skinner,
Cimon,	Kenny,	Small,
Cochrane,	Kirkpatrick,	Smith (Ontario),
Cockburn,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Sproule,
Colby,	Laurie,	Stevenson,
Corby,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Taylor,
Costigan,	Macdowall,	Temple,
Coughlin,	McCulla,	Thérin,
Coulombe,	McDonald (Victoria),	Thompson,
Curran,	McDougald (Pictou),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Daly,	McGreevy,	Tyrwhitt,
Davis,	McKay,	Vanasse,
Dawson,	McLellan,	Wallace,
Denison,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Weldon (Albert),
Deejardins,	McNeill,	White,
Dupont,	Madill,	Wilmot,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Mara,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Ferguson (Welland),	Masson,	Wilson (Lennox),
Foster,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wood (Brockville),
Freeman,	Montague,	Wood (Westmorel'd)—98.
Gigault,	Montplaisir,	

Amendment negatived.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Public Buildings, Quebec..... \$95,400

Mr. LAURIER. Aylmer post office, \$7,000—is this sum to complete?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have bought a site very cheap, for \$800. Tenders have been called for, and we think this sum will suffice to erect a building.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec Centre). Quebec custom house, \$4,000—it seems to me this is a very small sum.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is for the purchase of land only. Afterwards a larger sum will be required.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec Centre). I see there was a similar vote last year. Has that been expended on this work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are men at the present moment working at it. The hon. gentleman knows that loose rock has tumbled down from the cliff.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec Centre). I remember that last year between the nomination day and the polling, which occurred in the middle of the winter, it was found that there was great danger, and a large number of men were set to work. I would like to know for what purpose they were employed. This was in the month of February, and there is usually not much danger of the rocks tumbling down in the winter. Between the nomination and the polling day some 150 men were found to be necessary to prevent the rock from rolling down, I suppose, on the voters who were to vote for the Opposition.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are employed for that purpose.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what purpose?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. To prevent the voters from being killed.

Mr. LAURIER. Is any system followed with regard to that work? Is it done with a view simply of preventing the rocks from falling?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman knows there is loose earth and boulders on the cliff which, from time to time, fall down on the heads of the people and the houses below. We try to remove as few as we can, unless there is danger of their falling, because the work is costly, and we remove them only when there is need. There is another place where boulders are threatening to tumble down, exactly in the very place where men are now working.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec Centre). Is it intended, out of that sum, to pay the damages which have been caused recently? Not later than last year, a mass of rocks, some ten tons, came rolling down from the cliff below the citadel, and came in contact with a wooden house, which it pushed further out in to Champlain street. If this house had been of stone, no doubt the inmates would have been killed. Is it proposed by the Government to pay for these damages? If the Government admit their liability to remove boulders, how can they escape the responsibility for damages caused by rocks falling? Snow slides occur in winter causing very serious damage. If it is admitted that the Government are liable to remove boulders or loose rocks, I repeat that I do not see how they can escape the responsibility of paying damages caused by rocks falling down in front of the citadel.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In two cases, I think, we paid damages, but we did not admit that we were strictly bound in law to do so. One case was that of a horse killed three or four years ago. We do not admit that we are liable to pay for any damage done; we consider individual cases as they occur.

Mr. AMYOT. I beg to call the attention of the Government to the following facts, contained in a letter I received to-day, dated Quebec, 15th May:

"I have been requested by Mr. William Venner to write to you about a house belonging to him and situate in Little Champlain street, in this city, facing the Queen's wharf. On the first day of May instant several large rocks fell from the cliff in rear of this house and demolished about one-third of the westerly gable end wall. Mr. Venner has been informed that the military authorities of the Dominion Government are answerable for the damage done to the same, and he hopes you will use your influence and urge upon them the immediate necessity of having his house properly repaired and made tenable. He has leased this house

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec Centre.)

by deed passed before me, to one Quinn, who is now in occupation of the same."

I hope the Government, if they are responsible for stone coming down, the rocks being Government property, will see that the damage is repaired at once.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, if the case is laid before the Government it will be taken into consideration. We will ascertain the facts, and the case will then no doubt be placed in the hands of the Minister of Justice for advice.

Mr. LAURIER. What will be the total cost of the Coaticook post office and inland revenue office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total cost will be \$25,000 or \$26,000.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I do not see anything in the Estimates about the St. Michel wharf, but I avail myself of this opportunity to point out the necessity of prosecuting and completing the repairs which have been begun to that wharf. I am happy to acknowledge that the hon. Minister of Public Works has been lucky in his choice of the superintendent of those works, and that the result secured is greatly in the interest of the country. He has appointed a superintendent as practical and experienced as honest and saving. With a comparatively small expenditure he made an almost new wharf out of an old and dilapidated one. With about \$2,000 a work has been built there which, under ordinary circumstances, would have cost seven or eight thousand dollars. I hope the hon. Minister will prosecute those works, and will have sufficiently broad views to forget the differences of opinion which may exist between the present Federal member and the Government, and that public weal alone will guide him. I hope he will continue to do justice to that parish till the circumstances allow him to settle the main question, that is to say the capital due for the wharf.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) The political differences which exist between the member for that county and the Government have already lessened, and perhaps other differences may also lessen. As regards that wharf, I have reason to believe that a company has been formed, or is about to be formed, for the purpose of building a wharf further west—at about half a mile; that wharf will be much shorter than the present one, and I think it will require much less repairs. My intention is to maintain the present wharf as long as possible.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I know where this new wharf is going to be built and it might happen to be more advantageous for certain reasons. If this change is made the Government might use the stone and wood of the present wharf in the building of the new one. In this way the indebtedness incurred for the old wharf could easily be settled, the parish, and the Local and Federal Governments all contributing to its payment. I do not wish to discuss this point to-night. I have already dealt with it in this House, and the hon. Minister is perfectly well acquainted with it. He is aware that to-day this parish, which has borrowed from the Government a certain amount for the purpose of building this wharf, upon the pledge given by the public men of that time that she would never be called upon to refund it, should not, as a matter of justice, be obliged to pay the capital and interest. As I have already shown this House, the parish of St. Michel could not pay that amount without being at least almost, if not completely, ruined. If this reimbursement was asked for, the Government would not keep the pledge given by such men as Mr. Morin, Mr. Chabot, and all the public men of that time. They would act very unfairly towards that parish by compelling her to pay, alone, for the building and repairs of a wharf which is useful to all the large ships, to the whole shipping interest, which serves as a harbor of refuge in

stormy weather, and has already saved thousands of dollars to the shipping interest, a wharf which is useful not merely to that parish, but to the whole surrounding district. There is in this matter a question of justice, and I am confident that, looking at it in this light, the hon. Minister will use his influence to protect the rights of the interested parties. He may rest assured that that part of the country will be grateful to him, and, at the same time, he will act in a manner creditable to the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will be the total cost of the Hull post office and inland revenue office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$28,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the amount of inland revenue collected there?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not the amount of inland revenue, but I find the money orders issued amount to \$26,000, savings banks deposits \$25,000, post office revenue \$2,284. The population is now about 10,000, in 1881 it was nearly 7,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A point that is worthy of consideration is this: The revenue from the post office is \$2,284 gross, from that you must deduct \$1,000 salary, leaving a net revenue of \$1,284. We have expended \$28,000 on a building, which would produce a revenue of very nearly \$1,200, so that, allowing for the salary, not to say fuel allowance and caretaker, the whole revenue of the post office at least will be absorbed and there will not be one cent left. That is surely an improvident way to conduct public affairs. In cases where there is a considerable revenue collected there is fair ground for expending a moderate amount in the construction of public buildings; but unless I am very much mistaken the inland revenue at Hull is very little and the post office is the principal revenue, and so the Minister will see that the interest on the money expended on the public building plus the annual salary of the postmaster will use up the entire revenue of the post office and probably more too.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hull is a growing place and I have no doubt that the revenue from the different sources there will not only cover the expense but will be more than that. It being the city opposite to the capital of Canada and one of the cities of the Province of Quebec we thought we might give a better building than we would to a smaller place. We have adopted a new rule about this and that is to give a good building at less expense in the future.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the new rule I would like to know?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Instead of \$30,000 to try to limit it to about \$20,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For towns of what size?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Sometimes it would be less than \$16,000, but as a rule not to exceed \$20,000.

Mr. LAURIER. I am glad to learn we have a rule in this matter. I thought there was no rule at all and that this was judged of by exigencies. I do not say political exigencies, but I say exigencies only.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the rule apparently is that due discrimination is observed in looking after good supporters. That appears to be a very prominent rule for building a post office.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The leader of the Opposition will admit that while we have had a number of those buildings in counties represented by Conservatives, we have not limited the post offices to those counties, and that we have recognised the wants of other counties. I think it is only fair to say so.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, it is fair to say so. I am glad to say that two Liberal counties are to be endowed with post offices. That is not very much, but we are thankful for so much, and I am glad to say it.

Joliette Post Office..... \$10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will be the total cost of this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About \$21,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the population?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The population must be about 5,000 now. In 1831 it was 3,260.

Mr. LAURIER. It is not more than 4,000 now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Apparently the population is 3,215, by our census, and it may have increased, although that does not necessarily follow.

Mr. LAURIER. It has increased.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps it has, the hon. gentleman ought to know better than I do. This building seems to be for a post office pure and simple.

Mr. BOWELL. I think if you look into last year's Estimates you will find that it is also for the collection of inland revenue. I remember it being distinctly stated by the Minister of Inland Revenue that the collection of tobacco revenue there was very considerable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is nothing in the item before us to indicate that it is anything but a post office, and generally the Minister of Public Works is pretty full and accurate in his statements.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In this case it is for post office, &c., which means that the inland revenue must be there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the revenue in the "et cetera"?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot tell you.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The revenue from the post office alone would be barely \$1,100. I must say that expending \$21,000 to provide house room and accommodation for an annual revenue of \$1,100 is a way of managing affairs that no business man would very much approve of. It practically means that the whole revenue of this office, and something more to allow for insurance—for although we are our own insurers we ought to make a charge for it—will go for repairs and expenses of maintenance. Every one of those public buildings requires a caretaker, and you have the result that the whole revenue derived from this office would be consumed in providing house room, and salary. That is not business, and it prevents us from seeing to a certain extent what the post office costs us. Because those matters afterwards are charged not to the post office expenditure, but to the Department of Public Works.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Every one of those additional buildings means so much additional charge all the time. I will not detain the hon. gentleman on this point but I shall request the Minister to obtain information as to whether this covers the inland revenue building, and what amount of revenue is obtained both in the case of Hull and Joliette. The hon. gentleman will do that I presume?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, I will take a note of it.

Montreal Post Office, electric lighting \$2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the same thing as last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this an annual charge, or for doing work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The chief mechanical engineer states this is to be applied in making necessary extensions and alterations in the electric lighting apparatus of the Montreal post office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who supplies the electric light in the Montreal post office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a contract with the *Gazette Printing Company of Montreal*. The contract, as stated two years ago, was for five years; from the 23rd of October, 1885, so that it would be over in a short time. The price was \$2,750 a year. The cost of lighting with gas previous to that, for the year ending 30th June, 1884, was \$3,419, and to the 30th June, 1885, \$4,003. We thought it would be a considerable saving every year to have this electric light.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What number of lights are supplied for that? I suppose you have the contract there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not the contract here now. I had it last year, though.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was that contract made by the Government with the *Gazette Company* by tender or without tender?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was without tender. The *Montreal Gazette Company's* building being just in rear of the post office, it was very convenient for the post office to obtain the electric light from them, as we could have it without incurring a large expense for stock. But the post office, having a large number of officers, who do a large amount of night work, requires perhaps more light than we have here, and the question is now under consideration whether we should not provide our own apparatus; and I think it will end in that. The fact is that the *Gazette Company* made this arrangement more to accommodate the Government than anything else. It is not the arc light, but the Edison light, as the officers could not bear the arc light, which is very trying to the eyes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that in 1886-87, we paid to A. J. Lawson \$1,089, to other parties \$100, to the Edison Company \$2,241, to E. Chanteloup for electric light fittings \$487, making about \$3,800 for electric light and fittings in the Montreal post office, for which the hon. gentleman has concluded a contract at the rate of \$2,700 a year. *Prima facie*, that would look something like improvidence on the part of the Montreal post office. The hon. gentleman told us that there was a saving of \$600 or \$700, but when you come to spend about \$4,000 in addition to \$2,700 a year, the saving vanishes, and there is a heavy debit on the other side.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are certain expenses for introducing the light into the building; but the chief mechanical engineer of the department has told me that there was certainly a saving as well as a great deal less danger from fire and a better atmosphere in the building, so that the clerks felt better and could work longer.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand, the *Montreal Gazette Company* only supply the motive power.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They have also supplied a large portion of the apparatus.

Mr. LAURIER. That is necessary to convey the electric current, I suppose. Before you had that contract with the *Gazette Company*, how did you get the motive power?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before we contracted with them we only had the gas.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no saving at all, then. As I understand, the price of lighting the building under the old system was \$3,000. Now it will amount to \$2,700, and my hon. friend has just shown an additional charge of \$4,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When I say \$3,000 in 1885 for the gas, that is what we had to pay the gas company. We had the expense inside as usual.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). The incandescent lamps only last a certain number of hours, and they cost from 75 cents to \$1.50 each, according to the size, and they have to be frequently renewed. I understand that the Government supply these lamps; they are not supplied by the *Montreal Gazette Company*.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have to pay for them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the life of these lamps is about 1,000 hours, so that they would be used up in a year, and there would be at least \$1,000 a year for them. So that there would be certainly no economy in this change. I am inclined to agree with the Minister that as a matter of health and convenience the incandescent light is very much better than the gas, but he cannot claim economy for it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If we cannot have economy in the expenditure we have it in the health of the officers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should think the hon. gentleman could have competition for the supply of power in Montreal.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The matter is now being investigated, and the *Montreal Gazette Company* will not stand in the way of any change we may wish to make.

Quebec Custom House..... \$4,000

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Is this for repairs? It seems a very large sum?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. There is some painting, plastering, &c., to be done.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Is it intended by the Government to have the city water introduced into the custom house?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We wish to have it, but we have not yet come to an understanding with the body which the hon. gentleman presides over; but most likely, having the head of that department here, we may come to some understanding.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). If I am not mistaken, the corporation has been prepared to supply the custom house with water at the same rate as ordinary citizens.

Quebec immigration building..... \$5,000

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Is that to complete the immigration building on the Louise embankment?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; \$42,836 is the total cost.

Rivière du Loup post office, &c..... \$2,000

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Is that the whole cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, it will cost about \$20,000.

St. Jérôme public building..... \$4,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cost of this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$20,000. It is for the post office and inland revenue office. The population of the place is about 8,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman is under a mistake, unless the population of St. Jérôme has grown with great rapidity, because I see by the census St. Jérôme had a population of 2,200 in 1881. You will have the result here that the gross revenue will fall several hundred dollars short of defraying the salaries and the interest on the capital sum expended in building. That is a most extraordinary way of doing business. I see the Brampton public building is put down at \$7,000. It is put down as a public building pure and simple. Does that mean a post office or what?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Post office, custom house, inland revenue, money order and savings bank.

Mr. BOWELL. The revenue from Brampton is about \$15,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that Brampton is a very important place, and has, I think, a population of 6,000 or 7,000. I see now a vote for the Cayuga post office, \$7,000. The population of that place is I think about 800, and the net revenue was about \$800, and here is a vote demanded which, with the usual excrescences, will swell up until it will be larger than all the revenue we can get from that post. I think this is, perhaps, the worst case we have yet had. The same expenditure is asked for this village of 700 or 800 souls which is asked for these other places containing several times the population.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The building will cost \$13,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman's estimates have grown. I put the question to him, as he will remember, across the floor some few weeks ago, and I was then told that the total expenditure will be about \$7,800.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount of the contract for the building was \$7,871, but we have the furniture, heating, fencing and other matters to provide for, and that is the estimate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the case is rather worse than I thought. Here is a place, with a net revenue, all told, of rather less than \$800, and \$13,500 will have to be expended there to put up this building. Does that include the land?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It includes everything.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This amount is to be paid to provide house room for conducting a business of \$800 net. If you add the interest on that, and the fuel, and probably a caretaker, you get a very delightful result. This shows the wonderful economy and the wonderful care with which the public affairs are administered. I do not blame the hon. Minister so much in regard to this. I suppose he tries to keep the expenditure within reasonable limits, but it does seem to be a perfect scandal that such an amount as \$13,500 of the capital money of this country is to be expended, besides a considerable sum which will be inflicted on the people for maintenance for all time, in regard to such a place as this, because you have to put on a sum for insurance—for sometimes these places are burnt down—and you have a charge for repairs, a charge for the caretaker, and a charge for fuel. It is a most extravagant mode of carrying on the public affairs, and this is probably the worst case that we have yet had in the Province of Ontario. It is certainly worse than any of the cases that I have alluded to before.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like to ask the Minister whether it is the policy of the Government to build post offices in all places of the size of the village of Cayuga? Supposing there is no object for the expenditure of money except for some special reason, simply on account of the service which is to be rendered to the country, I desire to

know if it is the policy of the Government to build post offices in places of that size? I agree with the hon. member for South Oxford. It appears to me that a gross injustice is being done to the country. If you are going to establish a system of influencing the electorate by building post offices and other public buildings in small places like this, not for the purpose of economy or in the public interest, but simply to influence the electorate, so that they will cast their votes for the Government where they otherwise would not, we want to have the information. If it be the policy of the Government to build post offices in places of that kind, I have a very strong claim to press upon them. If they will build post offices in certain places in my county, they might possibly induce the electors to record their votes for the Government. If they will expend a sufficient amount of money in the county of Elgin as they propose to do in the county of Haldimand, perhaps they might find the same consideration given to them in Elgin as they have in Haldimand; though I have more faith and confidence in the integrity, the honesty and the uprightness of the people of the county of Elgin than to think that they would yield to any such temptation which might be offered to them by the Government. I think that, if there be one black act on the part of the Government which is worse than another, it is this expenditure for the Cayuga public building. If there was any necessity for it, I could understand it, but, if you take the interest upon the original capital which will be required for this building, and the expenditures that will necessarily be incurred afterwards on that account, you will find that it is going to be a loss to the country, although, as we have seen to-night, and as we may see for the next two years, the Government may have one supporter from that county. I think they are paying well for it. I want to know whether the Minister is going to establish as the policy of the Government that expenditures of this kind should take place in small towns, regardless of the requirements of those towns, in order to gain political advantages for themselves over their opponents?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must see that, as a rule, these buildings are erected in the larger centres of the different counties. We cannot do everything in one year or in two or three years, but by degrees. When the question comes up as to building a post office somewhere, we have to look at all the circumstances and see whether the place requires it, whether the public service requires it, and then we have to come to Parliament and ask for the money.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would ask the Minister to point out to me the great need for this building, the great advantages to be obtained, and how the public service is to be promoted by the construction of this post office building at Cayuga? Will the hon. gentleman bring forward the representations which have been made to him to show why he made up his mind to erect this post office building there? He speaks about the centre of the county. Will he say what representations have been made to him in reference to this? Surely he might give some reason why this expenditure should be made.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would like to ask the Minister, in view of the fact that this building is to be erected at Cayuga, why it is that he has not done anything for a town with five times the business and five times the revenue? I refer to the town in which I live, Orillia. I know that it has been repeatedly presented on the Government, and that petitions have been presented for a post office building there, and I think it is very unfair to the county of Simcoe and to that town of Orillia, which is a flourishing and a progressive place as any place in the Dominion of Canada, which has a population of 4,000 or 5,000 people and a revenue paid in of over \$6,000, with an allowance for rent and interest of over \$400,

that it should be left out while this small place is being considered. I know that an application was made and I think it is exceeding unjust that it was not granted.

Mr. COOK. The reason is that they elected an opponent of the Government. In the days when the leader of the Government and, I believe, the Minister of Justice, were going through the country in the "Jamaica" car, they called at the town of Orillia and held a meeting, and they promised the people, so it was stated at the last election, that a post office should be erected. There was a procession formed and they went through the streets of the town of Orillia. The Premier inspected the post office, and was reported to have exclaimed: "Why, this is not a building fit for a town of this size; you certainly require a fine post office, and you shall have one." Orillia has a population of about 6,000, and is one of the best built towns of Ontario. It has probably the most intelligent citizens, of its size, in the Province of Ontario. The result of the last elections shows that, because at one time it was almost wholly Tory, and at the last election it only gave a majority of three to the Conservative candidate, who lives in that town, and who is a large property holder. That accounts, I think, for the absence of any amount in the Estimates. Now, Mr. Quinn, the candidate in the last election, I believe paid a visit to Ottawa, and he interviewed the Minister of Public Works, and I understand he also interviewed the Prime Minister, and it is stated that he got a promise. When he returned to Orillia he made that statement, but the people were a little suspicious, his expenses being paid out of the town fund, the people were a little suspicious that he was down here looking after his own business; he has a timber limit in the North-West, and he was looking after the renewal of this timber limit and getting things into proper shape—it was so stated. Then another deputation of two gentlemen came to Ottawa and interviewed the Government again, with what result I do not know. They were more discreet than Mr. Quinn, and did not make it known through the newspapers. Well I find a report in a newspaper in the town of Barrie some distance from Orillia. Barrie is the shiretown of North Simcoe. The article reads:

"Mr. James Quinn, the twice defeated Conservative candidate for East Simcoe, returned home from Ottawa last week (his expenses being borne by Midland) where he had been interviewing various members of the Government to ascertain how it was that no appropriation was made for the Orillia post office. Sir Hector assured Mr. Quinn that the matter had been overlooked, and promised that the Supplementary Estimates would make things all right. The deputation then pushed for the claims of Orillia as a port of entry. Mr. Quinn had a private interview with Sir John, and was told (with a knowing wink, of course) to send down statistics, and Sir Hector would attend to it. But all these interviews took place before it was learned that Mr. Cook's appeal to the Supreme Court would be successful. So, it is not likely anything more will be done until a short time before the next general elections. Mr. Quinn did not say what Midland was after; but it is presumed that village wants a grant for an esplanade. These little claims of Orillia and Midland are interesting as showing what were the bribes Quinn and his friends were holding out during the last election: a new post office, built by the people of Canada for Orillia, and also a port of entry, and something else for Midland. Mr. Quinn had better take the great big piece of timber out of his own eyes the next time, and he will more easily see the little piece of splinter in Mr. Cook's eyes."

Now, I put a question on the notice paper some time ago, asking if the Government proposed to put a sum of money in the Supplementary Estimates for the construction of this post office in Orillia, and also what was to be done with Penetanguishene and Midland, but got no response. I am glad to see that the Minister has put a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for Penetanguishene, but he has neglected Midland.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We cannot do everything at once.

Mr. COOK. The work at Midland has been commenced and it would not take very much to complete it. However, I propose to discuss that question when we come to that item.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

I am extremely obliged to my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who is also a constituent of mine, for mentioning this matter. I am glad to get his able assistance, and I am going to assist him in getting something for his harbor in Parry Sound when the time comes. I think Parry Sound has been badly treated. I am sure the influence of my hon. friend ought to be very weighty, as he is largely interested, or at all events, his friends are, in Orillia, and I am sure he would like to see the progressive town of Orillia beautified with a magnificent public building such as they have got at Barrie. Barrie is not a much larger place than Orillia; it has been almost stationary the last two years. I spoke the other day of the blight Sir John had placed upon it in 1887. Orillia at that time was a small place, but she is going ahead rapidly. I do not know whether the Minister of Public Works has been there. I was out of the country, and when I returned they told me that these hon. gentlemen had honored my constituents with a visit at Orillia. I was very glad of that, because I thought the result would be as it has turned out, because Orillia gave me a larger vote than ever before; so that the promised post office, if intended for political effect, did not amount to anything after all. Now, I can assure the Minister of Public Works that it is no more than just that buildings should be erected in the town of Orillia. Is there any truth in the statement that Mr. Quinn obtained from the Minister a promise that an amount would be put in the Supplementary Estimates for the erection of this building? The Government should not discriminate against certain places in the matter of public buildings simply because the electors return representatives opposed to them in Parliament. It is an unworthy motive; the Government have no right to do so, the money belongs to the people, and the Liberals contribute more than the Conservatives, because they are more prosperous as a rule. The Government have educated their supporters to this principle: If you support us we will support you—you scratch my back and I will scratch yours. They have made the people improvident and led them to look to the Government for support, but afterwards they often leave the poor fellows out in the cold, when their influence is gone, just as the poor Grits are left. I want the Minister to let me know if there is any truth in the statement to which I have referred, because the deputation from Orillia made certain statements on their return, and if they were not the facts they should be exposed. Perhaps this matter has escaped the Minister's memory, and there is even time yet for an amount to be placed in the Supplementary Estimates, because, although there were supposed to be no more money grants, notice was given last night of a large number of grants to railways. The Minister of Justice has taken his seat, and I do not know whether he made any promises in his public utterances there or not; I rather think he did not. The leader of the Government did not do so openly, because it is always best to do it by a wink and a nod. I ask the Minister of Public Works if this matter escaped his memory for the second and third time?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Nothing has escaped my memory in that direction. I remember a deputation came here, and they were received as well as I could receive them; they seemed to be pleased with what I told them, and they made a great impression on my mind in the direction of that proposed building. Now the hon. gentleman has continued to make an impression on my mind in the same direction, and with the help of my friend on my right, most likely I will be very soon convinced that something should be done in that direction. But badinage apart, this matter was brought forward, but we are not in a position to ask Parliament to vote money for a great many buildings for which we would like to see sums in the Estimates. We cannot do everything in a year, and the hon. gentleman

says himself that though Penetanguishene is not in a county represented by a Conservative, it should not be forgotten. We do not look to that matter, but we consider the wants of the country. We may be mistaken; it is human nature to err, but we commit errors as seldom as possible. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) had better take what I tell him as an encouragement.

Mr. COOK. I am much obliged to the Minister and I understand he received the deputation very kindly and had a considerable interview with them, and sent them away rejoicing. If they went away glad they must have obtained a promise from the hon. gentleman.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We never make promises, because we cannot do so without having the authority of Council. When a deputation comes to me I listen to what the members have to say, and I make remarks or objections in order to ascertain exactly the position of affairs; and I then say to the deputation, that there is a great deal in what you say and I will report to my colleagues, and if the revenues of the country will allow us I should be glad to have the work carried out. But we cannot make promises either for a public building or for works in a harbor; it would be wrong to pledge the Government without the consent of Council.

Mr. COOK. I commend the hon. gentleman for being discreet and for not committing himself. I believe every word he has said. From what I know of the hon. gentleman I believe that is just what he would do. I know he is a very discreet public servant, and never makes a promise without endeavoring to fulfil it. But what has he to say about his leader? Has he the right to make promises without consulting Council? When he was at Orillia he told the people the public building was not satisfactory, that it was a disgrace, and they should have a new one. He made the promise at that time. I am sorry he is not in his place now, because I am inclined to think it must have escaped his memory. I desire to ask the Minister of Public Works whether he will use his endeavors to have an amount placed in the Estimates next year.

Mr. BARRON. Will the Minister state the circumstances which he considered in deciding whether this or that town is entitled to a post office? It seems to me that the member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) made out a very strong case in behalf of St. Thomas.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The new building is erected.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It was for Aylmer.

Mr. BARRON. The only answer the Minister gave to the strong argument advanced was that the Government in deciding whether this place or that place should have a post office, took into consideration all the circumstances. What are those circumstances? Will the Minister state them? Very likely they will be sufficient to justify me in coming to this Government and stating that the circumstances in my riding are such as to entitle me to ask the Government to have a post office at Fenelon Falls, which has twice the population of Cayuga.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I am very sorry that we did not discover at an earlier stage of the proceedings that the principle has been laid down that a village of 800 population was entitled to a \$13,000 post office. It seems to me, however, that these post offices are unequally distributed. The manufacturing town of Dundas in which I live, has always stood well by this Government, and the friends of the hon. gentleman who represents it made three trips to Ottawa in order to induce the Government to give them a public building of that class, and to put their post and inland revenue office in that town. But those expectations on the part of the hon. gentleman's friends were not fulfilled. It does seem to me

that it is not using his friends well that the town of Dundas, which has a population of 4,000, and which has always stood well by the Government which he supports, should be set aside and a mere village of 800 or 900 people should get a \$13,000 post office. It is true the hon. gentleman spent something like a couple of thousand dollars in fixing up a post office for us in that town some time ago. We have a very comfortable post office there now, but we did not reach that stage until it became necessary to lease a building from an active friend of the Government, and a friend that always worked very hard and faithfully on their behalf. The people of the town have a feeling that had it not been to square accounts with that gentleman that we would not even have got this much for the post office. I do regret exceedingly that we did not discover at an earlier stage that the Government intended to adopt the principle of giving a \$13,000 post office to a town of 800 or 900 population, because I think their friends in the town of Dundas would have felt that they would have had a strong claim, with their 4,000 of a population, to have something respectable in the way of a post office. We would be glad to take a \$13,000 post office, even though our town is larger than the village of Cayuga.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works to tell us what were the circumstances that induced him to make this expenditure for the town of Cayuga? If he will explain the theory upon which he arrived at the conclusion to make that expenditure, then we will be put in a position to know if other places which are similarly situated may have reason to apply to the Government for those public buildings? If he explains that to me I am willing to go on with the Estimates. I want to know how he arrives at this conclusion?

Mr. PLATT. I suppose that we might as well say what we have to say on this subject at once, as I have no desire to waste the time of the House. I cannot refrain from thinking that the rule which has been laid down by the Minister of Public Works as to the construction of public buildings, has more exceptions than almost any rule I know of. The hon. gentleman has told us that he cannot do everything in a single year, and the Minister of Finance has said that he cannot do all those things at once. There are a great many places that I know of that the Government have done nothing for in any year, and a great many places of more importance than the towns they have given public buildings to. I have no desire to make special claims on the Government for any town in my particular county, but I think under the present circumstances I can lay some claims to the consideration of the Government of the day. We have waited some time to get something done for the town of Picton in which I live. Our friends on the opposite side of the House, not long since, showed an extreme solicitude for the town of Picton and half-a-dozen of them came up there to express their extreme regret that the town of Picton and the county of Prince Edward, had been so long neglected and that the only thing that remained for our county to do, was to send a representative supporting the Government and their claims would be no longer lost sight of. It was pressed week after week in the Government press of that county, and even the Government press of the surrounding counties were continually explaining to the people of Prince Edward, that the reason they had been neglected for a quarter of a century was, that they would persist in sending somebody here to oppose the Government. It so happens that the people of Prince Edward have been pursuing this course for a very long time. I simply responded to those arguments by stating that it was a more heinous charge than I had ever brought against the Government, and that I did not think they would neglect any portion of the country because that portion of the country happened to have an opinion of its own on public questions. My friend from

Huron (Mr. Porter) claimed for the Government of the day that they were not of the character that had been represented, and that they were willing to do justice to all parts of the country no matter what opinions a particular part expressed. The general opinion during the late elections was that the county had been neglected. My opponents told on the public platform that for a quarter of a century very few dollars of public money had been expended there while certain of the neighboring towns of less size had received large sums of public money. My own friends thought that the people had been neglected, and both the supporters of the Government and those opposed to the present Administration were of the unanimous opinion that the county had been neglected. I had the support of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Porter) in saying that the Government did not deal out their gifts to the different counties according to the opinions expressed at the polls, but in accordance with even-handed justice. I think that the friends on the opposite side who showed so much solicitude for my county during the elections should press our claims on the Government for further consideration. We know that it very largely depended on the town of Picton as to the result of the election, and it was claimed that the town was going to carry against me by a very large majority, because there was a belief expressed that if a Government supporter was elected the public buildings would be erected. But my friend from Huron (Mr. Porter) came and told them that it would make no difference with the Government of the day as to the political complexion of the representative, and the people gave me in that Conservative town a magnificent majority of 28. Still, I have the right to rely on the assistance of hon. gentlemen opposite, who were so interested in my county at that particular time, to insist on the Government the fact, that the old town of Picton, which has paid taxes for twenty-five years, has never received any benefit from the public funds. I think that the claims of Prince Edward county should be no longer neglected. It is a deserving county, and the town is a deserving one, and I hope my friends will see that the Minister of Public Works will not fail to carry out the rule he has laid down and do justice to the town of Picton. I shall be most happy to give him any information that he requires from this side of the House; but, after what has been said by my opponents at home and in this House regarding our claims, I do not consider it necessary at this time to press for public aid. In fact, I am a little modest in pressing for public aid at any time. I am of opinion that the Government should themselves find out what sections of the country are in need of public aid and should give it only to those; and I regret that the sentiment prevails to any extent in this country that public aid is given for the purpose of gaining political support. I still refuse to believe that such a state of things exists in this country. I trust for the honor of our country that such a state of things will never obtain in it; but if we look over the list of counties which have received grants during the last few years, and consider the character of their representatives, a large degree of color is given to the charge that the Government are influenced in their grants of public aid by the political color of those constituencies. I think that is as serious a charge as can be brought against the Government. I trust that the expenditure of money will be made in those sections where it is most needed, and without regard to their political complexion.

Mr. MITCHELL I think the Minister who is in charge of the department whose votes are now going through, is generally credited on both sides with being a fair and reasonable man. He has heard the grievances stated on this side of the House, and he possesses a mind which will appreciate the force and value of the statements which have been made, in determining the course to be pursued

Mr. PLATT.

in the future. I must say that I have always found him reasonable and fair, and after what he has heard to-night, I think he will perhaps give a little more consideration to the gentlemen who have stated their grievances with moderation, and with a feeling with what was due to themselves and the constituencies they represent. I would suggest that as the discussion has been pretty full, we had better take the vote and get on with the business.

Mr. McMULLEN. In the county which I represent, there are no less than three towns, each with 2,500 inhabitants. The receipts in the town where I live are over \$3,000, and I believe the receipts of Harriston are nearly equal. If the Government are going to establish a principle on which to build post offices, I think we should know what that principle is. My impression is that when a town reaches a certain population and the receipts amount to a certain sum, the Government ought to consider whether they will erect a post office there or not. If the Government are going to adopt the policy of erecting post offices only in constituencies where supporters of themselves are elected, no matter whether the receipts are such as to justify the expenditure or not, it is well that the public should know it. In the county of Wellington there is only one town in which they have erected a post office, that is the town of Guelph, which has 10,000 or 12,000 inhabitants, and where the receipts are very large. There are several towns in Wellington where the population and the annual receipts are both greater than those of the town of Cayuga, and I would like to know on what principle the Government propose to build a post office in Cayuga when they overlook the necessities of other towns which have greater need of accommodation?

Mr. PORTER. I must apologise for speaking at all on this matter, but the hon. gentleman referred to me as having taken part in the election, and the remarks he made I take as complimentary. He said that I did not represent the Government as granting those favors on account of political support, but as dealing justly, and I think that is a proposition which I may maintain either on the public platform or in the House of Commons. I believe the Government do that. I believe their conduct has shown that they have considered all the circumstances, and have attempted to do justice. I was the more disposed to take that position because of the circumstances of the section I have the honor to represent. In my election there was not a single word of public buildings or of any favors to be obtained by the community if I was elected; and if there are items in the Estimates for public works in the town of Goderich, the necessity of those works was urged on the Government by a gentleman who was a very strong opponent of mine, who was, in fact, the principal agent of the gentleman who opposed me in the last election. This gentleman is mayor of the town, and is well acquainted with its wants; and he came to Ottawa and urged on the Minister of Public Works that those buildings should be constructed, as they were actually necessary in the public interest. Every person acquainted with the beautiful town of Goderich, the county town of a very large and important county, and acquainted with the condition of the post office, will admit at once that the arguments of that gentleman were undoubtedly well founded; and his having persuaded the Minister to listen to his arguments simply shows that the Government, when the facts and figures are placed before them, are willing to deal justly with every claimant, no matter whether he is a supporter or a strong opponent, as the mayor of Goderich was.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like the hon. gentleman who has just sat down to state if he considers it an honest, wise or just expenditure of public money to put a vote of \$13,500 in these Estimates for the purpose of providing accommodation for a business which does not net

\$800 a year? That is the question we are deciding. No reply has been given either by the hon. Minister or any other hon. gentleman on that side. It is perfectly clear why it was done, it was done for no other purpose than to bribe the electors of Cayuga to vote for the Government candidate. Now, I will not waste any more time over it.

Government Printing Bureau..... \$115,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is \$180,000 asked for the Government printing bureau. Turn to the miscellaneous, and you find that \$165,000 in addition to our considerable vote of last year, was demanded for plant required for the Government printing office; \$500,000 are going into this, in my opinion, very necessary useless job. It is a disgrace that in the present state of Government finances, at a time when we have a deficit of \$1,000,000, \$500,000 are to be expended in the current year or the year gone by for this purpose. It seems to me as if the intention of the Government was to waste the money of the country with both hands and to very little purpose. This may give a little patronage but it does not appear to me any possible good can result. So long as this lasts, we will be saddled with a sum enormously in excess of what our former arrangements cost us.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is estimated will be the ultimate cost of the building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$184,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How is this building being constructed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. By contract with Mr. John E. Askwith.

Mr. TROW. I am inclined to think this will be a bad investment on the part of the Government for the reason that the work will cost much more than it does at present.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is one item which we have passed to which I should like to refer. I see that for the Hamilton drill hall there is an amount of \$6,000. That seems to me to be a very large sum to be voted for a drill hall. When I presided over the Department of Militia, we took a vote for the drill hall in St. John, N.B., and I think the amount was \$11,000 or \$12,000, and I think that is a very suitable building.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This amount is for the completion of the hall. When it is completed, including the \$21,000 now asked, it will cost \$65,000 or \$66,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is an enormous sum to spend for a drill hall. In Halifax we have a drill hall which cost, I think, about \$11,000 or \$12,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that include the cost of repairs after a certain meeting which was held there?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No, I do not think so. I think this vote is sufficient to build a hall to accommodate all the military of the Dominion. It is so disproportionate to the expenditure in other places that I think the Government should give some explanation in regard to it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The requirements are laid before my department, then the chief architect makes a plan, and, of course, if it is a large building he states the reasons. In this case, the walls are of brick with stone dressing and stone foundation. The total length is 250 feet, and the breadth 116 feet, exclusive of a detached residence for the caretaker. As soon as the wooden building is destroyed, we will make one of brick.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My impression is, as I have heard from some of the officers of the volunteers, that the wooden building is to be preferred for military purposes to the brick. The difference in cost is enormous.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I may say on behalf of the people of Hamilton, that this is a very fine building. As the Minister has stated, it is a brick building with stone facings. The military force in Hamilton is rather large, and requires a good deal of accommodation. It must be remembered that the old building was burned down, and that this building was arranged for just before the general election, and I supposed at that time the Government felt very liberal towards a city like Hamilton, and they made this provision, and they have been very successful. At the same time, I must say that it is a very fine building.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is the Kingston examining warehouse, for which there is a revote of \$10,000, to be situated?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is not decided.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The post office and custom house in Kingston have a considerable space between them, and I think this might be erected there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Minister of Customs tells me that that is the place where it is intended to be erected.

Mr. BARRON. Has the contract been let for the Lindsay post office, customs house, &c., for which there is a vote asked of \$7,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, I do not think so.

Mr. McMULLEN. When we were discussing the post office at Cayuga, I had not the returns in my hand which I now have. I find that the returns for certain places in my county and adjoining counties show that Listowel, which is on the border of my riding, has net receipts of \$2,208; Harriston, a large town, with a population of nearly 2,500, has net receipts of \$2,305; Mount Forest, with a population of about 2,500, has net receipts of \$2,113. In none of these places is there a post office building, and there is no proposal to have a post office building, while in Cayuga, with net receipts of \$800, there is to be a large expenditure for a public building.

Mr. COOK. I see there is an expenditure of \$8,500 for the Barrie post office. Has that money been all expended?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not on this item.

Mr. COOK. I see that, last year, \$6,683 was expended on that post office which will make a total of \$15,834. Will that be the total expenditure?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The vote last year was to complete.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think this should be discussed on this item.

Mr. COOK. I was not in possession of the revenue of the Orillia post office when I spoke before on that question; but I have ascertained by reference to the Postmaster General's report that the net revenue of the post office last year amounted to \$5,220. I am sure the revenue of Barrie and Lindsay on the other side would not be much more. Orillia is the distributing point for all the post offices in that section of the country.

Mr. BARRON. Has the contract been let for the Lindsay post office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. When it is let it will be by tender.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Napanee post office and custom house, \$7,000—is that contract let for Napanee?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, the contractor is Mr. George Newlands. That is a more costly building than the other. It will cost about \$33,000 or \$34,000. Prescott post

office, \$15,000—we have purchased a site from Mr. R. Mc Carthy for \$3,500, but we have not yet received tenders. Public buildings, Ottawa, \$5,000—when a large amount is required for repairs, we must have a special vote.

Public Buildings, Manitoba \$105,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Manitoba penitentiary, \$75,000—what is the total cost of this to be, including this \$75,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Up to December, 1887, \$382,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then apart from this \$65,000, how much remains unexpended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$75,000 must be added to that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister will see that brings the expenditure on that Manitoba penitentiary up to close on to \$500,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that is an enormous sum for a penitentiary to accommodate 120 convicts.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the most expensive of all these buildings. I suppose the reason is because it is isolated from large centres.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid there is the same waste of money here which apparently went on in the provisioning and providing for the convicts, as to which we received a very unsatisfactory explanation. I have seen the building, and, unless it has been very much enlarged, I cannot conceive how \$500,000 has been laid out upon it. Is that by contract or by penitentiary labor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Both.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then am I to understand that over and above \$500,000 cash, the labor of the convicts is put in, whatever that may be worth?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Everything is included in this.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. \$500,000 cash and the labor of the convicts thrown in gratis?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, I think so. The cost of their labor is taken into consideration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Their labor is not worth as much as that of free artisans, but it is an enormous figure.

Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c \$148,500

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this is a good time to consider the question of the expenditure at Rideau Hall. The amount expended for contingencies is equal to \$50,000 a year. We are now making a change in our Governor General and the question can now be considered. There is an enormous expenditure connected with that establishment. I am not prepared to say that the amount is greater this year than formerly, but we should make an entire change. I do not think it is necessary for the country to contribute \$8,000 for fire and light. If we keep the establishment in proper repair, the Governor General whoever he may be, should pay the expenses connected with fire and light, and matters of that kind. This system has gone on for years, and we should not allow the item to pass without ascertaining whether it is the intention of the Government to continue the same course in matters of expenditure connected with Rideau Hall under the regime of the Governor General who will shortly arrive as has been done in the case of the last two occupants of the position! We pay the Governor General \$50,000 a year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

If we provide him with a comfortable house, which he has, I do not think we should be asked to pay the enormous sum we are paying every year in addition. His salary and staff expenditures cost about \$115,000 a year; last year it was \$113,000. The incidentals are a little over \$29,000. I think it is time that some change should be made in the manner of carrying on that establishment, and I should like to hear from the Minister whether the Government are preparing to carry on the same course with the Governor General that is coming as they have with the Governor General who is now leaving. This is a proper time to discuss the whole question before the new man arrives. My impression is that it is fully time in the interests of the people and the public expenditure when we should lay down some system. If it is the intention of the Government to continue to find a number of such things there as the vegetable garden, the flower garden and other things around the establishment, we should vote a certain amount annually and let it be understood that we will not exceed it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. So long as the Governor General is at Rideau Hall in the present building, the expenditure must go on. That building is an old one and it costs a great deal more to maintain than would a new building. Last year a number of members seemed to think it would be better to erect a new building, and I had estimates prepared, but after seeing the figure I thought the House would not be prepared to erect a new house for the present, and, therefore, we have to go on and keep this building in proper order. The Governor General as the representative of the Queen must have a proper residence. The hon. gentleman cannot expect His Excellency to take \$8,000 a year out of his salary to pay for light and fuel for the building—it could never be thought of. He has his salary, and I think he expends it freely while representing the Queen in this country. I do not think the expenditure can be much reduced. If the hon. gentleman has looked at the figures for the last three years he must see that there has been a reduction of several thousands of dollars; but I cannot promise that there will not be a larger amount next year, for it altogether depends on the requirements of the building. If a new roof is required it must be put on, if a gable threatens to come down it must be rebuilt, and the interior must be kept in proper condition, so that the Dominion of Canada may not be ashamed of the residence that is given to the Governor General. I do not think this is an amount that the people would ask to be reduced unless it could be shown that the money was squandered, and I do not think there is anything of that kind. The expense is a necessity, and, though a large expense, I do not think we can curtail it much.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is no doubt that the country must be prepared to furnish a suitable residence for the Governor General, and I do not think we could expect that the Governor General would pay for heating and gas out of his salary. But it appears to me, looking at the public accounts, that there must be a certain amount of waste. In speaking in this way we make no reflection on the people who are occupying Rideau Hall; they probably know nothing about it, but they have people about them who think that all this is furnished at the Government expense, and they are really not so careful as they otherwise would be. When examining the public accounts the other day I found that 400 tons of coal and 300 cords of wood were burnt at Rideau Hall, which seems to be a very large quantity, and one can hardly understand how it could be disposed of. The number of people employed round there is very large, especially considering that carpenters are working there all the year around. These amounts do not aggregate so much, but the same principle is involved. I think this country will be pre-

pared not only to furnish the Governor General with a comfortable residence and keep it in proper repair, but they desire that he should be in every respect comfortable; at the same time, I cannot help expressing the opinion that there are more people engaged about the grounds and Rideau Hall than is necessary for the purpose of making the occupants there comfortable and taking care of the property. It is the duty of the Minister of Public Works and his department to do this, and I think it is a matter he might fairly consider and see whether a reduction could not be devised.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Immediately after last Session I took care to have statements of all the expenditure there prepared, and after the Governor General had left I visited the building myself and went through it from cellar to garret to see it with my own eyes and be able to state to the House my opinion about it. After going through the whole building and having a statement of the number of people employed by the Government there, I found we could not have a less number than the number we have this year, reducing it by two or three men whom I thought we could get rid of, but altogether I do not think we can reduce it further.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This amount does not include the annual vote for furniture.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The furniture gets worn out and of course we have to re-cover it. We cannot cover one piece of furniture and leave the others in the old way. In the same way a portion of the paper may get spoiled and of course we have to repair the room. It is a large expense I know, but with all the care possible I do not think we can reduce it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is understood we pay for all expenses of furniture, and plate, and glass, and things of that kind?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you furnish the building all over?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. There are two divisions in this expenditure which ought to be borne in mind. The one is on the building and the necessary investment there. The other is the expenditure which really is part of the household economy of the tenants of that building. It seems to me that it is quite time a change was made in regard to this latter expenditure. I quite agree with the Minister that while we have such an old building as that, we cannot expect that the expenditure will be largely decreased, in keeping it in repair, and I have no doubt the Minister is trying to do the work as economically as possible. I desire to see an absolute change in what I might call the internal economy of the household. The change would not mean that we should ask the Governor General to pay the expenses we are now paying out of his ordinary salary, but a definite sum should be set aside for the purpose as an allowance to the Governor General, and then the Governor General and his household would be responsible for the expenditure of the money. As it is now, the expenditure is entirely in the hands of the department, and I would submit that it is impossible for even so careful and zealous a man as the Minister of Public Works to control it. It is a difficult position to place the Minister in, that he must be expected to look after the internal economy of such a household as that of the Governor General, but I believe it is right and just that the people of this country should expect that some official in the household of the Governor General should look after a proper and economical administration of the household. I do not see any other way it is possible to obtain that result, unless it is a change in the mode which

I have referred to: that a certain fixed sum shall be given to the Governor General for the purposes of his household expenditure. Then the proper administration should be left to the household, and they should be held responsible for it. As it is, unfortunately, it is the duty of the department to look after those employes at Rideau Hall. I can well understand the Minister does not wish to interfere in the household economy of the Governor General, and it would be a very difficult position to ask him to assume. If the sum is fixed, and handed over to the household there would be some proper official in the household who would be responsible for the expenditure. I believe that in that way the work could be done more economically than it is.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that we paid \$6,453 last year for painting. I would like to know from the knowledge he has of that building, if that amount of painting will be required on the arrival of the new Governor General. I notice also that we spent something over \$1,000 on carpets, and that some three or four hundred yards of carpets were laid down last year. What is his view with regard to the probable expense that will have to be gone to, to put the building into a position to receive the new Governor General. I notice that when the last man came there was considerable improvement gone to, and that we had to overhaul the whole place and to change the carpets and furniture and all that kind of thing. The probabilities are that next year we will have a larger sum than we have now, for the new Governor General will have new ideas with regard to the character of the furniture and fittings that he will require. If we are going to spend a very large amount on the arrival of the new man, my impression is that we had items of expenditure last year which might have been saved, in a view of going into this expenditure when the new Governor arrives. I find that last year it cost \$80 a day to keep that place in a position fit to be occupied by the Governor General, and I think there is no necessity for the number of men that are employed about that place. I admit that the gentleman we had under examination, Mr. Hutchinson, is an upright man and tries to do the best he can, but he was surrounded by a number of men there whom he could not well control. He also admitted, when he was before the Public Accounts Committee, that on some occasions men were sent there without his knowing anything about them. Possibly they were those who impressed on the Government that they should be employed and were sent there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman should not make that insinuation against us. That is not so. The hon. gentleman should not suppose that because we are his opponents, and in the Government, that we employ every one who comes to us. He should suppose that we are doing our duty, unless he has proof to the contrary. Mr. Hutchinson may know nothing about this because he is not called upon to decide what is done. If the hon. gentleman had put me the question I would have answered him at once. The system now is that an officer of the department, and an officer of the household go around three or four times a year in order to ascertain what repairs are required. A list is made and signed by them, and then submitted to me, and I decide whether the work should be done after a proper estimate is made. When that is assented to, then the men that are required are sent, and Mr. Hutchinson may perfectly well be ignorant of what the decision has been arrived at in the department.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know from the Minister of Public Works if he thinks it necessary to have four professional gardeners at Rideau Hall. There is a vegetable gardener and an assistant, and a flower gardener and an assistant gardener. Does he really think that it is necessary to have four professional men all the time at Rideau Hall, who are paid \$2 a day, Sunday included?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The men that are there are constantly employed during the period of the year, for which they are appointed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). A good deal of this expenditure is in connection with the repairs to the building. Did I understand the Minister to say he had considered the question, as to an entirely new building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). On the same grounds?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the idea was if we were to erect a new building it would have been on Major's Hill, towards Nepean Point.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood that idea had been abandoned. The Minister probably has formed some estimate of what the cost of that new building would be. I would like to know what estimate was formed in reference to that and also as to what we could dispose of the present property for, so that we would be in a position to judge whether it would be true economy to effect the change?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We could not obtain, of course, what the property cost us. I cannot say at all how we could sell it, because it would be a difficult property to sell, unless perhaps it could be used as a summer hotel or perhaps a public institution. But the estimate was over \$400,000, because we shall require not only the residence or castle, as we might call it, but the out-buildings, fences, drives, &c.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would ask the hon. gentleman to inform us on one or two points when we meet again. In the first place, it seems to me that it is rather hard that the Dominion should be called on to provide \$3,500 a year to keep up Major Hill park for the benefit of the citizens of Ottawa. I do not think that is a proper expenditure at all. It appears to me that the place might be properly enough leased to the city of Ottawa; but the people of Canada should not be called on to provide a recreation ground for the citizens of Ottawa. I should like the hon. gentleman to state when we meet again whether the Government proposes, and if so, why they propose, to continue that policy. The other point is this: He has often heard, and I think he is well aware, that this particular building in which we are carrying on our session to-night—this pit—is about as unwholesome a building as it is possible for any building to be; and I would like to know if the Government are considering the propriety of throwing out in some part of this building a room which will be tolerably healthy and which will be arranged on reasonable hygienic principles.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This last matter has been discussed already. We cannot make an addition to this building without destroying its appearance; but the hon. gentleman is aware that next to the west block there is a large space facing on the square which has not been built upon, and we might probably utilise that for the construction of a House of Commons, which might communicate with the present Parliament building by a sort of arcade or colonnade, which would bring the three buildings together. The House of Commons would then be alone, with certain offices belonging to it, and it would have all the ventilation and all the light possible on all sides. That is an idea. Of course it would cost a large sum of money, but for the comfort of the representatives of the people we should have it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not a question of comfort. Every man who has studied the hygiene of these buildings knows well that a room like this, where the sun never comes, and where it is impossible to have proper

Mr. McMULLEN.

ventilation, is a very unwholesome building in which to spend so many hours as we are now spending.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My hon. friend has properly called attention to this vote for Major Hill park. However indefensible that expenditure may be—and I agree with him that it is utterly indefensible—it has certainly this in its favor, that it is not a new vote. But I see that we are to be called on to vote a new item of \$5,000 for the paving of Wellington street. That is a new departure entirely, and I may say that when that item comes up, I intend not only to discuss it, but to divide the House on it in concurrence.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must remember that the papers on this subject were laid on the Table two or three years ago, and approved by Parliament. Wellington street is under the surveillance of the Government from the bridges to Bank street, and must be kept up by us. That is a bargain, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not move against the vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. And with all due deference to my neighbors, a very good bargain too; because a more disgraceful street before the Government made that arrangement I never saw in my life. I think it was an arrangement that might be justified by the necessity of the case.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.15 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 18th May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPRESENTATION OF KENT (ONT.)

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that I have received the certificate from the returning officer of the election of Archibald Campbell, Esq., for the Electoral District of the County of Kent, in the Province of Ontario.

TRADE COMBINATIONS.

Mr. WALLACE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 138) for the prevention and suppression of combinations formed in restraint of trade. He said: The House will remember that I presented recently the report of the committee appointed to investigate this subject. That report has shown what, I think, is a surprise to the House, and it certainly was a surprise to the committee, as it will also be to the people of the country. The extent of combinations formed in order to enhance prices and restrict production, and keep out others from engaging in the same occupation and business constitutes a serious evil which calls for legislation. We find by the evidence produced before this committee that coal combines exist in the principal cities of Canada, that these combines are most tyrannical, arbitrary and exclusive in their character; that they enhance prices to the consumer; that they prevent competition; and that under the cloak of law or under pretence of being attached, as in Toronto, to the Toronto Board of Trade, they have been doing acts which are entirely illegal, giving oaths and

statutory declarations, and compelling their employes to take those oaths, and in many ways violating the laws, and doing all this under the oath of secrecy and pledges not to divulge the doings of these associations. In the city of Ottawa we find an example of the American trust system imported into this country, in the case of the Ottawa Coal Company. We see there an example of the arbitrary way in which these combinations have increased prices, and they have done this under the influence of these coal organisations. In Ottawa until recently, coal was \$8.50 a ton, and to-day the very best quality of the same coal that was brought into Ottawa this spring, is selling for \$5 30, or a reduction of \$3.20 per ton. I think the influence of this investigation has done a good deal to remove the evils of combinations by acquainting people with the acts of these companies; but I think a more severe and permanent remedy is required, and I have therefore introduced a Bill dealing with those companies. I am aware that the period of the Session is late and it may be difficult to give a Bill of this important character as full and mature consideration as it deserves. But, Sir, the committee had a great deal of work to do. We held 26 meetings and investigated matters very thoroughly, and it was impossible to get through with our examination of the cases that were brought before us at an earlier period. Then the preparation of the Bill occupied a few days, so that it brings us now to nearly the end of the Session. I will briefly explain the provisions of this Bill. The first clause enacts:

"Every person who combines, agrees or arranges with any other person, or with any railway, steamship, or steamboat or transportation company (a) for granting to any person who is a party to such combination, agreement or arrangement, any facility for the purchase, sale, transportation or supply of any article or commodity which is an object of trade, which facility is, by such combination, agreement or arrangement not to be granted to any other person who is not a party thereto; (b) For denying to any person who is not a party to such combination, agreement or arrangement, any facility for any such purchase, sale, transportation or supply, and which, by the provisions thereof, is to be granted to any person who is a party thereto; (c) For unreasonably enhancing the market price of any article or commodity which is an object of trade; (d) For unduly restraining the traffic in any such article or commodity; (e) For limiting, lessening or preventing the production, manufacture, sale or transportation of any such article or commodity; (f) For preventing or restricting competition in the production, manufacture, sale or transportation of any such article or commodity—is guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable, on conviction, to a penalty not exceeding \$1,000, and not less than \$200, or to imprisonment for any term not exceeding twelve months, and not less than three months, or to both."

The next clause provides that any company that is incorporated by the laws of the Dominion of Canada, and that has been found guilty of misdemeanors of this kind, shall forfeit its charter. The third and last clause provides that,—

"Nothing in this Bill shall interfere with chapter 131 on the Revised Statutes of Canada respecting Trade Unions."

These are the three clauses of the Bill which I submit to the House for its consideration. The evidence taken by the committee justifies prompt and decisive action, because we find that not only in the case of the coal trade, which I have already mentioned, but in every other branch of trade, people are following the evil example that has been set in this instance; and the results have been so satisfactory to those engaged in the combination that if the evil is not checked we may expect that a large number of other branches of business will be affected by similar combinations. We see in the United States, and particularly in the State of New York, that investigations of a similar character are going on, or have been held, and Bills have been introduced. But in those States of the Union the combinations are so powerful and they have exerted such a great influence on the Legislatures, that it has been found impossible to pass an Act sufficiently stringent to suppress them. These matters in Canada to-day are yet in their infancy, and I think this is the time when they should be strangled, when it can be done more easily than at a future time. For that reason I press this Bill on the consideration of the House and the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD I am sure the House, without reference to party, and the country will feel deeply grateful to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), for instituting this enquiry, and I have no reason to doubt but that the thanks of the House are also due to the committee for making that report. We can only judge what the report is and what the evidence is from the information we have casually gathered. I quite agree with my hon. friend that it is well we should deal with this subject now, at least as soon as we can properly do it with due consideration, and with the means for forming a deliberate judgment on this important question. My hon. friend has stated that the fact of the committee sitting and the evidence that has been produced have already had a beneficial effect in reducing the prices of one of the most important articles of commerce. I have no doubt that this report, the introduction of this Bill, the publication of the evidence, will also have a most beneficial effect. I do not suppose my hon. friend thinks it would be possible that the House should read the evidence, digest the report and come to a final conclusion as to the merits of the Bill in the expiring moments of the Session; but he will have attained, and the committee will have attained, I think, all they can reasonably expect to attain, that is, the attention of the country will be called to the evidence laid before the House, and the Bill which is proposed to become law can be fairly considered, and those who are most affected by it can also have an opportunity of considering the measure and being heard in Parliament. I have great pleasure in supporting the interest of the Bill, but I do not think the House can go any further with it during the present Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is tolerably clear that the House cannot proceed further with this Bill, and I am inclined to believe that service has been rendered by this committee in calling the attention of the country to the natural fruits of the absurd system of protection under which we are at present living. A great deal of good will be done in the way of opening the minds of the people to see what comes of delivering the power of taxation to a few favored individuals at the expense of the general benefit of the community, and, therefore, I am inclined to agree with the First Minister in thinking that good will come of this. That, however, I think, will be the only good that will come of it.

Mr. HESSON. One of the greatest combinations investigated by the committee was one in which there was no protection, and that was in coal. Since the tax has been taken off, advantage has been taken to a greater extent than ever before by the combination, and prices increased.

Mr. GUILLET. In reply to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I would say that one of the strongest combinations we found to exist was the stove combination, and some of the most odious features were found to have originated during the administration of the hon. gentleman, from 1875 to 1879; and although they existed through all that period no effort was made by the hon. gentlemen then in power to control that combination or suppress it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman is referring to stoves: stoves are exceedingly protected.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must express regret that the House has not been able to deal with the question during the present Session. It is a very great pity that the evidence could not have been placed in such a shape as to be available now. I believe the report of the committee will do good; at the same time it is hardly right that we should separate without dealing with these combinations instead of allowing them to enjoy the sweets of their gain for six or nine months more before we meet again. However, it is in line with

the promise which the Finance Minister made to the combine, when he promised the manufacturers of this country at the beginning of the Session that there would be no alteration in the tariff and they could enjoy their sweets for nine months more.

Motion agreed to; and Bill read the first time.

GRANTS TO RAILWAYS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to-morrow, to consider the following proposed Resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the railway companies and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:

To the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company, for 22 miles of their railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Eganville, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 49 Victoria, Chapter 10, for a railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Eganville, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$70,400.

To the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, for 46 miles of their railway from Bridgewater to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, in the Province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$147,200.

To the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company, for 3 miles of their railway from the end of the present subsidised section to Messina Springs, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$9,600.

To the Mississippi Valley Railway Company, for the section of their railway from a point on the Atlantic and North-West Railway near the Village of Magog, to Ayer's Flat Station on the Mississippi Valley Railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 50-51 Victoria, Chapter 24, a subsidy of \$32,000.

To the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, for bridging the several channels of the Ottawa River at Culbute and West thereof, a subsidy of \$31,500, to be paid out monthly as the work progresses upon the certificate of the Chief Engineer of Government Railways, in the proportion which the value of the work executed bears to the value of the whole work undertaken, and for three miles of their railway extending from a point three miles east of Pembroke to Pembroke, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$9,600, provided that the entire work subsidised upon this railway shall be completed within four years from the passing of this Act, the subsidy granted by this Act not to exceed in the whole \$41,100.

To the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company for 84½ miles of their railway from Port Arthur towards Crooked Lake, in lieu of the subsidies granted by 48-49 Victoria, Chapter 59, and 49 Victoria, Chapter 10, for the construction of a railway from Murillo Station to Crooked Lake, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$271,200.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for 30 miles of their railway from Lake St. John towards Chicoutimi, or from Chicoutimi towards Lake St. John, being a transfer made at the request of the Saguenay and Lake St. John Railway Company of the subsidy granted to them by 50-51 Victoria, Chapter 24, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$96,000.

To the Tamisouata Railway Company, for 20 miles of their Branch Railway from Edmundston towards the St. Francis River, in the Province of Quebec, in lieu of the subsidy granted to them by 50-51 Victoria, Chapter 24, a subsidy of \$100,000.

To the Quebec Central Railway Company, for the construction and completion of a line of railway from St. Francis Station to a point on the Atlantic and North-West Railway near Moose Head Lake, 90 miles, in lieu of the balance of the subsidy, unearned, granted by 47 Victoria, Chapter 8, a subsidy not exceeding \$23,345 per annum for twenty years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on the bonds of the Company.

To the Central Railway Company of New Brunswick, a grant as subsidy (the road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 lbs. per lineal yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed authorising their transfer to the Company) of 4,652 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to the St. Martin's and Upham Railway Company, now forming part of the Central Railway, which rails and fastenings stand in the Public Accounts as an asset of \$93,612.54.

To the Elgin, Petitcodiac and Havelock Railway Company of New Brunswick, a grant as subsidy (the road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 lbs. per lineal yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed authorising their transfer to the Company) of 2,201 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to the Elgin Branch Railway, now forming part of the Elgin, Petitcodiac and Havelock Railway, which rails and fastenings stand in the Public Accounts as an asset for \$44,252.82.

To the Kent Northern Railway Company of New Brunswick, a grant as subsidy (the road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 lbs. per lineal yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed authorising their transfer to the Company) of 2,549 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to this Company, which rails and fastenings stand in the Public Accounts as an asset for \$58,334.27.

Mr. McMULLEN.

To the Halifax Cotton Company, of Nova Scotia, a grant as subsidy (the road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 lbs. per lineal yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed, authorising their transfer to the Company) of 233 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to the Company, which rails and fastenings stand in the Public Accounts as an asset for \$4,335.

To the Steel Company of Canada, in Nova Scotia, a grant as subsidy (the road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 lbs. per lineal yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed authorising their transfer to the Company) of 597 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to the Company, and which rails stand in the Public Accounts as an asset for \$11,964.66.

To the Albert Railway Company of New Brunswick, a grant as subsidy (the section of road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 lbs. per lineal yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed authorising their transfer to the Company) of 726 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to the Company, and which rails and fastenings stand in the Public Accounts as an asset for \$14,665.45.

To the Chatham Branch Railway of New Brunswick, a grant as subsidy (the road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 lbs. per yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed authorising their transfer to the Company) of 958 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to this Company, which rails and fastenings stand in the Public Accounts as an asset for \$14,439.84.

2. Resolved,—All the lines, for the construction of which subsidies are granted, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications, and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the Company with the Government, and which the Government is hereby empowered to make; the location also of every such line of railway subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; and all the said subsidies respectively, payable in cash, shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister or upon completion of the work subsidised.

He said: I desire to move that the resolution respecting grants for railways be placed on the Order Paper for to-day. I can only do so with the unanimous consent of the House as I am only entitled to move the resolution to-morrow; but under existing circumstances I ask the House to allow me to move the motion.

Mr. LAURIER. I must take exception at once to the suggestion. We cannot proceed with the resolution to-day, and I must ask that it stand till to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am in the hands of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. It is very objectionable that such an important matter should be brought in so late in the Session. I suppose that cannot be avoided now, but we should have on the Table of the House the correspondence which must have been exchanged with the companies which are to be favored in this way. It has generally been done, although I think it was not done last Session.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then I will move that the House resolve itself into committee to-morrow, and I desire to say that I have the assent of the Crown to introduce the motion. I would ask the House to allow me to add another resolution to those already on the paper, which, by an unfortunate oversight, was omitted, and which, I am quite sure, the House will readily allow me to correct. I received a letter from the hon. Minister for Northumberland—the hon. member for Northumberland I mean—coming events cast their shadows before them—pointing out the mistake I had made, and calling my attention to the fact that a loan of rails for the Chatham Branch Railway, New Brunswick, had been omitted. I sent to the Railway Department and found that the resolution had been prepared, but by some strange oversight had not been included in those handed to me to place on the Notice Paper. I ask permission to add a resolution covering this subsidy amounting to \$24,439.84.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 76) to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 50, respecting the North-West Territories.

THE HIGH COMMISSIONER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved third reading of Bill (No. 136) to amend chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes respecting the High Commissioner for Canada in the United Kingdom.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we should understand now, because there has been plenty of time for the Government to make up their minds with regard to the High Commissionership. Will the High Commissioner be appointed within a reasonable time—say within six weeks; and that is quite long enough, I should think, for so important an office to remain vacant any longer? It is now vacant for eighteen months, or will be with the six weeks added. I think we ought to know this, when we are passing a Bill for the High Commissioner.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot give the ordinary answer, to-morrow, but the High Commissioner will be appointed in a few weeks.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Who is he to be?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose that is a secret.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

PATENTS OF INVENTION.

Mr. CARLING moved third reading of Bill (No. 38) to amend the Act respecting Patents of Invention.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I understand the object of this Bill is to create a new office, and that the probabilities are that the Government will feel, as they have already stated, that the interests of that office can be trusted in the hands of the late Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I feel it would not be in the public interest that a course of that kind should be pursued. We all know that that gentleman has occupied the position of Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for some length of time. During the last election campaign, and when the election was over, it was felt by the Government of the day, prior to the returns all coming in, that their position might be very critical, and that some means would be necessary whereby, if they were not sustained by a sufficient majority, other means would be resorted to, to deprive the electorate of the Dominion of a certain number of the representatives chosen by the people, and that their seats might be jeopardized so as to enable the Government to have a working majority. It is useless for the Government to say that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery performed his duty. I am quite satisfied, from what has taken place, that there must have been some influence brought to bear on this man to induce him to act in the manner which he did, on that occasion. We have found that either by accident or otherwise a very large number of the elected Reform members were prevented from being gazetted for a long time, so as to give the Government of the day an opportunity of devising some means to prevent the return of the people's choice. I was one of those whose return was delayed for about three or four weeks, and the object for delaying the return is unaccountable to me, unless it was that my majority was not so great as it was in some other constituencies. I had only fifty-four majority, and perhaps they thought that by some means or other they would be enabled to have a recount, or a protest, so as to prevent me taking my seat. The Government ought not to have pursued that course, because I had on that occasion the pleasure of having the

whole of the combination company in my riding. They were there with their brass bands and drums, and from every platform they preached that the country was in an entirely different position to what it really was. Their object evidently was, if possible, to try and prevent your humble servant from being returned in that constituency. They left no opportunity unavailed of to bring about this result, and by all means legitimately, and I do not know but illegitimately too, they tried to defeat me before the election took place. They ought to have been quite satisfied with all this, and after the people had recorded a majority of votes for me, they should have allowed the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to gazette me at a proper time after the return was made. Perhaps some members of the Government may know more about this than they wish to tell, and perhaps some of them were in communication with my opponent in that contest. The next day, or the day after the election took place, I discovered that my opponent had gone from St. Thomas to the city of London on some business, and what that business was I for a long time was unable to find out. As time passed on and as my return was not gazetted, rumor said there was an intention on the part of my opponents to contest my seat, and by every possibility to try to prevent me from taking my place in this Parliament. Even up to the time that I left for the opening of the House I had not been gazetted. Time and again my friends asked me what was the reason of this long delay. I was unable to give them any information in reference to that, unless the belief which I expressed that the Government delayed my return so as to enable my opponents to protest my seat. My opponent, too, prior to the expiration of the time for protest, in answer to a question put to him, said it was not his intention to protest the election, but yet the gazetting was delayed until the very last minute. On the Friday night before the expiration of the time, I saw two individuals, the local representative and a defeated candidate, about the lobbies here. On Saturday morning they left, and at the very last minute the deposit was made and the protest entered against me. What were those men here for? Perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite will be able to explain to me what took place while they were in Ottawa. However, notwithstanding a firm declaration on the part of my opponent that there would be no protest, it was entered, and entered so late that I was unable to enter a cross-petition. The trial came on, and as I felt that my conduct in the election was proper in every respect, though I could not say what some of my friends might have done through indiscretion but with no wrong intent, I was declared elected and entitled to retain my seat. I had all the anxiety of that trial, and I am now in a position to say that had the gazetting not been delayed as long as it was, and had those two individuals not come down here, there would have been no protest entered. I would say this of my opponent, that he felt that it would be suicidal, so far as he was concerned, to enter a protest; but I suppose he was urged on; even up to the time of the trial he persisted in saying that he did not desire that a protest should be entered. In view of these facts, I ask, is it not reasonable for me to feel that this postponement is to reward a man who did me a personal wrong? But I do not blame him so much as I do those who induced him to do it. He was only the instrument in their hands; and those who instigated him should be held responsible. If he is guilty of wrongdoing, the Government, if they induce him to do it, are to blame, and not he. But what I complain of is that the Government should seek to create a position for a man who was guilty of such conduct, who violated the oath he had taken to do his duty faithfully and impartially. I feel, therefore, that it would be wrong in the public interest for this man to hold the position of Deputy Commissioner of Patents, and I beg to move in amendment thereto:

That all the words after the word "That" be struck out in order to add the following:—

It is not expedient that a deputy commissioner be appointed, and that in any event the appointment of Mr. Richard Pope, the late Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to this office, can only be regarded as done for the purpose of rewarding the said Richard Pope for a gross and deliberate violation of duty in the office he formerly filled, and that such an appointment, if made, will not be calculated to inspire confidence in the honest administration of the department in which the said Pope is employed.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Kent, Ontario, introduced by Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Langelier (Montmorency).

PATENTS OF INVENTION.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am delighted to be interrupted by the introduction of my hon. friend from Kent. I believe that every effort was made in the recent election to prevent our having the pleasure of his presence here during the remainder of this Session; and, Sir, no doubt he would have the same ground as I have for objecting to the appointment now proposed to be made. But, Sir, we find, when the country is appealed to, the voice of the people declaring that they have no confidence in the present Government on account of their many acts of wrong-doing and corruption, and their neglect to look after the interests of the country as they ought.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Wilson, (Elgin):

YEAS :

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Ellis,	McMillan (Huron),
Bain (Wentworth),	Fiset,	McMullen,
Barron,	Fisher,	Meigs,
Beausoleil,	Gauthier,	Mitchell,
Béchar,	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Godbout,	Perry,
Bowman,	Guay,	Platt,
Brien,	Holton,	Purcell,
Burdett,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Campbell,	Jones (Halifax),	Rowand,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Kirk,	St. Marie,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Scrifer,
Choquette,	Lang,	Somerville,
Cook,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Sutherland,
Couture,	Langelier (Quebec),	Trow,
De St. Georges,	Laurier,	Turcot,
Dessaint,	Livingston,	Watson,
Doyon,	Lovitt,	Welsa,
Edgar,	Macdonald (Huron),	Wilson (Elgin).—60.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Freeman,	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Girouard,	O'Brien,
Bowell,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Boyle,	Grandbois,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Brown,	Guilbault,	Perley (Ottawa),
Bryson,	Guillet,	Porter,
Cameron,	Haggart,	Prior,
Cargill,	Hale,	Reid,
Carling,	Hall,	Riopel,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Henderson,	Robillard,
Chapleau,	Hesson,	Roome,
Chisholm,	Hickey,	Ross,
Cimon,	Hudspeth,	Skinner,
Cochrane,	Jamieson,	Small,
Cockburn,	Jones (Digby),	Smith (Ontario),
Colby,	Kirkpatrick,	Sproule,
Corby,	Landry,	Stevenson,
Costigan,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Laurie,	Temple,
Coalombe,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Thérien,
Daly,	McCulla,	Thompson,
Daoust,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tyrwhitt,
Davis,	McDonald (Pictou),	Vanaase,
Dawson,	McGreavy,	Wallace,
Danison,	McKay,	Ward,
Desjardins,	McLellan,	White,

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

Dickinson,	Madill,	Wilmot,
Dupont,	Mara,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Masson,	Wilson (Lennox),
Ferguson (Welland),	Mills (Annapolis),	Wood (Brockville),
Foster,	Montague,	Wood (Westmoreland).

—83.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TROW. I notice the hon. member for St. John has not voted.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I have paired with the hon. the Minister of Finance.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for King's, N.S., voted, although he was paired with the hon. member for Albert, N.B.

Mr. BORDEN. I allowed the names in my immediate vicinity to be called without voting. Subsequently I saw the hon. member for Albert in his place and voted. I sent him a note informing him of the fact, and I presumed he would vote, being in the House.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I happened to come in too late, thinking I was paired.

Mr. BORDEN. Then I would ask that my name be struck off.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved third reading of Bill (No. 131) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act (from the Senate). He said: I promised the hon. member for South Oxford to give him some general idea of the scheme for the Crofters' settlement. The scheme is generally this: That the Imperial Government are to advance £10,000 on condition that £2,000 are raised from other sources. 1. That three or four trustees or commissioners should be appointed as a board to represent: (1) the Imperial Government, (2) the Canadian Government, (3) the private subscribers, and (4) the important land companies, whose gratuitous co-operation and assistance has been promised, subject only to reimbursement of actual authorised outlay, and that this board shall be entrusted with the responsibility of carrying out the scheme in accordance with the intention of the Government. 2. That the board shall be empowered to obtain such clerical or other assistance (possibly two paid emigration agents, one in the old country and one in Canada) as may be necessary in the selection and final settlement of the emigrants. 3. That in the event of the families being selected and arrangements made for their reaching the port of embarkation, the emigration officers of the Canadian Pacific Railway will take charge of the emigrants at Glasgow or elsewhere, carrying them to their final destination in the North-West Territories for a fixed low rate of passage money. 4. That, in order to meet the cost of emigration and to comply with the provisions of "The Dominion Lands Act, 1886," a sum not exceeding £120 shall be advanced by the Imperial Government and one-sixth by private subscription, and expended in accordance with a scheme drawn up and approved by the Minister of the Interior in terms of section 38 of the aforesaid Act. 5. That the board constituted as above will undertake, by means of their agents, to settle the emigrants on the Government land, to provide temporarily for their wants, and to collect the instalments of capital and interest from them in the manner hereinafter mentioned, they having the benefit of the knowledge and experience both of the Canadian Government land agents, and of the gratuitous co-operation of the officers of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Hudson Bay Company, and the Canadian North-West Land Company. 6. That the Canadian Government will give free grat

lands of 160 acres to each family, and also render every assistance through the High Commissioner in London, and through their immigration agents in Canada, in connection with the selection of the land for the emigrants, and their preliminary settlement. The Canadian Government will require that the emigrants selected shall be formally approved by an officer on their behalf. 7. That the money grants shall be for a period of twelve years, bearing no interest during the first four years, but the before-mentioned board will collect the principal and interest from the settlers during the last eight years by an annuity which, on an advance of £120, would amount to £20 17s. 8d. per annum. This is equivalent to an average interest of about £4 6s. per annum during the whole period of twelve years. 8. That the foregoing board will take, by way of security for the sum of £120, or lesser sum, so advanced, a mortgage on the 160 acres of free grant lands of the Dominion Government, including a lien on the chattels, the mortgage being secured in favor of the board by legal agreement. 9. That, if thought desirable, the Canadian Legislature will be requested to facilitate the passing of an Act in connection with the constitution, powers and duties of the aforesaid board. This is the Act which is before the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does the Canadian Government give any money?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About £12,000 are put at the disposal of the commissioners—£10,000 by the Imperial Government, and £2,000 by private parties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not less than £2,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to see that the poor immigrants are to have four years to look about them before being called on to pay. I think that is an admirable provision in all such schemes. The hon. gentleman will remember that I specially called his attention to the desirability of settling these people close together. By that I did not mean that Canadian settlers need be excluded from among them, but that the system of interposing a block of a square mile between each other square in that particular locality where they settle should be dispensed with by the Government. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has had time to consider the suggestion, and can say whether he will see that it is carried out or not. I believe it would be greatly to the advantage of the settlement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not quite prepared to say that. When the Government agreed that a Canadian commissioner should be appointed on the board, his services being quite gratuitous, and the whole scheme not involving any expense whatever to the Dominion Treasury, it was agreed that the late Minister of Interior should be the commissioner. I fancy his successor will be the commissioner, and I will bring before him the hon. gentleman's suggestion. I have no doubt that this scheme will be laid before all the commissioners, and the Government will be only too ready to agree to any claim such as the hon. gentleman suggests, if they recommend it as being in the interests of the crofters.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For fear of being misunderstood, as I notice I was by my hon. friend the other evening, I would repeat that my object is not to exclude Canadian settlers from the crofters' settlement. It may well be that the intermixture will be advantageous. All I desire is to prevent, what I would regard as a misfortune for this settlement, the interposition of large blocks of vacant land held on speculation by parties for the purpose of profiting by the improvements made around them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite understand the proposition of the hon. gentleman. It will, of course, be ad-

visable, if possible, to have an admixture of other settlers. For instance, if there were some Ontario farmers settled among them, they would teach them a great deal in the way of farming, because crofters are not supposed to be very good farmers. I am not aware of the mode of settlement the crofters proper had under the auspices of Lady Cathcart.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have visited that settlement, a part of which is close to Moose Mountain, and I found many of these men did well. I am inclined to think almost all are likely to do well, once they overcome the initial difficulty, but they made complaints on the very point which I have brought up; and the hon. the First Minister will easily understand that the difficulties of obtaining a proper school accommodation in particular, which, like all Scotch people, they are very desirous of having, were greatly increased by the fact that such a large area had to be brought into a single school section, and in that country, in winter time particularly, it is dangerous to send children a distance of two or three miles to school.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

THE SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved consideration of amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 120) further to amend "The Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act," chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: There is only one amendment: to enable the registrar to have control of the library of the Supreme Court, as he has hitherto had, instead of having to purchase books from the Stationery Department.

Amendment concurred in.

MARITIME COURT OF ONTARIO.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that Bill (No. 40) to extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario, standing in the name of Mr. Charlton on the Public Bills and Orders, be transferred to Government Orders and be read the second time. He said: The first clause is an important one, and I think should be adopted, with a slight alteration. As to the other clauses, they may be left over, with the exception of the last.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. EDGAR. Will not the general provision giving the court jurisdiction *in rem* clash with the law which already exists?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it will; I think it would amend it to that extent.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved second reading of Bill (No. 117) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act, chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: When I introduced this Bill the other day, I was confident that it would receive the universal assent of the House, as I was sure that its provisions were in favor of economy, uniformity, and simplicity of proceeding in the working of the Franchise Act. Unfortunately my provisions have not been realised. I see that amendments are threatened to be proposed which touch the very principle itself of the franchise; and I have been informed that a discussion on the principle of the Act itself might arise, and take up a great deal of time; and, at this

late hour of the Session, I do not think it is desirable that such a prolonged discussion should take place. I must say that when I thought of the good memory of my hon. friends opposite, I was afraid they would remember the speeches that they delivered in 1885, and I shuddered at the recollection of the length of time the debate then lasted. Accordingly, I think I may be allowed, in order to show my desire to bring this Session speedily to a close, to withdraw some of the clauses of the Bill, and ask the permission of the House, when we get into Committee of the Whole, to enact only the fourteenth clause; while the other portions of the Bill I will bring up again next Session. The fourteenth clause provides that a revision of the list shall be dispensed with during the year 1888.

Mr. LAURIER. What the hon. gentleman has just said proves once more the necessity of a vigorous opposition in this House. We have here saved the country from being inflicted another year with this Bill. As I have already said, we will get the entire repeal of this Act piecemeal. Twice already the hon. gentleman has moved the suspension of this Bill, and I only hope he will continue in the same line.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not wish the hon. gentleman to understand that the Government withdraws the measure: we only adjourn it until next year, and early in the next Session I shall present the measure again to the House. I am sure that meditation will bring wisdom to my hon. friends, and that they will then adopt the Bill as it stands to-day.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In that way they will adjourn it *sine die*—we will take it so, at all events. The last clause the hon. gentleman asks us to enact, I think, might be obviated if he would provide that wherever an election may take place during the year, say for the local House, the last revised list should be used for that election. Now the hon. gentleman will see, as we observed before, that in the event of an election taking place during the coming year, that election is run on the list prepared for 1885. I submit it is an extraordinary proposition that we should be running an election in 1889 on an 1885 list, and, therefore, even as a temporary measure, I think the hon. gentleman will do well to provide that the latest revised list in the county in which the election is held, should be used for that election. We do not know where the election may be held; it is as fair for one side as the other, there is no party gain or loss in it, but it is simply maintaining the principle that up to the last moment those who are fairly entitled to vote should all exercise the privilege which belongs to all free men of selecting a man to represent their views. I think the Government ought to yield to this proposition, instead of omitting the revision for another year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend is not generous. That is completely changing the principle of the Bill itself. As I am generous enough to sacrifice the body of my Bill, I should be allowed to preserve the soul of it, at least.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think there is either soul or conscience about the concern. But be that as it may, there are two ways in which the rights of the electors might be preserved fairly. One is the mode suggested by my hon. friend, which has the great advantage that it would cost nothing, and would meet all possible cases. The other is this: There are a certain number, although a small number, of protests now pending of elections to the House of Commons, and wherever elections are protested, and wherever there is a possibility of an election, owing to an election petition being presented there, the Government should cause a revision to be made. I will tell the Secretary of State why. It is known to me, and I believe there are gentlemen in this House who can testify from their own experience, that between the lists of 1885 on which the present elections are conducted,

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

and the present lists, there is a difference of many hundred votes in single counties. I believe that in one of the recent elections it was found that in one single polling sub-division containing 200 votes, there were no less than 57 persons who became disqualified in the present year as compared with 1886. That is, perhaps, an unusually large proportion. My own calculation has been from my own experience that from 5 to 10 per cent. of the voters are usually disqualified by a change of residence, by death, or by becoming ineligible in some way, in the space of twelve months, and the consequence is that when you allow about three years to elapse, you have something like 20 per cent. of those who are qualified to vote at an election, disfranchised under the present mode. That appears to be a proposition which is fair in itself, and ought to commend itself to the Government, unless they prefer to accept the proposition of my hon. friend behind me, which, as I said, has the merit of being very cheap, and of meeting all possible cases. My own would only meet, it is true, those cases in which the courts might decide that new elections would have to be held.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am very sorry we cannot accept that proposition. The second proposition would be very costly, and would give rise to a great deal of inconvenience and expense in many cases where elections may have to be held.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are only half-a-dozen protests now pending.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am sure very few of the protested elections will be determined otherwise than by retaining the members in their seats, and I hope we have now done with the protests. We have the pleasure now of seeing one of our friends (Mr. Pope) who, unfortunately, has been sick for a long time, appear here as young and well as he ever was, and I hope he will continue so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The suggestion offered from this side of the House would not involve any great expense, because I referred simply to cases of protests now pending, which would not number more than half-a-dozen.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Suppose there were eight protests going on, they would mean eight revisions, which would cost a considerable amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be the means of obtaining the full opinion of the people. Any election which now takes place does not by 20 per cent. represent the actual number of persons entitled to vote.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, as statistics which have been taken show. In the cities the change is considerable, but the average for all the constituencies is not 5 per cent., and the average of the rural constituencies is not more than 2½ per cent. a year.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think the average majority of candidates elected is 5 per cent. of the whole electors.

Mr. LAURIER. But whether the average be as small as stated or not, is not the principle absolutely wrong that you should not have an expression of the opinion of the people of the country. The only way to secure the true opinion is to take the provincial list.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says he has endeavored to make the law uniform, and while he has eliminated certain clauses he has left the soul of it. I suppose the spirit of the Bill is to work in the interest of the Government. There is evidently no principle in it, because universal suffrage was given to Prince Edward Island, and different suffrages to other parts of the Dominion, a feature which strikes at the principle of uniformity.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not in the Bill.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. Secretary of State said the object of the Bill was to make the law uniform. We understand that the Government is about to be reconstructed, and some hon. members will be called upon to appeal to the people under that arrangement. I suppose the Government are desirous of maintaining whatever advantage they possess under the old Franchise Act, with their own nominees or revising barristers. If the Government have confidence in the country, as they tell us every day they have, they should be willing to take the electors into their confidence and give the fullest opportunity of expressing their wishes. I know in some constituencies the vote will be materially changed, I do not say it will be changed in one way or the other, but it will be very largely increased, and I suppose the Government in many cases will receive the advantage of it whatever it may be. I would again urge on the hon. gentleman to accept the proposition I made and utilise the latest list, which will fairly represent the electors of the country.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. Secretary of State has stated that the increase in the rural districts is exceedingly small. In one rural constituency in New Brunswick it is stated there are 2,000 names to be placed on the list.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

NORTH-WEST REPRESENTATION ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 125) to amend the North-West Representation Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. WATSON. I think it is important we should adopt some uniform system of voting for the Dominion elections in the North-West Territories, and I beg to move:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of inserting provisions for the taking of the votes at the elections in the North-West Territories by ballot.

I do not think it is necessary to occupy much time, but I do say that the North-West should be allowed the ballot. We can understand that from the fact that the North-West Mounted Police, the Dominion Lands Agents, the Indian Agents, and a great number of people that are subject to influence by the Dominion Government in the Dominion elections in the North-West, are voters, that there should be voting by ballot there.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Watson:

YEAS:
Messieurs

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Amyot, | Gauthier, | Mitchell, |
| Armstrong, | Geoffrion, | Mulock, |
| Bain (Wentworth), | Gillmor, | Pateron (Brant), |
| Beausoleil, | Godbout, | Perley (Assiniboia), |
| Béchar, | Guay, | Perry, |
| Bernier, | Hale, | Platt, |
| Bourassa, | Holton, | Purcell, |
| Bowman, | Innes, | Rinfret, |
| Brien, | Jones (Halifax), | Rowand, |
| Burdet, | Kirk, | St. Marie, |
| Campbell, | Landerkin, | Scriver, |
| Cartwright (Sir Rich'd), | Lang, | Semple, |
| Choquette, | Langelier (Mon'mor'cy), | Somerville, |
| Cook, | Langelier (Quebec), | Sutherland, |
| Couture, | Laurier, | Trow, |
| Davis, | Lister, | Turcot, |
| De St. Georges, | Livingston, | Watson, |
| Doyon, | Lovitt, | Weldon (St. John), |
| Edgar, | MacKenzie, | Welsh, |
| Killia, | McMullen, | Wilson (Elgin).—62 |
| Fisher, | Meigs, | |

NAYS:
Messieurs

- | | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Bain (Soulanges), | Ferguson (Weland), | Mara, |
| Bergeron, | Foster, | Mason, |
| Bowell, | Freeman, | Mills (Annapolis), |
| Boyle, | Gigault, | Montague, |
| Brown, | Gordon, | O'Brien, |
| Cameron, | Guilbault, | Patterson (Essex), |
| Cargill, | Haggart, | Pope, |
| Carling, | Henderson, | Porter, |
| Carpenter, | Hesson, | Prior, |
| Caron (Sir Adolphe), | Hickey, | Reid, |
| Chapleau, | Hudspeth, | Riopel, |
| Chisholm, | Jamieson, | Robillard, |
| Cimon, | Joncas, | Ross, |
| Cochrane, | Jones (Digby), | Royal, |
| Cockburn, | Kenny, | Small, |
| Colby, | Kirkpatrick, | Smith (Ontario), |
| Corby, | Labrosse, | Sproule, |
| Costigan, | Laudry, | Taylor, |
| Coughlin, | Langevin (Sir Hector), | Temple, |
| Coulombe, | Laurie, | Thérien, |
| Curran, | Macdonald (Sir John), | Thompson, |
| Daly, | McDulla, | Tupper (Sir Charles), |
| Daoust, | McDonald (Victoria), | Vernasse, |
| Davis, | McDougald (Pictou), | Ward, |
| Dawson, | McGreevy, | White, |
| Denison, | McKay, | Wilmot, |
| Desjardins, | McLellan, | Wilson (Argenteuil), |
| Dickinson, | McMillan (Vaudreuil), | Wilson (Lennox), |
| Dupont, | McNeill, | Wood (Brockville)—89. |
| Ferguson (Renfrew), | Madill, | |

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

REPORT.

Criminal Statistics for the year 1886.—(Mr. Carling.)

SUPPLY—THE LOBSTER FISHERIES.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. KIRK. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and of the Government, to a matter which affects seriously a large portion of the people of the Maritime Provinces. I have reference to the recent Order in Council for the restriction of the time for fishing for and canning lobsters. I am aware that there have been complaints, which I have no doubt reached the Minister of Marine, and those complaints have existed for a number of years, that the Order in Council regulating the lobster season in the Straits of Northumberland and the northern parts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island had the effect of destroying the lobster fisheries in those waters, that the time for fishing was too long, and the consequence was that fishing has been injured and the lobster fishing industry in those districts were suffering very much. I am not aware that such complaints came from the southern part of Nova Scotia, but I have heard of complaints from that side of Nova Scotia of quite a different character. The complaints that I have been accustomed to hear from the fishermen were that, since 1879, they were restricted too much, and they had not sufficient time for prosecuting their calling. Since 1879 the regulations of the Government in regard to fishing for lobsters in the southern part of Nova Scotia, and that portion of New Brunswick in the Bay of Fundy, extended from the 1st of April to the 1st of August, and lobsters could only be canned during that season on the southern side of Nova Scotia, but on the northern side, in the Straits of Northumberland, the fishing season extended from the 20th April to the 20th of August. It was claimed that in the Straits of Northumberland the season was too long, and that lobsters should not be allowed to be taken so late in the season as August. It was claimed, and I believe properly claimed, that lobsters should not be taken in those waters later than from the 10th of July to the end of August, because during that season of the year the shells were soft and the fish was not in a condition to be canned. On the southern coast of Nova Scotia it was thought that the season

was too long, and that lobsters should not be allowed to be taken after the middle of July. The 1st of April is as early as fishermen can get their traps out, and they should be allowed to put them out as early as the season will permit. In Guysboro' county and along the whole coast of Cape Breton it is often the middle of May before they can get their traps out to fish, and therefore the season was not a long one even when they were permitted to fish to the 1st of August. The result of the complaints made to the department, which were heard by everyone throughout the Maritime Provinces, at any rate by the members representing fishing constituencies, was that the matter was brought up in Parliament last year by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies); and after a short discussion, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that a commission would be appointed to enquire into the whole matter and report to the Government, and that upon the report of that commission the Government would act. The commission were appointed, and I am sure every member of the House must have thought that they would collect information from various parties interested, and that their report would be thoroughly reliable. They proceeded with their work, and we have their report before us. But what do I find? I find that in the Maritime Provinces 77 witnesses were examined—26 in Nova Scotia, 25 in New Brunswick, and 26 in Prince Edward Island—besides some in Quebec and other places; but of the 77 examined in the Maritime Provinces not one or two is represented by the report as being a fisherman, but all were packers or overseers engaged in the packing business. However, the evidence taken by these men, so far as the southerly coast of Nova Scotia is concerned, goes to show that there was no falling off in the fisheries there, but that the lobsters are as large and as plentiful as they ever were; and there is no evidence to show that the season is too long or that the lobster fisheries are being destroyed. In the county of Guysboro' we have some fourteen or, perhaps, sixteen canning establishments; yet I find that the commissioners only visited one place in that county. It seems that these gentlemen were having a good time, and only travelled where the regular lines of steam communication would take them. The place they touched at in Guysboro' was Canso, a very important point, and they took the evidence of three witnesses connected with the canning establishments there. The evidence of these gentlemen goes to show that the lobsters are as plentiful in that district as they ever were, and that they are no smaller in size than they were when they commenced canning some twenty years ago. I make a few extracts:

"Mr. Leonard Schreider, lobster packer, Canso. Has been in the business three years but fished one year 14 years ago. Don't see much difference in the size of fish between 14 years since and now. Certainly can't see much difference in the past two years."

"Mr. White, lobster packer, Canso. No closure for any term of years is necessary at Canso. There is no visible change in the size or quantity of the lobster. Formerly and now 5 lbs. weight of raw unboiled fish made 16 ounces of meat. As to shortening the fishing season, different localities would require different regulations. August to him, as far as it goes, is probably the best month. Does not approve of leasing, it would not be practicable."

"Mr. William Frazer, of Burnham and Morrell, Caribou, N.S. Has been in business for six years at Caribou and St. John. Would recommend as the best fishing season to commence as early as might be, and fish to 10th July; then a recess to 10th August; and resume fishing till the end of September. Would not be in favor of closure for a term of years. Attributes the falling off in lobsters to a wrong fishing time. In June and July one-half the fish taken are in spaw; but after 10th August not two in 1,000."

Messrs. F. B. Hamblin & Co., lobster packers, of Pictou, N.S., who are very extensive packers, having factories both in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, say that they believe that if a close season is observed during the latter half of July and the whole of August, it is practically impossible to destroy the lobster fisheries, even if the fishermen are allowed to fish during the whole of the rest of the year. They say:

Mr. Kirk.

"To fish for six weeks only would not pay the cost of running it. Business cannot be done without three months' fishing. Mr. Hamblin's candid opinion is that if the lobsters are protected during the spawning time, they cannot be extinguished. Such protection would be ample to preserve the fishery. There should be sectional dates of fishing for different sections. In Mr. Hamblin's opinion ten days of variation in sectional date of close season is sufficient to cover the industry throughout Canada."

"Mr. George Rowlings, fishery overseer of Musquodoboit Harbor. Has been overseer only one year. Visits the factories six or seven times in the year, and estimates that it takes three and four lobsters to fill a can. His district is from Dartmouth to Ecum Secum, about 130 miles, and his remarks apply to that district."

"Messrs. Robert Simpson & Co., of Halifax, N.S. Respecting lobster fishery they would have the regulations retained just as they are, excepting that they would shorten the fishing season, and make it close on 1st July. In Prospect and Sambro, lobsters are as large as ever, also at Salmon River and Spray Bay. They handle lobsters taken in 30 fathoms. It takes 3½ to 4 average lobsters to fill a one-pound can. Simpson & Co. handle the fish of several factories—about 30—and furnish supplies to nine factories."

I have been told by gentlemen connected with the Fishery Department that it takes seven or eight lobsters to fill a one-pound can; but I find by this evidence, that on the whole southern coast of Nova Scotia the average given is from three to five:

"Messrs. E. D. & S. Staynor, lobster packers, Halifax, N.S. Own four factories; seemed reluctant to admit that lobsters were falling off in size and numbers. He believed that if the present law of 9 inches were in force, it would answer every purpose."

"Mr. J. E. Townsend, lobster packer, Halifax, N.S. He and Mr. Stairs drafted a memorial to the Minister asking for a commission to enquire into the lobster fishery. Can't answer as a question, whether lobsters are increasing or decreasing in size and number, but more factories are annually started. Decrease in size is premonitory to falling off in numbers. Times are poor. So I asked the Government to grant a couple of months extra, August and September, to apply to this year, but did not get it."

"Mr. Isaac Waters, packer and shipper, Halifax, N.S. Has been engaged in the business 23 years, and is now interested in the trade. His principal business is done along the coast, and although the lobsters are getting smaller, does not think they can be said to be exterminated. Fishing in the month of July does the mischief, and some firms he does business with will not put their hands on the fish they take in July."

They will not put their hands to the fish that are taken during the season in which it is not proper to fish, and during the month of July they are larger than in the month of August:

"Mr. H. B. Oann, lobster packer, Yarmouth, N.S. It takes 2½ to 5 lobsters, according to the catch, to fill a one-pound can. Can't say that lobsters are getting scarcer, in fact rather more were packed this year with increased number of traps."

As regards shortening of the season, would not be contented to close on 1st July. Would not want to throw off until 15th July.

"Broadford Cornell, lobster fisherman, Barrington. Has fished lobsters 5 years. They are about the same size as they were 5 years ago, but not quite as plentiful."

"Mr. John M. Shaud, lobster packer, Barrington, Shelburne county, has been in the lobster business 33 years, and packing on the Shelburne coast 16 years. When first came there it took 3½ lobsters to fill a can and it now takes about the same."

Therefore, you will see in Shelburne lobsters are not getting scarcer or smaller:

"Elijah Nickerson, lobster packer, Shelburne county, N.S. Lobsters are as large now as they were 5 years ago, and thinks they are as plentiful as they were then."

Now, I do not think it is necessary for me to read any more of the evidence in this report. I have only quoted the evidence taken so far as Nova Scotia is concerned. What I maintain is that, so far as the southern portion of Nova Scotia is concerned, the lobsters are as plentiful as they were when the lobster packing began some 20 years ago. This is fully borne out by the testimony of those witnesses which was taken before the commission last summer. I have, however, other evidence from fishermen. The evidence in this report has been, with one exception, altogether from packers. I have evidence, however, from fishermen and from gentlemen who are interested in packing besides the packers. I have a letter here from a gentleman whose experience extends from Halifax to Cape Breton, and he gives a schedule of sizes showing the

average size of the lobsters from 1883 down to last year; and he points out that there is a small falling off. He points out that it took four and a half lobsters, on an average, in 1883, to fill a can, while it takes now in some places five and a half, and in some places four and a half to fill a can. Then I have other letters from fishermen, one of whom says: "The lobsters in 1887 were larger in general than they were ever before." Another, a fisherman in the county of Guysboro', says: "I have been fishing lobsters for upwards of 18 years, and to the best of my knowledge they have not diminished in size." Another says: "Lobsters were larger during the last year than they have ever been. We caught lobsters in 1887 weighing 8 lbs." I may say that I asked these gentlemen for their opinion with regard to the lobsters. I wrote to them telling them that it was stated here by some of the officers of the department that in the fall of the year lobsters were not fit to be caught, and that it took from seven to twelve to fill a can. One of my correspondents said: "I have never seen lobsters like them in my life. We cannot catch them in our traps. Neither can we take them in our hand traps. They are as large this year as they ever were. In 1887 the lobsters were fully larger than they ever were." Now, this is the evidence of fishermen, and the hon. the Minister will see that, so far as the southern portion of Nova Scotia is concerned, the lobsters are not diminishing either in quantity or size, and, therefore, there can be no good reason why a month should be taken from these people. Now, I presented petitions here from fishermen to the House, which, of course, have gone into the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He will find by those petitions that these people do not complain so much of the spring fishing season being shortened, although they claim that it would be no injury to the fisheries whatever if the fishing season was extended to the 15th of July. They maintain that the fish are fully as good and as healthy up to the 15th July as at any season of the year. They admit that after the 15th July, down, perhaps, to the middle of September, there ought to be a close season, but that after the middle of September, lobsters are quite as full and as profitable to be taken as at any season of the year. I have the opinion of one gentleman, of whom I enquired the condition of these fish in the fall of the year, with the view of knowing what I should do with regard to pressing the matter of fall fishing. This gentleman has been in the business for a long time, and his experience extends from Halifax to Cape Breton. He says:

"Lobsters are in good condition, say from the 15th September, as at any time in the year. I know nothing of the northern shore of Nova Scotia. Our average during the fall months was as good, if not better than in June and July."

Now, there is nothing in the contention that lobsters are not as full and profitable to catch in the fall of the year as they are in the spring; and the only season of the year in which they should not be caught is from the middle of July to the middle of September. I am of the opinion that they should not be taken during these two months, but after that I maintain it is proper to catch them; and I agree with Mr. Hamblin, that if the close season is observed during these two months you may allow the fishermen to take as many as they like before and after, and then that it will be practically impossible to destroy the fish. I do not wish to say anything with regard to the lobster fisheries in the Straits of Northumberland. Those who are interested in the fisheries there can attend to that business. I am speaking more particularly in regard to the fisheries on the southern coast of Nova Scotia, and I think I have given sufficient evidence to satisfy any reasonable man that, as far as that portion of Nova Scotia is concerned, the lobsters are as plentiful and as large as they ever were. I want to know why it is that the Government refuse to

allow the fishermen to exercise their calling in the fall of the year. I believe the reason why those fisheries have been so much exhausted in the Straits of Northumberland is the regulation of the Government which permitted them to fish so long in the season of the year when the lobsters should not be caught, in the spawning season, when the shells were not filled, when they were soft shells, and at that season it would take twice as many lobsters to fill a can as it would when the shells were full.

Mr. WELSH. Three times.

Mr. KIRK. Well, three times if you like, but I wanted to be within bounds. It takes, at all events, that quantity more in the months of July, August and the first part of September to fill a can as it does at any other time in the year. I believe it is because the Government permitted fishing up to the middle of August, and also because they yielded to the pressure which was brought to bear by the packers to allow fishing up to the end of August, that the fishing in the Northumberland Straits has become exhausted. But, in the southern part of Nova Scotia, that practice has not been carried on, and, therefore, our lobster fisheries have been preserved, and for that reason I do not think it is necessary in that part of the Province to restrict the time of fishing to the extent proposed. I do not know anything about the views of the packers in regard to fall fishing. None of them have addressed me on the subject. But I do know the views of the fishermen, and they think it is quite proper to fish in the fall. They believe that, if the fish are protected during the two months from the middle of July to the middle of September, they might fish as much as they like afterwards. I think the Minister should allow them to fish for two months in the fall of the year. Such a provision is absolutely necessary in the interests of the fishermen. A large number of them have given up the other fisheries altogether, and have turned their whole attention to lobster fishing. The same boat and the same gear which are used for fishing for lobsters does not suit for the prosecution of the other fisheries, and as a rule the fishermen are not able to keep on land a double supply of plant in order to prosecute both kinds of fishing. Therefore, when you stop them from fishing lobsters, they are stopped from fishing altogether. They cannot afford to buy the boats required for other fishing, and so they are thrown out of employment. I would ask, if the Minister thinks lobster fishing is so profitable, that these men, by prosecuting it for two months, can subsist on the result of the two months' labor and remain idle for the other ten months of the year? It is absurd to suppose that these men can support themselves and their families on two months' fishing in the course of the year. I find that in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, during its recent session, the House unanimously passed a resolution recommending the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to allow two months' fishing in the fall of the year; to allow fishing up to the middle of July, then to make a close season until the middle of September, and then to allow two months' fishing after that. No doubt that resolution has been forwarded and is now in the hands of the Minister. I think the facts which I have given and the evidence which I have read from the report of the commissioners ought to induce the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to open up the fishing season, on the southern coast of Nova Scotia, at least for two months in the fall of the year. I hope the Minister will give this matter his earnest attention, and will give these people a chance to make a living. I am not sure but it would be better for these people, even if it were true that the fisheries were fished out altogether or were becoming exhausted, to have them exhausted and completely destroyed, so that the fishermen might be induced to turn their attention to some other business, but at present they are prevented by the Government regulations from prosecuting their lawful calling, and denied the right to make a living for themselves and families.

Gen. LAURIE. The hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) has gone very fully into this matter, and has read very full extracts from the report of the commissioners. I think he has shown by his remarks the necessity there was for issuing this commission and taking this evidence. That has shown what the value of the fisheries to our people is, and also how easily and how readily they have been destroyed by a neglect to observe the habits of the fish. I do not desire to detain the House, but I want to add a small contribution to what the hon. gentleman has stated. While there is likely to be a great destruction of the fish, on the other hand, if the rules which have been laid down by the Department of Fisheries are complied with in reference to the protection of the fish, there is reason to believe that good results would follow. I have a letter from Mr. Freeman Payzant, of Lockeport, Nova Scotia, in which he says :

"I am also of opinion that the present law, if enforced, provides ample protection to this valuable fish. In our immediate vicinity, the law is strictly observed; in consequence, our lobsters have not diminished in numbers, nor do they decrease in size. This is not the case when the law is entirely disregarded, as it has been in the whole of the Gulf of St. Lawrence."

Of course this is only his own view :

"We had a factory on the north side of Antigonish county, where we packed five years, utterly disregarding the restriction (and others doing the same). We abandoned this place three years ago. Lobsters got too small to pack."

Whilst I think that the restrictions imposed are very desirable, I would venture to hope that the Minister may see his way to make such a concession to the residents on our south coast as they have asked for, by somewhat extending the time during which fishing may be permitted. Those fishermen are as much interested in the preservation of the fish as anyone can be, because, as the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) has told us, their living depends on the maintenance of the fishery, and they desire simply that they may be permitted to fish for a fortnight longer, having satisfied themselves that that would not interfere with the breeding of the fish, and would not result in taking soft shell fish. On the south-west coast of Nova Scotia, the principal business of lobster catching depends on sending fresh lobsters to the United States and not on supplying the canneries, and, therefore, this is more in the interest of the fishermen than of the packers. We have a consensus of opinion on this point. I have handed to the Minister petitions from 350 fishermen from Shelburne county, asking that the time for fishing be extended from the 1st to the 15th July. I also hold in my hand two letters from lobster packers, asking me to urge this matter upon him. Therefore, as the subject has been brought up, I take this opportunity of introducing it in order that it may receive consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) ought to have intimated to me that he intended to bring this subject up, and I should then have been prepared to give a more comprehensive and better statement than I am now able to make from memory of what has taken place during the year.

Mr. KIRK. If the Minister will allow me, more than six weeks ago I was in his office and told the Deputy Minister that on the first occasion I could get when the House was moved into Committee of Supply, I intended to bring the matter up. He said he was glad I told him that, because he would inform the Minister, and the Minister would be placed in possession of all the facts that he could give to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. The Deputy Minister is not the Minister, and my hon. friend knows that it is quite uncertain, even if I got notice six weeks ago, that I could remember it in the multiplicity of business. However, I shall make a few observations with reference to this matter from my general

Mr. KIRK.

knowledge of the question. The hon. gentleman has made one statement in which I do not think the House will agree with him, when he says that rather than that the lobster fishermen should be deprived of their business, the lobster fisheries should be allowed to become exhausted. Now, I do not believe that is the sentiment of this House or the country. An industry which, within the last year, amounted to over 17,000,000 cans of lobsters alone, besides the live lobsters that were taken, a trade employing thousands of people, is too large an industry to be allowed to be sacrificed. I believe the public sentiment of the country is now becoming nearly ripe for some fairly strong preventive measures for the preservation of the lobster industry and the lobster fisheries. In the first place it must be assumed that the Department of Fisheries, or the Minister at its head, has no object in view except to do the best he can, from the information at his disposal, to preserve the interests of the lobster fishermen, the lobster packers, and all others engaged upon that industry, so far as consistent with the preservation of the very source of their industry, the lobsters themselves. Now, if you take the history of the lobster business in the eastern States of the United States, if you take the history of the lobster business in Norway, and wherever else it has been prosecuted, you will find this result: that from over-fishing the lobster fishery has constantly decreased, and that there has come a period when it became essentially necessary, in order to preserve it, that strong measures should be taken to prevent over-fishing, even though the lobster canner, even though the lobster fishermen, had to suffer in consequence of that restriction. In the United States to-day it is generally admitted that the lobster fishery is pretty nearly exhausted, and, consequently, the people are now looking for another supply. They are now drawing their lobsters from other countries, and a great many citizens of the United States are engaged in the work of supplying lobsters for the United States market from our own shores. Well, as a result of over-fishing under the regulations which from time to time have been in force, everybody who has studied this question, everybody who has practical experience in it, has come to the conclusion that it is high time that something more should be done in order to preserve that industry, if it is to be preserved at all. I readily admit with my hon. friend that there are different circumstances upon different parts of our coast. If you take the Gulf coast, if you take Prince Edward Island, and other parts of the northern coast of Nova Scotia, you will find the lobster industry in a far more depleted state, in a far more exhausted condition, than it is on the coast of Nova Scotia from its western extremity up around to Cape North. If my hon. friend will take the report of the fishery overseers and of the fishery inspectors, from the different Provinces, and will look through them for the last six or seven years, he will find a constantly increasing note of warning, and he will see that stringent methods are necessary in order to preserve this industry. Well, this culminated last year, as my hon. friend has said, and I promised that a commission should be appointed to investigate the whole question, and procure such additional information as we could obtain. That commission was appointed and did its work. It is not for me to say whether that work was done perfectly or imperfectly. I believe that a fair average amount of evidence was collected, and that the evidence, take it all in all, points strongly in the direction of restrictive measures. My hon. friend has one opinion with reference to what should be the close season, and almost every person has an opinion of his own as to what that season should be. Almost every fisherman you ask has a different opinion from his neighbor, according to the locality and a point of view from which he regards the question, and it is impossible to reconcile these different opinions. Now, Sir, four men were appointed on that commission. They studied the question during last

summer; they had already studied the question for years; they were persons who had been engaged in the lobster fisheries and had an intimate knowledge of it. After they had gathered the evidence, which has been printed, in consequence of the general impression they obtained from their years of previous experience, and the general impression gathered during their trip last summer, they recommended unanimously the close season which has been adopted by the Government. Now, I think that is one very strong proof that this is as fair a close period as can be had. My hon. friend says that the evidence was chiefly obtained from packers. Well, if his statement is correct—and I think in the main his statement is correct—more packers have been interviewed, and their evidence taken, than fishermen. My instructions to the commissioners were to take their evidence from the best persons they could get to give information. The evidence has been taken, and as the packers' evidence predominates, you will fairly conclude that they would give evidence as favorable to the continuance of their business as they possibly could. Yet, when you read the whole of that evidence, taken from the different Provinces, you will find the mass of it tending in the direction of increased restriction, stronger regulations and a shortening of the time. I may say that the department has gone not only on the result of the commission, but it has also gone upon information which had come to it year after year. The opinion of the officers of the department is in the same direction and is stronger in favor of a close season or of suspending fishing for a number of years than is the report of the commission, or even the evidence which was gathered by the commission, and it was upon both of these that the regulations were ultimately founded. My hon. friend believes in fall fishing. Of all the mass of evidence which is in the department, while there are certain witnesses who believe that fall fishing should be allowed, the great mass of evidence is against fall fishing. The packers themselves, some of the most responsible of them, have not only written me but have stated to me that in their opinion fall fishing would be injurious. Fall fishing was once allowed under the regulations in this country, and it was found to work destructively. From the time the lobsters shed their shells until six or eight weeks afterwards, the period is indefinite, it may be a longer or shorter time, they are not in a fit condition, so far as their flesh is concerned, for canning or eating purposes. They are then in their most hungry condition. They catch readily at bait and they can be caught with much more ease, and, therefore, more indiscriminately and in larger numbers than later in the season. I say the weight of evidence in the department to-day is decidedly against the granting of fall fishing. The hon. gentleman has said that we have shortened up the season on the south part of Nova Scotia. It is true we have shortened it on one end, but we have widened it on the other end, and whereas previously no lobsters could be taken before 1st April, now lobsters can be taken from 1st January until 1st July. The hon. gentleman may say that does not amount to much. I say it amounts to a great deal, more to certain localities than to others. If you take Digby, Yarmouth, Shelburne and Halifax you find that the live lobster trade is continually increasing, and is becoming the most profitable branch of the trade. It is the least destructive to our fishing. The lobsters are taken chiefly, I believe, for the United States market, and the United States will not allow any lobsters of less than 10½ inches to be imported into their country, so that none but fully-grown mature lobsters are taken, whilst the canneries sweep in everything, and the result is that the canneries are the most destructive to the lobsters themselves. Well, I say we have given on the south coast of Nova Scotia the privilege of taking lobsters for shipment or for canning from 1st January until 1st July. My hon. friend says there

are localities where this cannot be availed of. That may be true. Localities differ; it is impossible to make a separate regulation for every locality in which differences can be pleaded. We must have as far as possible broad lines of distinction and as far as possible uniformity of the law. Multiplied difficulties arise in the carrying out of the regulations and in the enforcement of the law, if those differences are allowed for every locality which can plead its local circumstances. The interest of the fisherman has been pleaded, and it is for the interests of the fisherman that the department is chiefly acting. Unless the supply is kept up the fishermen's interest is not conserved. He may for the time reap his reward, but if he reaps it only by the depletion and ultimate destruction of the fisheries he is taking action that will very seriously injure the industry, which ought to be kept a perennial and constant industry in our country. I do not say that the regulations are cast iron; they are not. Unfortunately the fishing regulations never have been cast iron in this country, and the result in regard to the regulations and the enforcement of the regulations of our fisheries has been that they have not had the force of statutory laws, and by the pressure of circumstances and the pressure of opinion and sentiment they have been changed from time to time until the idea of fixity has almost departed from our fishery regulations. These, as I say, are not cast iron rules. The department has not finished its investigation; the department is earnestly at work trying to get at what are the facts of the case from the mass of conflicting evidence we have from all quarters. If it is found that these regulations are not the best, the department can change them, and I am prepared to change them. If it is found they do not cure the difficulties and something more is necessary in respect to a close season, that something more will have to be resorted to. There is this against a short close season: it does not prevent the destruction of fish. Give three months of fishing and the people will fish with greater moderation than if the time is only two months as the period during which the operations are to be carried on. By using increased activity, by using a larger number of traps it is possible to destroy more fish during the two months than if the season were three months, when there would be less activity and eagerness shown by the men in the pursuit of their vocation. I say it is impossible to please every locality, it is impossible to please every body of people. As far as possible the department wishes to do what is best for the fishermen, considering also what is best for the promoters of the industry, and if changes are shown to be necessary in this respect, changes will cheerfully be made, and what is considered best, after mature deliberation and the gathering of evidence, will always be cheerfully done by the department for this or any other part of the public service.

Mr. PERRY. I am very glad the hon. gentleman for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) has brought this subject before Parliament and the Department of Fisheries. I must acknowledge, I am happy to acknowledge, that the Government or the Department of Fisheries have taken a step in the right direction. I think when they endeavor to protect the lobster fishery, and do it properly and impartially, they are doing what the country expects them to do; they are doing what the people of Prince Edward Island, who have a very deep interest in the lobster fisheries, expect them to do, and they give this Government credit for doing it. I hold in my hand the evidence of several parties deeply interested in lobster fishing and packing in Prince Edward Island. I am not going to speak for Nova Scotia fishermen, who are well represented by the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) and other hon. members who represent the coast counties, I merely speak for Prince Edward Island. I have a knowledge of the lobster fisheries from my own personal observation, although

I am not personally interested in those fisheries. I have gone to those fisheries, made enquiries, seen the men catch the fish, seen the boats come in; I know how the traps are made, when lobsters should not be caught and other points, and so I can speak impartially. I find that every one of the twenty odd fishermen who gave evidence before the commission are satisfied with the amount of restriction placed upon those fisheries by the department. The only grumbling is in regard to this: that the close season on the south side of the Island does not meet the requirements of the people. For instance, Mr. Holman, of Summerside, wrote to me and said:

"I have \$20,000 invested in the lobster fisheries on the south side of Prince Edward Island, and under the present regulations I have only about one month's fishing."

It takes one week to put down the traps and another week to take up the traps, and so there is only about a month's fishing. The department should take this into consideration, whether it is fair, just and proper that \$20,000 belonging to a very enterprising man in Prince Edward Island should be thrown overboard in order to carry out the restrictions which have been placed upon the fisheries by the department. It cannot be denied that the lobster fishing is declining fast. I remember well when three or four fish would fill a can, and now it will take from seven to eight. That is an evidence that it must be decreasing. The only way to keep the lobster fishery as it is, or to improve upon it, is to have certain proper restrictions and to carry them out. Let me read to you what Mr. Morrow says, a man who is deeply interested in the lobster industry:

"Mr. Frederick Morrow, of Souris, is owner of two factories, one at Souris, and one at Black Bank, both in King's County. Both factories are running this year, since 26th May, and Black Bank will run till 20th August. Commenced lobster packing in 1880. The two factories employ outside and inside 60 men and 22 women, to whom \$7,000 will be paid this season in wages, or equal to about \$120 per man. Mr. Morrow thinks the present regulations are all right for the north side of Prince Edward Island, but it would be better for the south side of Prince Edward Island, running from Cape Beart to West Point, to commence on 20th April, then shut down on 15th July, and re-open on 15th August, and fish until closed by the weather. May and June are the best fishing months.

That is Mr. Morrow's opinion and no doubt when he expends some \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year in wages alone he must be deeply interested in those fisheries, and we must come to the conclusion that he knows something about the question. Mr. Rogers in giving his evidence says:

"Interested in two lobster factories at Egmont Bay, Prince county, employing 45 men, at an average of \$30 per month per man; and 12 women at 10 per month, thus expending \$5,880 in wages alone, besides the other necessary supplies, bringing it up to \$6,000. His view is that different seasons should be for north and south of Prince Edward Island. On the north lobsters strike in early and on the south strike in later. For the south he would suggest that fishing might commence about 25th May; close down on the 1st July; re-open 1st August; and finally close on 20th September."

Both gentlemen agreed that the lobster strikes the shore on the north side as soon as the ice breaks, but on the south side the lobsters only make their appearance about the last of June, and it would be useless for the fishermen to have their traps out on the 1st of April. I suppose the lobsters are like other fish. They have their natural inclinations, and they are at one end of the coast at a certain time, and upon another end of the coast at another time. Although the lobster does not travel fast he travels sure. Mr. Holman in giving his evidence, says:

"Has been interested in the lobster industry for some years both as owner of factories and as supplier of others. He now owns eleven factories, of which six are on the south of the Island and five are on the north. Employs about 220 men, at an average wages of \$36 per month, and 90 women at \$20 per month; thus expending \$25,560 in labor, besides supplies. Is favorable to different seasons for north and south of Prince Edward Island. For the south it would be better to commence fishing as now on the 20th April; omit the month of July; recommence 1st August and continue fishing for the whole month of September, although it would be inconvenient as to taking up and resetting the traps in the recess in July. On the north he would retain the present season. Is not hostile to closing for a term of years in view that such

Mr. PERRY.

closure would bring the lobsters up to the legal standard, that is to say, would not object provided sites of existing factories are protected during such closure.

This shows that Mr. Holman who has a large experience in fishing, and who has large capital invested in this industry in Prince Edward Island, is satisfied that the lobsters in Prince Edward Island are decreasing, and decreasing fast, because he says he would not have the slightest objection to see the lobster fishery stopped for three years. I am satisfied, as I said before, that the department did right in appointing this commission to investigate this matter, and if they can see their way to have a commission appointed this year to make a full report it would be very desirable. I contend that one year is a very short time for gentlemen to travel along the shores of the Dominion of Canada, where those fisheries are in existence, and to make such an intelligent report as would be of any service. Next year they would be in a better position to do so, and in fact it takes two years of experience to come to any conclusion on this subject. There is no use throwing cold water on this industry. It is one of the largest branches of industry in the Lower Provinces, and you see that thousands of men and women, and even children, are employed in it, making a living. You find a large amount of capital invested in it, and those fishermen contribute more to the revenue of the country than any farmer. I believe that a fisherman expends 100 per cent. more than a farmer does. Therefore, the fisherman has a right to be protected. The men who supply him have a right to be protected, and the fish which enables him to pursue this industry *a fortiori* must be protected. I was sorry to hear my friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) say it would be better to have those fisheries ruined. I say no. I say protect those fisheries, and protect them as they ought to be protected. I am not prepared to condemn the Minister of Marine for the manner in which he has protected those fisheries. I think he has done very well, and I like to give him credit when he deserves it, for, the dear knows, he deserves castigation enough in some other directions. In this direction, however, I am satisfied to give him his due credit. If he can only see his way to make an extension of the time for fishing on the south side of Prince Edward Island to the last July, I think all parties interested in the fisheries would be satisfied, and if he cannot see his way, I hope and trust he will be enabled to say: I have done the best I could. I repeat again that the people of Prince Edward Island—not only the fishermen, but the farmers, who by those fisheries have a channel opened to them for a larger consumption of their products—are deeply interested in those fisheries, and they will give the Minister credit for endeavoring to protect those fisheries as well as he possibly can. I hope he may see his way clear to change the Order in Council, and to extend the time on the south side of Prince Edward Island. As far as the north side is concerned it is all right.

Mr. WELSH. I have listened with pleasure to the speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and I quite agree with him in every point he made. As far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, I think that if the fisheries are carried on a few years more in a similar manner to that in which they have been carried on in the past, that they will be destroyed altogether, and I can speak from personal observation. The Government have before them the report of the commission appointed to examine into this matter last year, and I have full confidence that the Government will consider that report and act upon it. I have my own private opinion, that if the fishery was stopped in Prince Edward Island for three years it would be the best cure, and after that the fishing should be carried on under certain restrictions and rules. I leave that matter altogether in the hands of the Government. I do not agree with my friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) who says that even if the

whole fishery should be destroyed it would be better to keep it on, than to let these people who are now engaged in the industry be idle. On the whole I agree with my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the remarks he made, and I will leave the matter in the hands of the Government, confident that they will use their best judgment and preserve this important industry for the people of the Dominion. I have got another matter, Mr. Speaker, which I wish to bring before the House.

Mr. KIRK. Before the hon. gentleman passes from this question I would like to say one word.

Mr. WELSH. I am just going to finish now. I have been waiting a long while and this matter is pestering my mind.

Mr. KIRK. I do not think it is right to bring up another question before you finish this one.

Mr. WELSH. How long will you take then?

Mr. KIRK. There may be some other gentlemen anxious to speak on this question before another subject is taken up. I am charged with saying that the lobster fishing should be destroyed altogether rather than that the present regulations should be continued. I said nothing of that kind at all. I approved of the regulation of the Minister so far as Prince Edward Island and the north shore of Nova Scotia are concerned. What I stated was that it would be better to allow the lobster fisheries to be destroyed altogether than to keep the fishermen of the Dominion waiting and starving and trying to catch a few fish. It would be better, so that they could turn their attention to something else at which they could make a living, because as the regulations are now they are eking out a miserable existence. I pointed out that the regulations allowed the fishermen of Prince Edward Island to fish from 1879 to this year until the 20th of August, a month later than they should be allowed. Years ago I told the Minister, at least half a dozen times on the floor of this House, that he was allowing the packers in the Gulf to destroy the fisheries by allowing them to fish when the lobsters were in spawn and were casting their shells. The hon. Minister admits that they should not be caught at such a time, and yet he allowed that to be done. That is the reason why Prince Edward Island finds its fisheries in their present condition, and why the Minister finds it necessary to make his regulations so strict as they are. If he had listened to the warnings I gave him, there would have been no necessity for such stringent regulations. I have the testimony of one of the largest packers in the Dominion of Canada on that point. Mr. F. B. Hamblin, who is a packer on the north shore in the Gulf and in Prince Edward Island, says this in a letter written in 1883:

"Having been in the lobster packing business in this Province for over thirty years, I am prepared to show that the present law is doing more to destroy the lobster than would be done by all the factories combined, were there no law to regulate the season for catching. It is my opinion that one factory will destroy more fish in one month than the fish are spawning, than ten could possibly do in the other three months which constitute the season. Add to this the fact that during this month the fish are so poor that not a penny is made by the packer.

"In conclusion let me say that the present law, in my opinion, is not only destroying the fish as nothing else could, but also driving capital out of the business, as under the present law few packers would be found in the business if they could realise 50 per cent. on the cost of plant."

That is what I have been telling the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for years. Although packers were permitted to pack up to the 20th of August in some years—I do not know whether it is the case in every year—owing to pressure from the packers, the Minister extended the time and allowed them to fish later, and that is what has destroyed the lobster fisheries in the Gulf and around Prince Edward Island. The same thing, however, does not apply to the fisheries of the south shore of Nova Scotia, as I have pointed out. I have given ample evidence, from the re-

port of the commissioners, to prove that the fisheries on the southern shore are as good to-day as when they began to pack lobsters. The hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island who spoke, says it takes eight or nine lobsters to fill a pound can in Prince Edward Island. That is not the case on the southern coast of Nova Scotia, where the evidence is that it takes from two to five and a-half. The reason of that is that the fishermen were only allowed to take fish down to the first of August; and some of them closed their factories before that date, because they found that the lobsters taken during the latter end of July were not equal in quality to those taken earlier. Now, Sir, I maintain that if the fishermen were allowed to fish until the middle of July, and then again for a couple of months from the middle of September, and if no lobsters were allowed to be caught or canned of a smaller size than nine inches, it would be practically impossible to destroy the lobster industry. The hon. Minister says that the lobsters taken in the fall of the year are not fit to be taken or to be canned. The testimony we have in the report does not go to sustain that contention. No evidence was sought by the commission on that point, and only one packer, so far as I have seen, gave evidence on that subject, and he points out that the lobsters taken in the latter part of September or in the fall are quite as good as those taken at any other time. This gentleman, who has had very large experience, extending over many years, from Halifax to Cape Breton, states that during the year they canned in the fall as well as in the spring, which they did previous to 1879, no more lobsters were required in the fall to fill a can than in the spring. On that point, Mr. Haddow, of New Brunswick, gave testimony, which seems to have been volunteered. The commissioners do not seem to have required any testimony on that point. They seem to have made up their minds before they began their enquiry that there should be no fishing in the fall of the year. Mr. Haddow volunteered his testimony as follows:—

"Needs a month's recess, say 20th July to 20th August; finds the fish fuller and larger in September, heavier and easier to pack."

This is the only evidence on that point, and yet the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gives it as his opinion that the lobsters are not as full in the fall as in the spring. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that the rule is not a cast iron one, and that his only desire is to make such regulations as will suit the fishermen, with due consideration for the preservation of the fish. There was, however, no necessity for him to assure us of that. If I had thought he had any other desire than to do what is right, I would not have spoken on the subject. After the testimony I have read to-day, the hon. gentleman cannot but be satisfied that, basing his judgment upon the evidence submitted by the commission, so far as the south part of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton is concerned, the fisheries have not been exhausted, and there is no necessity for restricting further the time for catching lobsters. Now, that he knows the facts, I hope he will extend the time and allow the fishermen to have six weeks or two months, if possible, in the fall of the year. I am well aware of the fact that the lobster packers do not desire to open up in the fall of the year. Not because they believe that would destroy the fishing industry, but because after they have shut down their establishments in the spring, and their hands have all separated and gone home, it is not easy for them to open up again in the fall, and they would rather have all their fishing done at one time. For that reason, we have the influence of the packers solid against fall fishing, but I say, if you go in the southern coast of Nova Scotia, you will find the fishermen all along the shore from Halifax to Cape North, favorable to fall fishing. I am well aware that to allow lobsters to be caught from the 1st January instead of the first April would be an advantage to the fishermen on the western coast of Nova Scotia, those who catch the lob-

sters for exportation, but it is no advantage to the packers, because they cannot put their traps out earlier in the season than April. Although the law does allow the fishermen to put their traps out in the eastern part of Nova Scotia and in Cape Breton as early as the 1st of April, I would venture to say that this year not one trap has been put out the 1st of April. When they can put their traps out, it takes a week or a fortnight to get them ready; so that if they can commence to put them out the 1st of May, it is the middle of May before they can commence to fish, and they are reduced to six weeks fishing, which is too short a time for the fishermen to earn a living for their families. I sincerely hope the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will withdraw this Order in Council, so far as the southern part of Nova Scotia is concerned, and give six or eight weeks fishing in the fall.

NORTHERN LIGHT—CAPT. FINLAYSON'S SALARY.

Mr. WELSH. My opinion is the same now as before the hon. gentleman spoke, and the Government have before them the commissioners' report on the lobster fisheries, and if the facts are as the hon. gentleman has stated, the Government are informed of them. I will leave the matter in the hands of the Government to use their discretion in deciding what is best to be done. This matter has been pestering in my mind for some time, and I did intend to take up some time of the House in explaining it. But as we are so close to the end of the Session, I will abbreviate as much as possible my remarks if hon. gentlemen will give me their attention for a few minutes. I am much milder now than I was at the commencement of the Session, and have good reasons for it. I was determined to pitch in a little plainly to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but as a few days ago he said if I would wait a little while the Government would make me a present of the *Northern Light*, that has been an inducement for me to keep quiet. I accept the promise he then made, no doubt with the consent of the Government, and I hope it will not be like the Indian gift, and that he will not take it back again. The fact of the matter is this: The Government of the day, in 1876 or 1877, appointed Captain Finlayson to the command of the *Northern Light*.

Mr. LOVITT. I rise to a point of Order. We are discussing the lobster fishery and not the *Northern Light*.

Mr. WELSH. I am not aware that there is any resolution before the House in connection with the lobster fisheries. If there is, I will resume my seat. I hope my hon. friend will not interrupt me so long as I am in order. In 1877, Captain Finlayson was appointed to the command of the *Northern Light* at a salary of \$900. He is a sober, industrious, competent man, has a first class certificate, and a man with whom his greatest enemies cannot find fault.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Does he vote Grit?

Mr. WELSH. I do not know. I never heard him express an opinion on political matters, and do not know if he ever voted. He was continued in 1877-78-79 and 80, at \$900, and in 1881 he got his Irish promotion. His salary was then reduced to \$600. This man has to go to sea in December, January, February, March and April, when navigation on the river St. Lawrence is most dangerous and difficult. He has to weather snow storms, gales of wind, and obstructions on account of ice, and then, in May, he is discharged and sent home to support a wife and half a dozen children, or perhaps a dozen children, on \$40 a month. I would not complain of this so much if it was the rule of the service; but I have obtained the papers, and I find there is not another master in the Government service that is so poorly paid. I find that the captain of the *Napoleon* receives \$1,000, the captain of the *Druid*, \$1,000, the captain of the *Newfield*, \$1,400, the captain of the *Lansdowne* \$800, and the only man who

Mr. KIRK.

is treated in this way in the service of the Dominion is the captain of the *Northern Light*, who occupies one of the most important posts in the gift of the Government, who commands one of the most important steamers in the possession of the Government, a steamer which, for her size, has the greatest power of any belonging to the Government, and which requires the greatest care to navigate. This man goes to sea in the winter, and he has more responsibility in that way than any other master in the marine service of the Dominion, and this man is specially selected for that purpose. In the summer, his steamer is under repair, and he is sent home, and a number of men are employed to make the repairs. Who ought to superintend the making of those repairs? The hon. gentleman says it should be the marine agent. It is impossible for the marine agent to superintend those repairs properly unless he can be in two or three places at once. There is not a master in the service of the Dominion, in the surveying service, in the service of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, or anywhere else, who can be compared for his labor to this man. For the whole of the winter they are at home comfortable, and they get their full pay, while this man has to work during that season. I have already read the statement in regard to the wages which the captain received, but I will read something further. This is the first notice that the captain of the *Northern Light* received as to his service being dispensed with:

“DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES,

“OTTAWA, 17th June, 1881.

“SIR,—I have to inform you that Captain Finlayson's services are to be dispensed with, and I telegraphed you yesterday that they would cease on the 18th instant. You will accordingly pay him up to the 18th instant included, and also pay him a gratuity of one month's salary.”

That is the notice which he gets after being four years in the Government service. We heard the Minister of Finance yesterday talking about superannuation, talking about bringing in the clerks in the High Commissioner's office in London, and putting them on the superannuation list, and we know that the clerks in Ottawa are placed on the superannuation list, and I should like to know why captains in the Dominion service should not stand in the same position and receive a superannuation. This is a peculiar kind of allowance to make to a man who has served for seven or eight or ten years, his wages having been cut down from \$900 to \$600, a man who gave up a good appointment to take this position. Then he applied to the department as follows:—

“22nd June, 1881.

“SIR,—I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter on the 17th stating that my services as master of the *Northern Light* would not be required after the 18th instant. I would take it as a very great kindness if you will write me and let me know the reason that I am discharged. Although the Minister is on the Island, he is very sick, so I cannot see him.”

Therefore it was clear that this notice was given by some deputy. The answer to that was:

“SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 22nd ultimo, enquiring as to the reason for your discharge; and in reply I am to inform you that the Acting Minister was of opinion that it was unnecessary to keep you on as master when your services were not required during the summer.”

That is signed by William Smith, Deputy Minister. Then, immediately after, having discharged Captain Finlayson, they asked him to take command of the *Northern Light* again, and stated that if he would do so, they would pay him wages of \$75 a month. That is paying him on another basis again. It seems he accepted that under certain conditions, and, on the 9th November, 1881, this letter was written:

“I am to inform you that Captain Finlayson is to be appointed master of the *Northern Light*, Captain M. P. McElhinney, first mate and clerk, and Mr. Henry W. Mutch, second mate, as already advised. The first and second engineers are already engaged. I have to request you to engage the necessary firemen and such men as are required, and send the vessel to Pictou on the first fine day offering. You can also engage a person to act as cook and steward. On the arrival of the vessel in Pictou, all hands are to be discharged with the exception of the captain, the two mates, and the two engineers, and cook and steward.”

Then, on the 20th September, 1882, the marine agent at Charlottetown writes to the Deputy Minister:

"Sir,—Will you kindly inform me as to the terms of agreement between the Department and Captain Allan Finlayson, as to wages.

"I am, &c.,

"ARTEMAS LORD, Agent."

The Deputy Minister replies on the 27th September:

"SIR,—I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 20th instant, requesting to be informed as to the terms of the agreement between the department and Captain Allan Finlayson as to wages; and in reply, I have to refer you to my telegram of 3rd November last in which you are instructed to enquire of Captain Finlayson if he would accept the command of the *Northern Light*, and that the wages were to be \$75 per month. These wages were to be paid while Captain Finlayson was employed, and he was to receive half pay when not employed."

Then, on the 11th October, the agent of marine writes to the Deputy Minister:

"Captain Finlayson is now being paid \$40 per month as half pay, which means \$80 when employed. Pardon my again referring to this matter, but I wish to be put right as I understand the agreement in May does away with the instructions per telegram of 3rd November, 1881."

Then on the 18th October, 1882, the Deputy Minister writes to the marine agent:

"I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 11th instant, in reference to the wages to be allowed Captain Finlayson, and in reply I am to inform you that Captain Finlayson is to be paid at the rate of \$40 per month when employed, and to receive \$40 when not employed. This arrangement is to date from June last."

So here is another variation in the terms. I want hon. gentlemen to follow me in this so as to see that I am right. Then, on the 12th October, 1885, the Deputy Minister writes:

"With reference to the salary paid by you to Captain Finlayson for last year, I have to request you to inform me why full wages have been paid when the vessel is laid up. I have to refer you to my letter of the 27th September, 1882, stating that Captain Finlayson was to receive \$75 per month, and half pay when not actively employed."

He refers to a letter which was corrected apparently by the subsequent statement that he was to get \$80 a month. I should like to know what is the consistency of that department? On the 16th October, 1885, the agent writes to the Deputy Minister:

"I am in receipt of the department's letter of the 12th instant, calling upon me to report why full wages have been paid Captain Finlayson when the vessel is laid up. I beg to state as follows: Spring 1884, when steamer went to Pictou for repairs, I received the following telegram:—

"OTTAWA, 3rd May, 1884.

"A. LORD,

"Agent Marine and Fisheries.

"Send steamer Pictou, discharge crew except captain, engineer and oiler. Let Coker know when ready for inspection. Do not place on slip until authorised.

"WILLIAM SMITH."

"The ship did not return to Charlottetown until 11th October, 1884, when the captain was fully employed getting ready for winter work. After winter's service was over, ship went to Pictou, put on slip, and returned to Charlottetown 19th May, 1885. As there was considerable work and repairs to do to the ship above water, I requested Captain Finlayson to stay by the ship and see the work done properly, as, with the increased work of my agency, both inside and outside the office, I had not time to give to the ship. Captain Finlayson has been about the ship the whole of the past summer, averaging from three to four days in each week, and I was of the opinion he was justly entitled to full pay. I may be wrong, but the workmen required some one of standing to see that they did their work properly, and did not slight fastenings, &c., or idle away their time, and I consider Captain Finlayson has earned the extra pay he received."

This is from the agent of marine, a gentleman who has been a large shipbuilder, and who is a very competent man. The only fault he has in my eye is that he is such an out-and-out Conservative, but he is a proper man for the position, he holds, being a thoroughly competent man. This extract, which I did not see before, agrees with my view, and shows what a difference there was when the captain was not there to look after them, but a *posse comitatus* was put on the boat to spend the Government money without anyone to look after them. Is there an hon. gentleman on

the floor of this House, who will sanction and approve of such conduct? I say no, with all due deference to my hon. friend I am confident that the Minister of Marine and the Government will for the credit of the country, for the credit of the service, put a sum in the Estimates to pay this man, and put him on the same standing as the other masters in the Dominion service. I am an old sailor myself, and I should like to see a superannuation fund provided for these men, some of them, probably, twenty or thirty years in the Government service, having large families, and when they go to their graves, they leave them nothing. What man on \$600 a year can support a wife and a dozen children, and bring them up and educate them? I am astonished at my hon. friend—but I know he has had no experience in that line. Well, now, about the agent. Sir, I am very happy to bear testimony to that gentleman's ability, and there is another gentleman here whose name I see mentioned in these papers, to whose ability I have pleasure in bearing testimony, that is Captain McElhinney. I am not intimately acquainted with him, but I know him by sight. I have seen him about the *Northern Light*, and I know of the services that he performed for the Marine Department at Cape Traverse in the ice boat, changing the bad system that existed there until the Government sent him down to introduce a new system. I understand this gentleman has been sent to Great Britain and Europe to see about the *Northern Light* service; perhaps I may be here when the vote for that service comes on, and I may say a few words upon it. I think the Government could not have found a more competent man in the whole Dominion to send out on this service. The acknowledgment I got was a letter dated at Ottawa on the 2nd July, 1886:

"I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 19th ultimo, requesting instructions as to amount of wages to be paid Captain Finlayson, commander of the *Northern Light* during the summer months; and in reply I have to inform you that Captain Finlayson is only to receive half pay when the steamer is not actively employed."

Then there was a petition sent up to the Government by some of the leading men, and some of them no great shakos, perhaps, like myself. The captain wrote a letter to the Government requesting that he might be put on a proper footing, and here is the petition appended to it:

"We the undersigned would respectfully recommend the application of Captain Finlayson to your favorable consideration, and would urge that this request for higher wages be granted. (Signed) Peake Bros. & Co., Longworth & Co., William Welsh, Simon W. Orabbe, John Hughes, Almon Lang, R. Blake, L. C. Owen, G. W. Wakeford, Neil McLeod, M. Blake, Wm. Campbell, W. W. Sullivan, T. N. Haviland, Donald Ferguson."

That went on, and there has been no decision since. Well, I came up here last year and spoke to the Minister of Marine about the matter, and there must have been a very serious misunderstanding between us, for if I am not mistaken he told me that he was very pressed for business but he would consider the matter, but he said he thought I had put it in a very fair light, and that as soon as the House adjourned he would give the matter consideration and see the evil remedied. Very well, I went down and met the captain, and told him the result. I told him that it would be all right, that the Minister of Marine was an honest man, and a fair man, and would be just in the matter, and that the captain would be put on a proper footing, on the same footing on which he was at first engaged. I never heard anything to the contrary until I came up. The Minister of Marine then said to me: "Welsh, I will tell you what to do, you write a letter to the department so as to call my attention to the fact before you leave." I wrote the following letter, dated the 7th May, 1887:—

"Hon. G. E. FOSTER, Minister of Marine.

"DEAR SIR,—Referring to the petition of Captain Finlayson, of the steamer *Northern Light* for an increase of salary, I beg to call your attention to the fact that he has been about 11 years in the service of the department, that his salary has been \$80 per month, but that at times when the boat was laid up, he has been reduced to half pay, and

is prevented from obtaining any other employment, having to hold himself at the command of the department. That Captain Finlayson's command is a very responsible one in the Gulf during the winter navigation, and when the boat is laid up, that the master should be constantly on board, during repairs and looking after the ship. It is generally supposed that the master of a ship should have more wages than any other officer, but in this instance the engineer has a larger salary than the captain. Of the pay of the engineer I do not complain. Captain Finlayson is the only master (I believe) in the employ of the department who has been treated in this manner, having his salary subject to reduction while the boat is laid up. I would earnestly request your early consideration of the matter, in justice to the department and Captain Finlayson."

Now, I do not know that it is necessary for me to occupy the time of the House any further about this matter. Some gentleman has sent me a memorandum, I don't know who it is. He says: "This will make you lose your \$150,000 for Prince Edward Island, if you keep us any longer." Now, I have a great mind to keep you for two hours, and I just dare any hon. gentleman—remember this, I just dare any hon. gentleman on the floor of the House to get up and move a resolution to withdraw the grant, and I promise you we will have a vote on it. Now, I am going to leave this matter in the hands of the leader of the Government and of his colleagues. I am satisfied that if they look into the matter they will do justice.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has gone into this matter very thoroughly, and I do not think he will ask me to take up as much time as he has done in replying. But what I lack in speaking of it, I will undertake to do in thinking over it very carefully. I am sorry the hon. gentleman misunderstood me when in the kindness of my heart and owing to his seductive manner, I promised him that I would carefully look into the matter. He misunderstood me. I do not think that he knowingly misrepresented me. I think it may be that I expressed myself a little too kindly with reference to this matter. The salary that Captain Finlayson has is the salary that he was getting when I came to the department. I knew that he had received that salary in the past, and it has been running until now. I had great confidence in my predecessor, and I thought that it should go on as he had arranged it. There is this to say about it: Captain Finlayson undertakes the service about the middle of December and he runs the ship for three, four or five weeks, and then lays up until April, when he runs the vessel three or four weeks more, and he has nothing more to do until the next December. That, I suppose, is the reason why his salary was placed at \$80 per month and \$40 per month when off service. He has been receiving \$960 a year for several years. The hon. gentleman has mentioned the captain of the *Lansdowne* as receiving \$800. That captain goes on service in April and remains there until the last of December, and a very arduous service it is. So Captain Finlayson, from 1882 up to this time, received a good deal more than the captain of the *Lansdowne*. In regard to the captain of the *Northern Light* not having been given in charge of repairs, I rather think that although a man may be a very good captain, he may not be always the best person to superintend the repairs on a vessel; so when the vessel was repaired last year, I authorised Mr. Lord, our agent, to look after the matter, which he did through a foreman who had charge of the work. However, when the hon. gentleman gets away in his *Northern Light* and is sailing about the Island and when the new steel vessel is ready and Captain Finlayson takes command, perhaps he will find his position more pleasant than it is at present. That new vessel will be one that will be used in summer as well as winter. The hon. gentleman has discharged his duty to Captain Finlayson by bringing this matter before the House.

DUTIES ON FLOUR, CORNMEAL, &c.

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to submit to the House a motion, which I have been in the habit of submitting for Mr. WELSH.

some years past, when the opportunity has occurred, and I submit it on this occasion as on former occasions. I am not going to make a speech, but I feel it to be my duty to carry out the pledge made to my constituents to endeavor, as far as in my power lies, to impress on Parliament the necessity of taking the duties off wheat, corn, flour, corn meal, and coal. As long ago as 1882, when I was elected by acclamation, I stated, after my election, that I agreed with the policy of the Administration in its two leading features: its policy in regard to railways and the National Policy proposed at that day, with the exception of those features and some excessive taxation on manufactured goods. I need not discuss the question and go over the arguments I have adduced to the House on former occasions, but I will simply state that I believe it is in the interests of the country, in the interests of the workingmen, the mechanics, and laborers, farmers, merchants, and all classes, that the food of the people and the heating material should be relieved, as far as possible, from any taxation. I move:

That in the opinion of this House it would conduce to the comfort and well-being of the people of Canada, and especially of the working classes, if all import duties were removed from flour, cornmeal, corn for feed or milling purposes, wheat and coal.

Mr. AMYOT. In my opinion we must either have protection or reciprocity, and as this would be half protection I think it is no measure at all, and I will vote against it.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mitchell:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Gauthier,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Perry,
Béchar, Godbout,	Hale,	Platt,
Bernier,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Landerkin,	Rowand,
Campbell,	Lang,	Ste. Marie,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Laurier,	Scrifer,
Choquette,	Lovitt,	Semple,
Cook,	Macdonald (Huron),	Sutherland,
Couture,	Mackenzie,	Trow,
De St. Georges,	McMillan (Huron),	Turcot,
Doyon,	McMullen,	Watson,
Edgar,	Meigs,	Weldon (St. John),
Ellis,	Mitchell,	Wilson (Elgin).—44.
Fiset,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Ferguson (Renfrew),	Montplaisir,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Welland),	O'Brien,
Baker,	Foster,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Bowell,	Gordon,	Porter,
Boyle,	Grandbois,	Prior,
Brown,	Guilbault,	Reid,
Bryson,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Cargill,	Haggart,	Robillard,
Carling,	Hall,	Roome,
Carpenter,	Henderson,	Ross,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Hickey,	Royal,
Chapleau,	Hudspeth,	Shanly,
Ohisholm,	Jamieson,	Small,
Cimon,	Jones (Digby),	Smith (Ontario),
Cochrane,	Labrosse,	Sproule,
Cockburn,	Landry,	Stevenson,
Colby,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Taylor,
Corby,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Temple,
Oostigan,	Macdowall,	Thompson,
Coughlin,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Coulombe,	McDougald (Picou),	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	McGreevy,	Wallace,
Daoust,	McLelan,	Ward,
Davis,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White,
Dawson,	McNeill,	Wilmot,
Denison,	Mara,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Desjardins,	Masson,	Wilson (Lennox),
Dickinson,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wood (Brockville)—89.
Dupont,	Montague,	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TROW. I notice the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) did not vote.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I paired with my colleague, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny).

Mr. KIRK. When my name was called I had forgotten for the moment that I had paired up to six o'clock with the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), who was unavoidably absent. I ask to have my name struck off the list.

Mr. MITCHELL. What I ask is if the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) is counted in the vote?

Mr. DALY. I paired with the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier).

Motion agreed to.

FAREWELL ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY.

A MESSAGE was received from the Senate, with an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, as follows:

To His Excellency The Most Honorable Sir Henry Charles Keith Petty-Fitzmaurice, Marquis of Lansdowne, in the County of Somerset, Earl of Wycombe, of Chipping-Wycombe, in the County of Bucks, Viscount Caln and Calnstone, in the County of Wilts, and Lord Wycombe, Baron of Chipping-Wycombe, in the County of Bucks, in the Peerage of Great Britain; Earl of Kerry and Earl of Shelburne, Viscount Clanmaurice and Fitzmaurice, Baron of Kerry, Lixnaw and Dunkerron, in the Peerage of Ireland; Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George; Governor General of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Senate and of Canada, in Parliament assembled, desire respectfully to assure Your Excellency of the sincere regret of ourselves and of the Canadian people, at the termination of Your Excellency's official connection with Canada, and at the approaching departure of yourself and your distinguished consort.

We also beg to assure Your Excellency that the Canadian people have regarded with high appreciation your presiding care over the affairs of this Dominion, as Her Majesty's representative; and gratefully recognise Your Excellency's active interest in the constitutional and material progress of this country.

We shall remember with gratification that Your Excellency has been happily enabled to fulfil the hope expressed in the earliest of your public addresses, that you might be the first Governor General to cross the entire breadth of the Dominion by the Canadian Pacific Railway; and we shall always refer with pleasure to Your Excellency's eloquent utterances on that occasion, bearing witness to the importance of that great work, as opening up to the influences of civilisation our vast unsettled and fertile Territories; and as creating a new highway, upon British territory, between the eastern and western portions of the British Empire.

Our recognition of the important services which Your Excellency has rendered to this country would be imperfect were we to omit the acknowledgment of the deep and practical interest which Your Excellency has taken in the literature, art and science of the Dominion, its educational institutions and learned societies; and in all the more ennobling elements of civilisation which teach us rightly to develop and use the vast resources with which we have been endowed. The aid and concurrence, in this particular, of Her Excellency the Marchioness of Lansdowne has been marked and beneficial; and Her Excellency's name will long be associated in the minds of our people, with all that is dignified in a public career, all that is gracious in private life.

In assuming at the command of Her Gracious Majesty, the high position of Governor General of Her Majesty's Dominions in British North America, Your Excellency brought with you historic traditions connecting your name with the fortunes of this continent in the past century. And we venture to hope that in Your Excellency, Canada has secured a friend who, enjoying the confidence of the Crown, and participating in the counsels of Imperial statesmen, will aid in guiding our destiny, and guarding our interests.

Our regret at Your Excellency's departure is tempered by the reflection that Your Excellency goes to occupy a more brilliant position, and a wider field for your high administrative abilities than this country affords. And in undertaking at the command of the Empress of India, to represent as Her Viceroy, Her authority over Her Oriental subjects, Your Excellency will be continuing the traditional care of your House for their elevation and advancement.

In bidding farewell to Your Excellency we beg to assure you and Her Excellency the Marchioness of Lansdowne, that you are followed by our warmest wishes for your welfare and that of your family.

And we beg Your Excellency to convey to Her Most Gracious Majesty the assurance of our unaltered devotion, and of our loyal wishes for the stability of the Throne, and the safety and prosperity of the Empire.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that said Message and Address be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

196

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee).

Arisaig, Bayfield and McNair's Cove (Cape George)
Piers, Repairs \$4,500

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will this amount complete the work on the Bayfield pier? I see the hon. Minister of Justice has taken good care of his county, and I have no doubt it is a very desirable expenditure. It would be well to know whether this is going to be completed and what amount is to be expended. I see that \$38,202 have been spent on that pier already. Is this amount now going to complete it, and how is the work being done? Is it being done by contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is an item in the Supplementary Estimates that will complete the work.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is the Bayfield wharf for marine or commercial purposes?

Mr. THOMPSON. There has been a wharf there for some time. It was supported for a while by the Provincial Government and by a company. It has now been transferred to the Dominion Government and this is to replace the part which has been carried away.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will that complete the work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. LOVITT. Will the hon. gentleman tell me if he is going to work immediately to remove those rocks at Yarmouth, so that we may not have the trouble for a revote?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is being done at the Digby pier?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$40,000 were voted for the purpose of erecting a new pier last Session, but the difficulties about selecting a site were such that we saw that unless some repairs were made to the old pier there would be no accommodation and the trade and the public would suffer. Under those circumstances essential repairs were made to the old pier, amounting to about \$7,000, and we believe that that will last sufficiently to serve the trade for three years, perhaps four, while we are building a new pier. We will not begin with a new pier this year and we will likely ask Parliament next Session to revote the amount. In the meantime it will not be expended.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I happened to be at Digby last autumn and there did not appear to me much to show on the old pier for an expenditure of \$7,000. I do not mean to say, however, that the work is not there. At that time the pier was very inconvenient, and I would impress on the hon. gentleman that no time should be lost in arriving at a determination with regard to where the new pier is to be. The sooner you get to work on the new pier the better. If the hon. gentleman could see the old pier as it is I think he would come to the conclusion that a new one should be built immediately.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I know the present pier is not a very desirable one, but in the meantime we had to give some accommodation to the public and to the trade. The proposed pier was to be built either at the point on the same side as the old pier or below the creek or the river, in order to obtain a better landing and a shorter pier to the necessary depth of water.

Harbors and Rivers, Prince Edward Island \$10,000

Mr. PERRY. Will the hon. Minister be kind enough to tell the House what the work is at Cascumpec, for which a vote of \$2,000 is taken?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is not a new work; it has been prosecuted for two or three years. It is to continue the opening of the projected channel 100 feet wide and 14 feet deep at low water, through the inner bar of sandstone about 150 feet long, over which there is now 10 or 11 feet of water. As the work has all to be done under water, it cannot be proceeded with very speedily, but we are making substantial progress, and probably in another year we shall obtain the depth we require.

Mr. PERRY. I see that there is only \$3,000 appropriated for the repairing of breakwaters and piers in Prince Edward Island.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the Supplementary Estimates there is another vote for \$3,000.

Mr. PERRY. That makes only \$6,000, and it is not sufficient. There are 26 wharves and piers on the Island, which cost about \$60,000, and if the Government think they are going to repair them with \$5,000 or \$6,000, they are mistaken. These breakwaters received a large amount of damage last fall. The wharf at the West Point is altogether broken up. I drew the attention of the Government to this last year. Mr. Perley in his report states that the wharf at the West Point is of much benefit and importance, and since the Dominion Government took it over from the Local Government, they have not spent one dollar on it. That wharf cost \$4,000 or \$5,000, and to let it go down piece by piece is an injustice to the people. They have no other way to ship their produce to Chatham or Shediac. I suppose the Government are waiting for the people to put their hands in their pockets to repair it themselves. I would like to ask the hon. Minister how much was collected last year in wharfage dues from the wharves on the Island? Under the Local Government we collected over \$6,000, and I am told that the tolls have been increased under the Dominion Government, so that I suppose the amount must now be greater. Hence the Government are not expending as much on these wharves as the revenue they are receiving. We know that the coast of Prince Edward Island is very much cut into by harbors, and these wharves, if they are kept up, are of great benefit to the people. I thought, when they were taken over by the Dominion, that they would be kept up, but I find that they are not. From year to year a good deal of money is expended on them, but in what way? By giving the work to private parties without tender. The inspector goes down and gives this one a job and that one a job for \$50 or \$60, and the money goes to partisans, I am sorry to say. Not that I object to Conservatives having the handling of the money if value is given for it, but it is not. It is unfair and unjust that these jobs should be given without public tender. I hope the Minister will not allow these works to go down, but will see that they are kept up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know what is the exact number of wharves in Prince Edward Island which we are responsible for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the number named by the hon. member is correct—between twenty-four and twenty-six.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is the income mentioned from these wharves correct?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say, as that is not in my department. These wharves have wharfingers who are paid out of the tolls, so that there is not much revenue coming to the Treasury. Last year the amount voted was \$2,000. This year we have made it three times as much. That shows that we wish to do what is right, and that the intention is to repair these wharves in the best way possible. If more money is required next year, we will ask Parliament for more, and if Parliament gives us the money,

Mr. PERRY.

we will expend it. But this year I think we shall be able to get on with \$6,000.

Mr. PERRY. I will read, if the committee will allow me, a list of the wharves on the Island, with the amounts expended on them:

	Amount Expended.
Kier's Shore Pier	\$ 5,091
South Rustico Pier	657
Campbell's Cove Breakwater.....	100
Annandale Pier	2,474
Lewis Point.....	2,250
North Cardigan	2,732
Georgetown	2,254
Lambert's	486
St. Mary's Bay	1,336
Mink River.....	293
South River	1,021
Pinette	1,814
Belfast.....	4,355
Port Selkirk	2,947
China Point	3,486
Vernon River.....	908
Pownal	3,429
Hickey's	1,255
Nine-Mile Creek	482
Victoria Harbor, Crapaud	4,267
Hurd's Point	2,000
McGee's Pier	2,721
Higgin's Shore	4,226
West Point Pier	4,226
Total	\$ 53,222

Now, besides this we must bear in mind that we have the Tignish breakwater, the Miminegash breakwater, the Malpeque breakwater, which are not included in this list, and these suffered a good deal of damage last fall, to repair which it will cost over \$1,000 each. So that the hon. the Minister will have only \$2,000 in his hands to repair these piers of which I have spoken. That is a very small amount to put them in an efficient state. I trust the Minister, if he cannot bring down provision this year, will have ample provision next year for this purpose.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My hon. friend is rather unreasonable in expecting that these ports are to be treated differently from other ports. He must remember that Prince Edward Island does not support the present Administration, and therefore cannot expect, under the practice of the present Government, to receive much attention at their hands. The Government are always well able to take care of their own constituencies. The hon. member for Cumberland has four railways in his county and a short line thrown in, and now he is having an agricultural farm in his own county, so that after he leaves us, there will be nothing left to be done by his successor. The hon. the Minister of Justice has taken care of his county.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In justice to his county.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There are other counties in Nova Scotia like Guysboro' which have no allowance. The counties of Queen's and Shelburne never got anything until, by an accident, they were represented on the other side, and they are not likely to be represented so again, I am glad to know. I think, however, the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island has a good claim for his demand. \$6,000 is a very small amount to keep these wharves in repair, especially expended as it will be wholly on political considerations rather than as the public requirements demand.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Really my hon. friend forgets the drains on the Government. Had he been here last night, he would have noticed that we have to pay \$8,500 to keep a private park for the citizens of Ottawa; \$13,500 to provide a post office for the village of Cayuga with a population of 800 souls and a net annual postal revenue of \$800; \$100,000 for four post offices of nearly

equal magnitude. Under these circumstances my hon. friend must not be so unreasonable as to expect that the Government are going to give \$3,000 for 100,000 people at the far end of the Dominion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$10,000. Do not minify it; and \$3,000 more in other places.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. \$12,000. As much as was given to Cayuga post office, to be given to Prince Edward Island. That is terribly extravagant! I wonder how the Minister of Finance can allow such expenditure. My hon. friend must understand these things! The Government wants money; bye-elections have to be carried; and the hon. gentleman will see that the money cannot be forthcoming for Prince Edward Island.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is supposing that the twenty-six wharves are out of repair. The only thing out of repair is the representation of the Island.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman let us know the tariff? We know pretty well what the tariff is in Ontario to carry a doubtful county. What does he think the tariff may be in Prince Edward Island?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know what it is in South Oxford.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think South Oxford has a share in any of these estimates, and I am sure it is not likely to have any.

Harbors and Rivers, New Brunswick..... \$8,750

Mr. ELLIS. What do you propose to do on the Tobique River?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose some of this is for the Tobique River. It is to continue the improvement of the navigable channel of the River St. John and also of the River Tobique.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why does the Government confine itself to improvements and the removal of boulders in the River St. John? Is it because the Minister of Inland Revenue represents the upper section of that river where these expenses are to be made? Has he forgotten the Miramichi, which is a very important river, and the place where the magnificent stone is got from? I admit it has had a considerable traffic for the development of the stone quarries, but that rests on the merits of the stone itself.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no reason except this: that I had not seen any boulders there. I have seen only rock and the beautiful stone of which the hon. gentleman speaks, and my attention has not been called to the necessity of removing any boulders. This is the first time I have heard that the River Miramichi requires these improvements.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do not plead that in the future, for I give notice that it wants improvement very much. If not too late, I would ask the hon. gentleman to bring down in the Supplementary Estimates an amount for this purpose.

It being six o'clock, the Committee rose and reported progress, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

STANSTEAD, SHEFFORD AND CHAMBLY RAILWAY.

Mr. FISHER. Unfortunately, when the Senate passed the Bill relating to the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company, there were three words incorporated by mistake into the name of the company with which that company wished to amalgamate, and I, therefore, move that

all rules respecting Private Bills be suspended, and that I may have leave to introduce Bill (No. 139) respecting the Act of the present Session respecting the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times, considered in committee, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Harbors and Rivers, Quebec..... \$89,250

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) I would like to enquire whether the hon. Minister of Public Works has taken into consideration the petition which was sent to his department, by the people of St. Barthelemy and other parishes of the county of Berthier, praying that piers should be built in order to prevent the dangers attending the breaking-up of ice on the St. Lawrence. The county of Berthier is not alone interested in that matter. The counties of Maskinongé and St. Maurice stand in the same position. Every spring great damages are caused there by the breaking-up of ice on the St. Lawrence, and measures calculated to protect those three counties should be adopted. The Government have already done something; they built two piers in the town of Berthier, but the people of the parishes which suffer to the same extent, are exposed to the same dangers, would like to secure the same protection. In the early part of this Session I have called the hon. Minister's attention to this matter, and asked him whether a sum would be placed in the Estimates this year for those works. The hon. Minister advised me to wait till the Estimates would be brought down, adding that I could then judge for myself. I have followed his advice, and I find that neither in the first nor in the Supplementary Estimates is a sum placed for the county of Berthier or for the counties of Maskinongé and St. Maurice. It seems to me that equal justice should be done to all parts of the country; and if the Government can devote \$20,000 to building piers in Sorel, they could certainly devote half that sum or one-third of it to the protection of the people living on the north shore.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is right and wrong. He is right in so far as those works may be required; on the other hand he is wrong, because we cannot attend to everything at a time. Moreover, as regards the places he has just mentioned, I was unable to decide what should be done and how much I might ask my colleagues for those works, without having the necessary informations, not informations like those given in a petition or in the representations just made by a member, but informations given by officers of my department, by engineers, informations which I could take as a basis to submit an estimate to the Council and afterwards to Parliament. We will consider that question during the recess, in order to decide what we can do, and what we must do. As regards Sorel, the object was not merely to afford protection against floods, but it was especially to prevent towns from being entirely destroyed by the ice, besides a number of steamboats and other boats which seek refuge in the Richelieu river. The hon. member may rest assured that I shall not fail to mind that question. I took a note of it.

Mr. MULOCK. There is matter I would like to bring to the attention of the Government. Although it is late in the Session I do so with the confident hope that they will correct an error that they have fallen into, and for the purpose of the present discussion I will assume it was an error.

I do not intend to offer any observations, but simply to point out to the Administration a grievance which I think the Minister of Public Works should correct in the interest of justice. He is aware that last year a number of officials in his employment were dismissed from office, and if I may be allowed to read to him a couple of affidavits that have been placed in my hands setting forth what these declarants allege to be the facts attendant upon their dismissal, I think he will deem it in the interest of justice to enquire into their cases and do what justice requires.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it relevant to the item now before the House?

Mr. MULOCK. It is relevant, I think. I will read the affidavits and the chairman can decide the point. I will read the affidavit of James O'Reilly:

"James O'Reilly, of the City of Montreal, in the Province of Quebec, laborer, do solemnly declare:

"1. I am an Irish Roman Catholic.

"2. I am married and have two children.

"3. I was employed continuously on the Lachine Canal during the summer months of each year for four or five years previous to 1887.

"While so employed the canal superintendent never found any fault with me.

"4. I considered my position as a permanent one, and I returned to work as a matter of course each year at the opening of navigation.

"5. I did not take an active part in the election contest in Montreal Centre between Mr. Curran and Mr. Oloran, but I supported Mr. Oloran and I said that Mr. Curran's conduct with regard to the Home Rule resolutions was unmanly.

"On the 29th of April, 1887, I met Mr. Conway, the canal superintendent, on the street, and he told me the works would open on the following Monday. He then asked me if I had not heard rumors to the effect that certain of the men employed on the canal had voted and worked against Curran in the late election. I said I had heard rumors to that effect. He said: 'Why did you not tell me of it?' I asked him if he had not heard them himself, and he said he had. He then said:

"I have six or seven names of men who worked against Curran in the election that I am instructed from Ottawa to suspend, and your name is among them. You will have to go and see Curran when he comes down here on Monday and get a letter from him."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter is connected with canals and has nothing to do with the present item. The hon. gentleman will have several opportunities before these Estimates are through to explain the errors that he says have been committed, when we come to the Estimates on canals. The matter has nothing to do with this item. I had nothing to do with this matter, it belongs to the Department of my hon. colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the point of order is well taken.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My hon. friend will have an opportunity when the item for railways and canals comes up.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not wish to press the matter against the ruling of the Chairman, but late as the Session is, I do protest, without desiring to enter into controversy, against any rapid judgment against me by the Chairman, or by anybody else in this House. The Chairman simply determines, without hearing from me, that this point is well taken—perhaps he is right, perhaps he is wrong. But I submit that it is unseemly on the part of any official—and for the purposes of this discussion the Chairman is an official of this House—I protest on the ground of his unseemly conduct—

The CHAIRMAN. Order. I ask the hon. gentleman to take his seat.

Mr. MULOCK. For what purpose?

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. MULOCK. I submit—

Mr. LISTER. You can't bulldoze us that way.

Mr. MULOCK. I submit that members of the House have a right to be heard. I am willing to sustain the Chair. I am willing, more than the majority are in this House, to

Mr. MULOCK.

uphold the dignity of the Chair and the dignity of the House. I consider the Chairman is the custodian; but, although my respect for the Chairman is so great, I am not going to abdicate my own rights. I am not going to admit that any man in this House has the right *ex parte* to determine upon the rights of others. I do not propose to criticise the conduct of the Chairman further than to refer to what has happened. Before I had finished my argument, after the Minister of Public Works had come to him privately and spoken to him, as I was addressing the committee, the Chairman interrupted me and delivered judgment without argument, and without hearing my explanation. Is that the course that is expected of him, who is to sit as arbiter between us all? There is a function that every Chairman and every Speaker has to discharge.

The CHAIRMAN. I must ask the hon. gentleman to resume his seat. I asked the hon. gentleman in the beginning of his remarks if the affidavit which he proposed to read was relevant to the item before the committee. Instead of replying to me he commenced to read it. I saw at once it had no reference to harbors or rivers, or to any item that is before the committee, but to canals, the responsible Minister of which department is not present in the House. I thought it highly improper that the hon. gentleman should, upon this occasion, take up the time of the House in reading an affidavit or discussing a matter which had no relation to any item before the committee. Another opportunity will arise, frequent opportunities may arise, either when the House is moved into Committee of Supply, or when we reach the item of canals, for the hon. gentleman to bring this item up, and the Minister of that department will be in his place. It was not with any purpose of restraining the hon. gentleman from bringing up this matter that I sustained the point of order, but it was simply that the time of the committee might not be wasted by irrelevant matter. I must persist in the ruling which I made, and request the hon. gentleman to defer his remarks until the proper occasion arises.

Mr. MULOCK. I know that you have the best motives, and I do not desire to come into collision with you, but permit me to say that these last remarks of yours do not apply to the motion now before the Chair, which is a motion that the committee arise.

The CHAIRMAN. I have heard no such motion.

Mr. MULOCK. The motion was made by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) if I can believe my own senses.

Mr. LISTER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. And therefore it is out of order for any man, even the Chairman, as it has happened now, to interrupt a member when he is addressing the committee. I think the time has arrived when we should understand whether we are in committee or in the House, and what the Rules of the House are. Last night I heard the Speaker of this House say that it was not his duty to prevent unseemly or unparliamentary language in this House; and this very Session that same Speaker, within the knowledge of every hon. gentleman in this House—

The CHAIRMAN. I must call the hon. member again to order. He has no right to reflect upon the conduct of the Speaker.

Mr. BOWELL. The Speaker did not say so either.

Mr. MULOCK. Did not say what?

Mr. BOWELL. What you said.

Mr. MULOCK. The Speaker last night did say that there was no duty imposed upon him to prevent unparliamentary language in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. I must ask the hon. gentleman not to reflect upon the conduct of the Speaker.

Mr. MULOCK. He prevented them using language which he thought was unparliamentary. However, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Public Works, if the committee, if the whole majority in this House, endeavor in their various ways to prevent this question, that I desired simply to submit for the consideration of the committee, and which I said I proposed to submit without observation, from being ventilated, they can of course resort to their majority and to technicalities and prevent it. I am aware that it is unpalatable for hon. gentlemen opposite to have this question brought up, it is unpalatable to the First Minister, because he openly declared that he had no sympathy with the people for whom I am pleading. I do not propose to discuss this question, but simply to give a narrative of the facts. However, since, Mr. Chairman, you have so ruled, I will not press the matter at this stage, but I venture to prophesy that the despatch of business would have been accelerated if the Minister of Public Works had not been so astute as to endeavor to suppress a discussion of this question at this stage. It is probable, it is possible, it is perhaps more than possible, that he will hear more of it before we are through, and perhaps the Session will not be brought to that speedy termination which it would have been if I had been permitted to bring this matter before the attention of the committee in a proper and constitutional way at this proper time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sure there is no desire, although the hon. gentleman may think there is, on the part of any hon. member in this House, certainly not on the part of the Minister of Public Works, to prevent the hon. gentleman making a speech, reading any papers he thinks it his duty to lay before Parliament, to ventilate any subject he thinks of public interest. If any such attempt were made, I would join the hon. gentleman in asserting his rights. The Minister of Public Works simply stated that he gathered from the speech of the hon. gentleman that he was referring to a subject connected with canals, and as that subject was not before the committee, he asked it to stand over until some question relating to canals was up and then the hon. gentleman would have an opportunity to bring this matter forward. No doubt my hon. friend will, instead of delaying the Session, help us to prorogue the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to do so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite sure the hon. gentleman will do so. When the question of canals is brought up, I shall, as leader of the House, see that the hon. gentleman has a full opportunity to bring up this question and read all the papers. In the meantime as this is a question connected with harbors and rivers, and not canals, the hon. gentleman himself will see that it would be more appropriate to bring it up at the regular time and regular place, when some question connected with canals is before the committee.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is quite pertinent to the matter now before this committee, and I will proceed with it.

The CHAIRMAN. I will permit it simply for the sake of saving time. At the same time it is quite irregular and not pertinent to the matter now before the committee.

Mr. MULOCK. I will continue to read the affidavit :

"In the meantime I will put men on temporarily in your place, and if you get a letter from him you can come back to work." I said "I will do nothing of the kind. Rather than go and beg a letter from him I will lose my place." He said "No, no; I consider you one of the best men I have on the canal. Go and get the letter." He then told me I had poisoned my mind with reading "that G—d— Post and the other papers," but added "you must not blame me for this. I had nothing to do with it, as I had my instructions from Ottawa."

"8. I would not, and did not, humble myself by going and begging Curran for a letter, and I have not been employed on the canal since.

"9. Neither Mr. Curran nor anyone else, as far as I am aware, has ever taken any steps to have me reinstated in my position on the canal, nor have I ever been notified to go back there.

"10. I am advised, and believe, that seven men were discharged or suspended at the same time and for the same cause that I was. The names of these are Edward Tobin, one Holden, Michael Egan and one Frawley. The others were not on my part of the works, and I do not know their names.

"11. I was informed by a Government official here that the names of all the canal men who had supported Mr. Cloran in the election were sent to Ottawa by some of Mr. Curran's committee, with a view to their being suspended. And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the 'Act respecting extra-judicial oaths.' Four marginal notes are good—twenty-eight words erased are null.

"Declared before me at the city of Montreal, in the district of Montreal, this 9th day of May, A.D. 1888. } his
JAMES x O'REILLY, mark.

"D. BARRY, Commissioner for Ontario."

Another affidavit is by Edward Tobin, of the city of Montreal, Province of Quebec, laborer. It is as follows :—

"I, Edward Tobin, of the city of Montreal, in the Province of Quebec, laborer, do solemnly declare as follows :—

"1. I am an Irish Roman Catholic.

"2. I am married and have eight children, the oldest of them being nineteen.

"3. On 1st May, 1874, I was first employed on the Lachine canal and I remained in that employment continuously from the opening to the closing of navigation in each year until last year.

"4. During all the time that I was employed on the canal, no fault was ever found with me.

"5. I considered my position as a permanent one, and I returned to work as a matter of course on the first of May in each year, being the day on which the work always commenced on the canal.

"6. Some years the men employed on the canal were notified a few days before the first of May to be in readiness to come back to work; but most years we all came back as a matter of course without waiting for such a notification.

"7. On the 1st of May, 1887, I went back to work as usual. The superintendent, Conway, was not about when I began work, but he shortly afterwards came up to me and said: "Ned, I've got orders from headquarters not to employ you until you see Mr. Curran." I said, "No, I'll not go and see Mr. Curran. Before I'd go and see him and apologise to him for opposing him I'd eat that mud on the street." He said, "Well, I've nothing to do with it; those are my orders."

"8. I did not go and see Curran or anyone else to ask to be reinstated in the position from which I had been unjustly removed merely for exercising my rights as a free man, and I have not since been employed on the canal.

"9. Neither Mr. Curran nor anyone else, as far as I am aware, has ever taken any steps to have me reinstated in my position on the canal, nor have I ever been notified to return.

"10. James O'Reilly, one Holden and one Frawley were also discharged from the canal works at the same time and for the same reason that I was.

"11. I am advised and believe that Michael Egan, also employed on the canal works, was reprimanded by Conway for opposing Curran in the election.

"12. During the winter of 1886-87, I was employed in the Grand Trunk Railway yard, and on the first of May I abandoned that employment in order to attend to my duties on the canal works.

"13. I did not take an active part in the Curran-Cloran election, though I supported Cloran and advised my fellow workmen in the Grand Trunk yard to do so also.

"14. On one occasion I attended a meeting called by some of Mr. Curran's supporters and called out "How about Home Rule?" during one of the speeches, as I believed that Mr. Curran had betrayed his nationality in pursuing the course he did on the Home Rule question. I heard it commonly reported that my so doing was one of the causes of my suspension.

"15. I am and always have been a Liberal, and my political convictions were well known to Mr. Conway, as I have never tried to conceal them.

"16. It was currently reported among the workmen that a list of the canal employes who had supported Mr. Cloran was sent to Ottawa by Mr. Curran's committee, with a view to having them discharged; or at least forcing them to humble themselves and apologise.

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the "Act respecting extra-judicial oaths."

"Declared before me at the City of Montreal in the District of Montreal this 9th day of May, A.D. 1888. } E. TOBIN.

"D. BARRY, Commissioner for Ontario."

I do not propose to make a charge against the Administration at all, or to take up any time, but simply to call the attention of the Administration to this state of the facts. Those men were employed for years upon the canal at Montreal, and

whilst it might be argued technically that they are temporary employes still they had been continued in employment from year to year, entering upon their duties when navigation began, and, of course, having nothing to do when the navigation closed, but coming on as a matter of course each year. That they discharged their duties faithfully to the country; that there was no reason so far as we can discover, unless it be a political one, for their discharge; that they appeared to take some part in the election of 1887 against the Government candidate, Mr. Curran, and were discharged from their positions as Government employes; that the Government agent, Mr. Conway, stated in discharging them, he was not acting upon his own responsibility but upon orders received from Ottawa, evidently meaning from the Administration, and that the Government at Ottawa was put in motion by Mr. Curran's committee. Under those circumstances I ask the Government to investigate this case and to do justice. These affidavits disclose the fact that those men are unable to get justice through the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). Without further comment, and giving the Government the whole of the nine months vacation to do justice, I place this case in their hands, notifying them that next Session if they do not see their way to deal with the case in the way they ought to, and which I believe is to reinstate those men, I shall feel it my duty to comment upon their conduct.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total expenditure on this work on the Du Lièvre River and what has been done with this money?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total cost would be \$82,000.

Mr. WELSH. As you are about to pass a vote for a pier, I wish to say that I am not going to object to that vote, but I happened to be out of the House when the Prince Edward Island piers were under consideration and I want to say something in reference to them. I often wonder how the piers in Prince Edward Island have got into such a bad state of repair, and I wonder more particularly because I understood them to be under the administration of the hon. Minister of Public Works. Last year I had cause to bring the matter to his notice, and I mentioned a couple of piers, which were attended to and put in proper order. If I had not done so they would have been in a state of dilapidation yet, and they would have cost three times the money to repair them now that they did before. I received a letter the other day from a wharfinger about those piers, and he mentions: "There is a great deal of stuff to ship in the spring; and last fall I laid out some \$30 to make it fit for the people to ship them. Mr. William Smith, at Ottawa, was dissatisfied with me for so doing." I was surprised at this, but when I made enquiries I found those piers were under the Department of Marine. When a representation is made that those wharves want repairs, it is sent to the Marine Department and the Marine Department pigeon-hole it. I do not wonder at the wharves being in a bad state of repair when the Minister of Public Works does not get notice of it, until perhaps six months after communication is made to the Marine Department. I suggest that those piers be put in the hands of the Minister of Public Works, for two departments have charge of them now and I find that is very awkward. I notice that there are \$6,000 to be spent among 30 piers or about \$200 each, when some of those piers would require \$1,000 to put them in order. In this way the public service receives an injury, and I hope the Government will consider this matter. I believe it would be better if the Marine Department would receive the revenues, and that the repairs should be done altogether by the Department of Public Works, without leaving it to the Marine Department to make a report to the Department of Public Works. Better still, why not
Mr. MULOCK.

have an official who will go around those wharves and make his report direct to the Public Works Department? It is certain that something ought to be done. The Government may rest assured that the people of Prince Edward Island feel this thing keenly. It is a great surprise that when wharves are built at the public expense the people have to go seven or eight miles out of their way to get at them. In conclusion I state again that I believe the Government should place all those wharves and piers under the direction of the Public Works Department.

Mr. SCRIVER. Before this item is declared carried, I desire to express the disappointment which I feel at seeing no appropriation in the Estimates proper or the Supplementary Estimates towards the construction of a very much needed work in the county which I have the honor to represent; I refer to the proposed improvements at the mouth of La Guerre River and the Teafield in the parishes of St. Anicet and St. Barbe. The hon. Minister of Public Works will remember that an officer from his department made a survey and plans of the proposed work last season; and when a deputation waited on the hon. Minister last winter, they were received not only with great courtesy, but in a manner which, notwithstanding the judicious reticence which I suppose a Minister always maintains under such circumstances, led me to believe that he was favorably impressed in regard to the proposed work, and would probably recommend to his colleagues the placing of a sum in the Estimates for it. In view of all this, I feel very great disappointment at the lack of any such appropriation. I trust, however, that the hon. Minister of Public Works will not forget that his attention has been called to this work. It is one very much needed indeed for the protection of the inhabitants in that quarter. Damage was caused, as he knows, by the overflow of water from Lake St. Francis, a state of things probably not foreseen when the dam at Valleyfield, at the head of the Beauharnois Canal, was constructed. While on my feet, I may be allowed to say a word in reference to another work—one not connected with the Department of Public Works, but with the Railway Department; I refer to the extension of the embankment at the head of the Beauharnois Canal, which was brought to the attention of the hon. Minister during the illness of his colleague the hon. Minister of Railways, and which he very kindly promised to bring to the attention of that gentleman. I also notice with regret that no appropriation has been made for that work; but I do sincerely trust that by next year an appropriation will be made for both of the works to which I refer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That matter was not lost sight of, but I could not make the appropriation this year. However, I will remember what the hon. gentleman has just said.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much does the work at Ste. Adelaide de Pabos cost, for which a vote of \$7,500 is taken?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The chief engineer estimates the whole cost to be \$15,000, so that we shall require about \$2,500 more. It is for the construction of a breakwater.

Harbors and Rivers, Ontario..... \$101,650

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is to be done with this vote of \$10,000 for Goderich?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is for the continuation of the works that we have been carrying on. This sum is required to complete the works for which contracts have been let for the improvement of the mouth of the harbor and its approaches. The hon. gentleman knows that from one side of the lake the silt or sand comes and accumulates at the mouth. We have been trying to prevent this by extending one of the piers; but that has not always suc-

ceeded, and we have been obliged nearly every year to dredge the bar that forms at the entrance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this a dredging vote properly?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is for the removal of 70,000 cubic yards of material at the entrance of the channel, making an opening of 125 feet wide through the bank between the new channel of the river and the harbor, and to provide stop-locks, &c., for turning the water of the river into the harbor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose what the hon. gentleman wants to do is to use the freshest water of the Maitland River to scour the harbor.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There used to be some complaint about the difficulty of making the harbor in certain winds. Has this vote any reference to that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The north west pier has been extended. As I say, the river is to be diverted by cutting the bank, so that when a large quantity of water comes down in the spring we think it will scour the channel between the two piers, and thus keep the harbor tolerably well open, so that the dredging in the spring will be a comparatively small work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In connection with this Goderich harbor, there is a sort of outport eight or ten miles distant, called Bayfield, to which I directed the attention of the hon. gentleman several times when I had the honor of representing South Huron. I should like to know whether the Bayfield harbor has been put in such a condition that vessels can use it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will help me to recollect that harbor?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not in any way connected with this item, but the hon. gentleman will remember that after certain expenditure it was blocked up again, and I should like him to inform me later on what has become of the harbor.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Is that the harbour where the Capreol family had a large interest?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I never heard it. It is about 12 miles to the south of Goderich in the county of South Huron. The hon. gentleman voted about \$4,000 to put it in order some three years ago, but owing to some errors in the work it became completely choked up again.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take a note of it, and give the answer probably to-morrow.

Mr. PLATT. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that he has neglected one important harbor in the Bay of Quinté, at the town of Picton. I think the hon. gentleman should explain the reason why the dredge, which he promised in 1881 would be sent there, has not yet arrived. I remember when he told the people of Picton that the dredge was on its way, but it has not yet arrived. The harbor is in such a condition as to require dredging. I trust the hon. gentleman, when in that locality next year, will visit Picton harbor, and see what can be done there. I do not ask that so much in the interest of the town in which I reside, as from the fact that the improvement of harbors for better navigation is in the interest of the general public. Everybody who visited Picton during the late election said that the harbor needed dredging, yet I find nothing in the Estimates for that purpose. Can the hon. gentleman give any information as to the report of the engineers concerning the construction of a harbor of refuge at Wellington, Lake Ontario? The hon. gentleman will remember that he sent an engineer to

the village of Wellington, on the western part of Prince Edward County two years ago, and his report I have not been able to get. I hold a return which was brought down last year, which gives the report of the chief engineer, Mr. Perley, but since then another engineer visited that place and took soundings. The report we have is one concerning the building of a breakwater and not of a harbor of refuge. I do not know if the scheme is feasible, but the hon. gentleman said the harbor would be constructed under certain conditions. This is a project which, if carried out, will be in the interest of all the mariners of the lake. Does the hon. gentleman remember whether the report of the last engineer was favorable or not? The people have been led to believe that something would be done, and now they are beginning to despair, and say these promises are only tricks before elections. A delegation waited on the hon. gentleman some two years ago concerning this matter, and since then the engineer visited that place, and I would like to know what the engineer reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is impossible for me to remember what the engineer has reported two years ago, but I will try and give the hon. gentleman the information to-morrow morning.

Mr. PLATT. I wonder it did not appear in that return.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. What others have said about Wellington and the possibility of having a harbor of refuge there, I am not responsible for. I am only responsible for what I said myself.

Mr. PLATT. I thought there might be some mistake in leaving out of the return the report of the last engineer who visited there, because I find in the return of Wellington harbor a magnificent map of the harbor of Port Rowan. There must have been some mistake made in the department.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to point out to the hon. Minister the very great necessity of the work at McGregor's Creek and Little Bear Creek. I am very glad, indeed, that the Government have thought fit to appropriate that amount of money for it. It will be of very great importance to the people, and ought to be proceeded with at once. I trust the hon. gentleman proposes at an early day to have Little Bear Creek dredged. There are now on the banks of that stream from \$50,000 to \$100,000 worth of logs of square timber, cord wood and ties, which it is impossible to get out until the creek is cleared, and that timber will be spoiled if the work is not done before another year. The reason the creek requires dredging now is that owing to the nature of the soil and to the fact that the dirt was not thrown sufficiently far from the stream, a portion has fallen back into the creek, thereby causing shoals which obstruct navigation. It is of great importance this work should be proceeded with. I trust the hon. gentleman will see that it is proceeded with without delay, and thereby save the large amount of property that is lying there waiting for shipment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is intended to be done at Owen Sound?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The entrance to the harbor requires widening, and there is a piece of swamp that has to be removed and dredged out. The purchase of land and that work will require about \$40,000. The locality will contribute \$20,000. That will be put to the credit of the Minister of Public Works, who, with the money which has been voted, will go on with the work, trusting that Parliament will give us next year the balance of \$7,000 or \$8,000 more which will be required to complete the work. Thus we will have a good harbor and a large harbor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the pier at Portsmouth, in regard to which a vote of \$4,000 is asked for repairs, owned at present by the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. COOK. I see there is a sum of \$2,600 for Midland Harbor unexpended. I should like to ask if that has been expended or not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, it has been expended.

Mr. COOK. Has the harbor been completed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. COOK. What amount is required to complete it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not sure, but I think there is something in the Supplementary Estimates for that.

Mr. COOK. No, there is not. There is something for Penetanguishene.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course sometimes when these matters are discussed I may be mistaken, but the hon. gentleman is right, I find now that it is for Penetanguishene.

Mr. COOK. This matter of the Midland harbor was made a subject of an electioneering dodge in the riding of East Simcoe at the last election, and it was used for all it was worth. There has been a large amount of money expended on the harbor of Midland and deservedly so, but no provision has been made to complete that work. After the protest had been filed and brought to a successful termination, in regard to the sitting candidate, it was stated that now that a new election would take place the probabilities were that the Government would secure a supporter from that riding, and they would put in the Estimates what was required to complete the work. Several deputations have waited on the Government in regard to that matter, and the Government are reported to have given a promise that this work would be completed. When the result of the election trial before the Supreme Court was made known, the reeve of that town is reported to have said: "How unfortunate it is for our harbor, because now we will not get any money for it." I would like to know if the Government do not intend to put any sum in the Estimates for that work on the ground of political motives? I enter my protest against any action of that kind. I do not suppose that will amount to very much with the Government. It may be that the Minister of Public Works should not be accused of making this a political question; but it seems very strange that his friends throughout that section should base the result of the election upon a matter relating to public expenditure at that port. It looks very much as if the department intended to do something of this sort, when they did not put a sum in the Estimates to complete the work. If the work had not been commenced, I would not have said anything about it at present; but, while condemning the course the Government have taken in regard to that harbor, I must congratulate them upon doing something for the town of Penetanguishene by improving its harbor, which is another town in the riding which I have the honor to represent. I see they have placed a sum of \$10,000 in the Supplementary Estimates for that work, which is estimated to cost \$40,000. I understand that the town is to furnish a sum equal to that voted by the Government. Is that so?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, they are to furnish \$10,000.

Mr. COOK. Can the work be completed for \$20,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say positively.

Mr. COOK. Does the Grand Trunk Railway furnish another \$10,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, I think they provide their contribution by furnishing material at a low rate.

Mr. COOK. Does the Minister expect that the work will be completed for \$20,000? The report of the Penetanguishene Herald newspaper says it will cost \$40,000. There was a vote taken on the by-law in that town, and it was carried almost unanimously. I am glad to see the Government are doing this, and no doubt that is through my influence. I hope the Minister, if he has made a mistake in regard to Midland harbor, or has overlooked it, will still do something more there. The work ought to be completed. I should like to know if the inspector who was there, Mr. Herdon, is still employed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, when his work was completed, he was discharged.

Mr. COOK. Before I sit down, I may return the compliment paid to me by my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). Yesterday, he kindly interceded with the Government on behalf of a post office in the town of Orillia, which is in my riding, and he condemned the Government, as I did, for not doing something for that town. I want to point out that the Government have not done anything for the harbor at Parry Sound, which is in the hon. gentleman's constituency, and I call the attention of the Government to that. Parry Sound is a very important place; a large quantity of lumber is shipped from there, and vessels with very heavy draught use that harbor. I would like to read an article which appeared in a Parry Sound newspaper on this subject, which is as follows:—

"Although over \$100,000 has been placed in the Estimates for the coming year by the Dominion Government for the improvement of the harbors of Ontario in addition to the sum of \$165,000 appropriated last year for the same purpose, and although we have repeatedly pointed out to our member, Mr. O'Brien, the unfairness of these divisions and have urged him to see that our harbor obtained its just share of the public expenditure, yet, either he has been unable or unwilling to secure for us the small grant necessary to put the harbor and channels leading into it in a proper state for the convenience of the shipping trade. Owen Sound gets another pull of \$15,000 for its harbor, on which more money has been already expended than on any other port on the Georgian Bay; Collingwood gets another \$10,000, and a further vote of \$4,000. Midland harbor gets \$2,600 to complete; Thornbury has had \$2,500; Hilton \$3,000; Little Current, \$3,500; Seguinadah, \$7,000, and about the only harbor on the bay which has been passed over is Parry Sound. If it had not been for the liberality of the Ontario Government our inside channel would have been practically closed up this summer owing to low water, and if the derricks, beacons, and buoys are allowed to take care of themselves as they have in the past, it will soon be almost impossible for captains of vessels not well acquainted with our channels to navigate its waters. It is a shame and a disgrace that our interests are so persistently ignored at Ottawa."

I do not wish to say anything further. I wished to return the compliment that my hon. friend paid me last night, and I wished to draw his attention to the fact that this constituency has been entirely neglected in this matter.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am happy to be able to tell the hon. gentleman that his solicitude for the Parry Sound harbor is altogether thrown away, because Parry Sound happened to be, I think, about the only really good and natural harbor on the Georgian Bay. It does not require to be dredged; it has these advantages that some day will make it a place of very great importance. The only drawback to Parry Sound harbor is the fact that brother lumbermen of the hon. gentleman have been in the habit of dumping their sawdust into it, and thereby interfering with some portions of it. With regard to the channel the Ontario Government have that in hand, and as long as they are working at it, we cannot expect the Dominion Government to contribute anything.

Mr. COOK. The hon. gentleman's constituents know now that he has not exercised any influence in behalf of their harbor.

Mr. MASSON. I do not like a remark in the newspaper paragraph the hon. gentleman has read, to pass unchal-

lenged. That paragraph, I suppose, must be taken as vouched for by the hon. gentleman who has read it. It states that Owen Sound harbor has received more than any harbor on the Georgian Bay. The statement is not true, but if it were, it would only be right, because it is the best harbor on the Georgian Bay, and does by far the largest trade in Ontario. It ranks, in tonnage, second only to the harbor of Toronto, which surpasses it in inland trade, and Kingston alone surpasses it in foreign trade. But so far from Owen Sound receiving a larger amount than other harbors on Georgian Bay, it has not received one-half what Collingwood has received, and other harbors doing the same competing trade along the Georgian Bay and Lake Huron shore, and some of them have received, comparatively, ten times as much as Owen Sound. The amount received by Owen Sound already, and including the present vote, is \$95,000, while Collingwood has received over \$200,000.

Mr. COOK. I did not complain about the amount of money that was expended in Owen Sound harbor, nor did the article complain of the money that was expended in other places, but it said that they were entitled to have it there as well as anywhere else. I believe the hon. gentleman is correct when he says that some other harbors on the Georgian Bay got ten times as much as Owen Sound, because I remember that, in 1878, the hon. member for North Simcoe, in addressing his constituents at Collingwood, said that I, who was then supporting the Mackenzie Administration, had only got the paltry sum of \$10,000 in the Estimates, and that I should have got \$100,000. "You elect me," he said to them, "and when the Conservatives come into power I will see there is \$100,000 placed in the Estimates for your harbor," and he has carried out his promise. The principle adopted by this Government is to distribute the public money for political purposes, and they promise money for harbors all along the line, wherever it will exercise a political influence in their favor, but in the case of Penetanguishene, where an absolute promise was made before the last election, they could not very well escape from carrying out the promises made.

Mr. WARD. I desire to say a word in reference to a remark by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) in reference to the absence of an item in the Estimates for the Midland harbor. During this Session, as the hon. gentleman knows, I have taken a considerable interest in the promotion of the works at Midland, and a large deputation came down from that town and waited upon the Minister of Public Works. They were courteously received by that hon. gentleman, and informed that a certain amount would be given provided the town of Midland also gave a certain amount for the harbor. That is the system adopted, I believe, in the case of harbor improvements, and if that amount had been provided by the town of Midland, I have no doubt that a large amount would have appeared in the Estimates this Session for that harbor. I know the importance of the work at Midland, and I am sure that when the people there pass a by-law to provide a certain amount for the improvement of the harbor, the Government will also give something, and the work will go on.

Mr. McNEILL. I just wish to correct a misapprehension under which my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) is laboring, when he speaks of the best harbors in Georgian Bay. I only wish him to pay a visit to North Bruce, I will show him two of the best harbors on the Georgian Bay. So far as my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Masson) is concerned, I will just say to him, when he states that Owen Sound is the best harbor on the Georgian Bay, that we do not count Owen Sound as a harbor at all. But if he comes to Bruce we will show him Colpoy's Bay and Tobermory, which are the two best harbors on the Georgian Bay. It is right that hon. members in this House should understand what the facts are.

Dredging—Harbors and Rivers generally..... \$185,250

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. New dredging plant, \$27,250—perhaps the hon. Minister can inform me about what is the cost of a new dredge and the requisite barges for service on the lakes, either Lake Erie or Lake Ontario?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The *St. Lawrence*, hopper dredge, cost \$116,000; *Canada*, \$42,000; *New Dominion*, \$8,000; *Cape Breton*, \$19,000; *George Mackenzie*, \$15,000; *Prince Edward*, \$23,000; *Queen of Canada*, \$15,000; *Nipissing*, \$15,000; *Challenge*, \$31,000; *Ontario*, \$20,000; *Sir John*, \$20,000; *Sir Hector*, \$15,000. These include scows.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose such a dredge as would be suitable for service in harbors of the great lakes could be obtained for about \$15,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. From \$15,000 to \$20,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About what is the prime cost per diem of one of the steam dredges?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My impression is it is from \$60 to \$70 a day; larger dredges would cost more. We have been obliged to hire private dredges at different times, when the Government dredges were employed elsewhere, and the prices have varied from \$75 to \$100 a day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Over and above the cost of fuel and labor the owners would require a respectable amount of profit on the prime cost of the vessel. I shall be glad if the hon. gentleman will bring down a statement covering this point, because I was about to make a suggestion with regard to the upper lakes where there are very many harbors which the Government could hardly be expected to keep open entirely at the public cost, but where, if it was understood that dredges could be obtained from the department for two or three days at a time, the municipalities and the persons interested would be very often quite willing to pay for them. If that were done, or if it were known that that would be done, a large amount of money would be saved to the Government in the long run. It has frequently come to my notice that two or three hours' dredging at the proper time would prevent very formidable obstructions from forming in rivers and harbors, and the reason why so many applications are made and so much money spent is because it is practically impossible to obtain a dredge; but if some arrangement was entered into by the department, and if it was understood that the department at the prime cost of \$20, \$30, \$40 or \$50 a day, would allow on application one of their dredges to be used at those various harbors, the people would be quite willing to pay the cost and would not come to Parliament for a grant. A large amount of money would be saved if the department could keep a general service dredge available for a considerable part of the season.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The department has several times loaned dredges to private individuals and corporations, and also to the Government of Prince Edward Island. That Government asked for the use of a dredge and said they would pay the cost. Having a dredge at our disposal I assented, and we loaned them the dredge at a certain rate, taking care that our own officers remained on board. That has been done several times, but it is not every day we can loan a dredge in that way, because there are works to be prosecuted which require the vessels. For example, I was speaking of the mouth of one of the harbors on Lake Huron. We could not expect the corporation to do the work of dredging because it is really a harbor of refuge, and so the Government have to do the work. Then there are certain shoals formed in the waterways of the country, and, of course, we have to look after the dredging of them. When dredging work is to be done near private wharves, the private parties often ask the Government for the use of the dredge

and pay \$40 or \$50 a day, and we accede to the request and the cost is paid in advance. In this way a considerable expenditure has been saved; but as I have already stated we have such a large territory that it is very seldom we have a spare dredge. The suggestion is a good one, and I will take note of it in case the present system might be improved.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would ask the hon. gentleman to bring down at a subsequent stage a statement of the rates per diem at which the dredge could be obtained on our great lakes. I quite see that if we can have only a moderate number of dredges it will be impossible to have one at the service of the public all the time, but it would be well to have an understanding that when a dredge was available it could be obtained at a certain rate. I do not think it is generally known that the department is willing to allow dredges to be used in that way, because the question has been put to me several times and I have not been able to answer it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will see the difficulty at once. There are private dredge owners who are ready to say it is not fair for the Government to compete with them. We have our dredges there, and if private companies or corporations have dredges there also, we should not come into competition with them. There is a good deal in that:

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, there is a good deal in that, but what I am proposing to do is distinctly in the public interest, because the hon. gentleman knows very well that this is emphatically a case in which a stitch in time would save nine. Numerous cases have occurred in which the Government by loaning their dredges to be used by private parties for two or three days may save them \$5,000 or \$6,000 in removing obstructions a little while after. My remark was simply intended to apply to those harbors in which the Government at various times expended money, and which may be regarded as public works. I do not know at this moment what private dredges there may be on Lake Ontario. My information leads me to think that on Lake Ontario, at any rate, they are very scarce indeed. I hardly think that on our side there are any except those under the control of the Government. There may be some on the other lakes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, there are.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I see an item here of \$27,250 for dredging plant. We were told during the discussion on the Lake St. Peter debt that one of the advantages we were going to derive from that transaction was that we would receive \$600,000 worth of dredging plant. I would like to know, what does the hon. gentleman propose to do with that dredging plant when he receives it from the Harbor Commissioners? It appears to me that the hon. gentleman with that material at his disposal, ought to be able to avoid the necessity of asking this House for any expenditure on dredging plant. To avoid speaking again, and although it may not be in the proper place, I would also ask the hon. gentleman in reference to the item for dredging in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, what place he proposes dredging during the coming season in Nova Scotia?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount asked for new dredging plant is for repairing the *Canada*, one of the dredges, also for repairs and improvements to the *New Dominion*, the *Challenge*, the *Nipissing*, the *British Columbia* and *George Mackenzie*.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am glad to observe that the *Sir Hector* never gets out of order.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think not. He always takes care of himself. The hon. gentleman wants to know what dredging we intend to do in Nova Scotia. That is impossible for me to say. After the reports of the engineers

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

are collected and when the Session is over I will see what amount of money we have, and I will take the most pressing work.

Mr. KIRK. How many dredges are there in the Maritime Provinces?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think there are five.

Mr. ELLIS. I would ask the Minister of Public Works, inasmuch as the harbors are so deep and contain so much water in other places, if he cannot allow the whole expenditure to New Brunswick, and particularly whether he cannot give us a large share of it for the harbor of St. John. I see that the grant for Digby pier is dropped; and I wish to state that the travelling public of St. John are greatly interested in the prosecution of this work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have done some dredging in the harbor of St. John, but the hon. gentleman knows that the harbor, as far as I can recollect, is the property of the city of St. John, and that, therefore, if they are required to dredge their wharves it cannot be at the public expense.

Mr. ELLIS. It is a public harbor.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The harbor proper; yes. The hon. gentleman knows that in the harbor proper we made a large breakwater at Negro Point, and that this work was done without parsimony on the part of the Government. We tried to make it a substantial work and I think it is one. If it is shown to my department that some dredging is required in the harbor of St. John, in the public interest, we will attend to it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that it is in the public interest. It is true the harbor is the property of the corporation, but they only hold it in trust for the benefit of the public, on the same principle that the Harbor Commissioners hold the harbors of Montreal and Quebec for the public benefit. In view of the public works going on in the country, it seems to me that some attention should be paid to the harbor at St. John. The refuse coming from the rivers blocks up the harbor, and it would be in the interest of the public generally that it should be dredged; a large amount of vessels come there from all parts. It seems to me that we have a fair claim to have that harbor attended to and not to allow it to get into the state it is now.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will see that the matter is attended to.

Mr. EISENHAUER. In reply to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) the Minister of Public Works stated that he was not able to say definitely where this dredging would be done. I wish to remind the hon. gentleman that I brought to his notice that it was very necessary to do some dredging in the harbor of Lunenburg before the winter. A very large fleet of vessels, comprising some 60 or 70 sail, are laid up there for the winter, and when a storm comes on those vessels are constantly fouling, and serious damage occurs for want of proper accommodation. I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the urgency of the matter and I trust that something will be done before the winter season.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. Minister will remember that some of the people of my county have been pressing for dredging in the St. Mary's River for a long time; and as he has added \$10,000 to the vote, probably he has made up his mind that it is about time there should be some dredging there. I understand that a petition was presented to him during this Session asking for a grant. I believe my opponents begin to feel—I think they felt all along—that it was useless to send petitions through me, and this year they have sent them through my opponent, the defeated candi-

date. I hope that the pressure from him will be sufficient to obtain a grant this year, as it is very necessary to have some dredging done there. The hon. Minister will remember that a dredge was sent there just while the election of 1882 was going on. It worked for a few days, but it was very shortly found that it was not a suitable dredge, and it was withdrawn; it happened to be too large, and would not work. A great deal of lumber and timber is shipped through that river, and the lumbermen are obliged to ship it in small vessels in consequence of the low water in some places. These men are laboring under a great disadvantage in not being able to use large vessels, and I hope the hon. Minister will not overlook the representations made to him by his friends.

Gen. LAURIE. As allusion has been made to the necessity of dredging in other harbors, I may be allowed to call attention to petitions which have been laid before the Minister for dredging at Barrington harbor and Lockeport. Lockeport, like Lunenburg, has a very large fleet of vessels, and exports an enormous amount of the produce of the industries of our people. The channel through Barrington is also much used by steamers, and it is most desirable that the harbor should be deepened.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. member for Shelburne will now see the way in which the Government aid those who support them.

An hon. MEMBER. The same old song.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes, and there is a good deal of music in it. I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works, although he has disregarded the constant applications and remonstrances of the people of that district, will now, even at this late hour, regard their application through their present member, and make those expenditures in the public interest to which that county was entitled to many years ago. The hon. member will now see, as we have already seen from the votes placed in the Estimates, how highly the Government appreciate the change in public opinion in that constituency.

Mr. LOVITT. I think it is hardly fair for hon. gentlemen to accuse the Government of not dredging harbors in constituencies which are represented by opponents. Although I was opposed to the Government, they kindly granted me a dredge for Yarmouth harbor. I do not think it is well to be too hard on them.

Gen. LAURIE. I am glad to see that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) recognises at last that I did not make any promises of Government aid in order to gain my election, and I am obliged to him for the support he gives me in urging this work for my county.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask how the vote of \$15,000 for dredging in Manitoba is to be expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say just now. It depends on the reports from my engineers and the applications that may be made. When those are before me, I will divide the money at my disposal according to the needs of the localities.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to ask the cost of the tug *Princess* which was purchased at Selkirk and taken up to Lake Manitoba.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think I gave the figure last year.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think so. The tug was almost rebuilt on White Mud River during the last season. It was only taken up last year from Lake Winnipeg to Lake Manitoba.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman had told me he would bring that up, I would have got the infor-

mation. If he will be kind enough to put in writing what he wants I will try and get it.

Mr. WATSON. A vote of \$6,000 was taken last year for the North Saskatchewan River. No revote is taken this year. Has that money been spent?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It must have been expended for the object for which it was voted.

Bridges—Ottawa city, over the River Ottawa, the Slides, the Rideau Canal, and approaches thereto \$8,300

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Under what circumstances does the hon. gentleman ask the general Government to pay for a bridge over the Ottawa River?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is in accordance with the arrangement which was made two or three years ago with the city of Ottawa, and which was laid before the House at the time and sanctioned by the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the arrangement?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The city of Ottawa returned to the Government the property known as the Major's Hill Park. Then there was the income tax put on the officers of the different departments. There was litigation going on in the different courts against a number of the officers with respect to this income tax, and the matter was to be appealed to England. The Government thought, under the circumstances, they should stop this litigation, as of course ultimately the income tax would have fallen on the public Treasury. Besides, the city of Ottawa claimed that, as the Federal Government had large properties here, and as the police of the city and the waterworks were at the charge of the city altogether, and the Government contributed nothing for keeping up the streets or for the other expenses of the corporation, they should pay a contribution. Under these circumstances the Government took under their charge a double bridge over the Rideau Canal, from the lower town to Wellington street and also that portion of Wellington street, opposite the Government grounds, from the bridge to Bank street. Then we had two bridges over the slides near the Ottawa. Those were also put under the charge of the Government, inasmuch as they had to be built and maintained on account of the slides built by the Government. I think that was the reason why these properties came under the control of the Government.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the reasons given by the hon. gentleman will hardly be satisfactory to this House or the country. In the first place Major's Hill belongs to the Government and not to the city of Ottawa.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman might remember that, under his Government, whilst he was a Minister of the Crown, that property was granted to the city on condition that it would be returned to the Government whenever required for the purposes of the Government, therefore the property had passed altogether into the hands of the city, and would not have come back to the Government unless we erected, for example, a castle for the Governor or used the property for public buildings; and we thought that property should come back to us, inasmuch as it was an eyesore, not being kept in proper condition alongside of these buildings.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Just so; the Government of which I was a member thought it right that the city of Ottawa, if they wished to ornament their public places, should do so at the expense of the citizens, and the property was transferred conditionally to the city of Ottawa; the understanding being that in the event of its being required for public purposes at any time by the general Government, possession of it would be resumed by them. It was handed over to the

city with the object of avoiding what the hon. gentleman is calling on us to do, that is, expending a large sum of money on it. What right have the taxpayers of this country to pay for ornamenting these grounds? The hon. gentleman says we are obliged to keep them up. Why, we were not obliged to do so unless we resumed possession of them, and therefore I say the Government taking back this property and imposing a charge for keeping it in order, is an unjustifiable proceeding. The hon. gentleman assigns as another reason that it was because the courts had decided that the civil service should not pay an income tax. We have nothing to do with that either. The civil service have their own positions and salaries, and we have nothing to do with the income tax. What have we to do with the bridges of the city of Ottawa? Is the hon. gentleman going to introduce a policy under which every part of the country may apply to this House for grants to build bridges? In the Supplementary Estimates, there is another amount for a bridge across the Rideau. What have we to do with that? If that principle is to be adopted, every town in the Dominion may justly ask for assistance to span their rivers wherever a bridge is required. The whole tendency here is to centralise the expenditure in Ottawa. We expend enough public money in this city without having to pay for police protection. Besides we have a police force of our own for the protection of the buildings, and I do not see why we should rely on the city for protection at all. We see the Government cutting down other proper expenditure. We see the vote for \$10,000, which has always been given for Dominion exhibitions, withdrawn, when it was found that the exhibition was to be held in the chief city of the Province of Nova Scotia. That was a small business considering the large amounts we are spending daily here and in other places; and we know that if the exhibition were to be held in Ontario and Quebec, there would be no plea of economy to justify the withdrawal of that \$10,000. The people in the Maritime Provinces, who expected to have a permanent exhibition there, will be greatly disappointed; yet while the Government in a fit of economy are going to withdraw this grant, they can ask for a large sum to build bridges over the Ottawa River, and keep the park in order, and are going to ask for a further sum for the street in front of the building. I think the House and the country will be very much dissatisfied when they learn that the Government have assumed these obligations, when they compare them with the actions of their predecessors.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My recollection is that the courts decided against the right of the municipalities to tax the incomes of Dominion officials. I know that I had a suit in reference to that matter, and that the municipality were defeated. Further, I think it is a most outrageous piece of impertinence on the part of the municipality or the citizens of Ottawa to attempt to tax Dominion property, or even to advance any claims that they have such a right. One-half of this city and one-half of the population of this city is due to the fact that it was selected to become the Dominion capital in preference to other competitors. I suppose that there is not less than one and a quarter or one and a half millions of dollars expended in this city every year in consequence of its being the capital, and it is, I think, the most preposterous piece of impertinence for these people to pretend that they have any ground whatever for taxing our property. They owe, not ten times, but a thousand times more to the Dominion for the expenditure made within their bounds than the Dominion Legislature or the Dominion officials can be said to owe to them in any shape or way. I was not aware that these agreements had been entered into, or I should certainly have protested against them, because I think the municipality of Ottawa has been paid a thousand times over for the expenditure which it may have made.

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter was explained to the House at the time, and the House voted the money and it is rather late now to protest against it. It was accepted by both sides of the House at that time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not remember it. Of course, we have been in the habit of seeing these items run through very rapidly at the end of the Session, so that we may not possibly take cognisance of some of them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, I do not blame the hon. gentleman for not having been aware that this was passed, but, at the same time, it was adopted by the House. In regard to the Dominion exhibition, I may say to my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) that we did not think the Government should vote that amount this year. I may say, however, that, if the sum had been granted this year, there was another applicant for the grant besides Halifax. Manitoba and the North-West, which had never had an exhibition aided by the Dominion Government, were applying, whereas there had been an exhibition in Halifax before; so I am afraid that the hon. gentleman may find that he was making a mistake in complaining on this subject.

Mr. COOK. I think grants of that kind should be entirely suspended, and that the Provinces should look after those matters themselves. In Ontario we have an Industrial exhibition in Toronto, which is displacing the Provincial exhibition. I do not see that there is any necessity whatever for a Dominion exhibition. I think the Provinces are quite able to look after those matters themselves, and that the Dominion Government should husband the little resources they have left.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I should like to ask if the principle which has been adopted in regard to Ottawa is to be followed in regard to Quebec. I corroborate the statement of the Minister of Public Works that the arrangement entered into with the city of Ottawa was brought before this House, but I understand that it was on the principle that, because there is a large amount of property belonging to the Government at Ottawa which does not pay any taxation to the city, the city should be recouped for what it loses in that way. If that principle is good in regard to the city of Ottawa, it should be applied to the city of Quebec to a much larger extent. I believe there is a much larger amount of property in Quebec belonging to the Government which does not pay any taxation than there is in Ottawa. At Ottawa, the Government not only keep a public park for the advantage of the citizens, but they also maintain the street in front of the Parliament buildings. In Quebec, every private citizen is compelled to maintain the sidewalks in front of his property. The Dominion Government have an immense amount of property there, and they have never given one cent towards the construction or maintenance of those sidewalks, and they have not recouped the city for the amount it has expended on them. They have properties there which they are obliged to protect against fire, and, as everyone knows, there was a great conflagration last year in the citadel. Our fire brigade was called upon to stop the fire, and the greater portion of our fire appliances was destroyed or damaged in putting down that fire. But, after the fire was over, not a cent was paid to the city of Quebec by the Federal Government. Not only that, but I have heard the Minister of Public Works state that the Government derived a great benefit from the waterworks of the city of Ottawa. I think we are paying rather dearly for that benefit. I see that we are to pay \$16,000 for the use of the water. In Quebec, after a great deal of wrangling with the Government they agreed to pay \$3,000 for the water, which is used by the citadel and the cartridge factory and the laboratory. The number of men in the citadel itself is very large, and we do not

get as much as is paid even in Halifax. I think in Halifax they are getting from the Federal Government between \$6,000 and \$8,000 a year for supplying the citadel with water. In Quebec we cannot get one cent from the Federal Government for the sidewalks which we are obliged to construct outside of the Government property. The city has been threatened with actions for damages on account of the bad state of the sidewalks in front of Government property, and they have built the sidewalks, and have not been able to get any money back from the Government for them. I must say that we have been better treated by the Local Government—I do not mean only the present Local Government, but its predecessors also. The various Local Governments in Quebec have been always willing to build the sidewalks in front of their own buildings, in fact to do the same as is done by private citizens. The Minister of Public Works knows that it is the law in Quebec that private citizens shall make their own sidewalks, and I call attention to this point in the hope that the Government may reverse the decision to which they seem to have arrived, not to pay anything for the fulfilment of the obligation which rests on private citizens to maintain the sidewalks in front of their own property.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was not aware of what the hon. gentleman states in regard to the sidewalks. I do not think it ever came before me.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec Centre). No, most of the Government properties in Quebec are military properties, and for some years I believe they have been taken out of the Public Works Department and put in the charge of the Militia Department, and it is since that was done that this expense has been incurred by the city.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must say that I think the sidewalks should have been constructed by the Government in Quebec as they have been elsewhere. That is a matter which is really for the convenience of the building itself, and I think that should have been done. As to these bridges, which have been referred to in the city of Ottawa, the hon. gentleman must remember that they are required on account of the canal and the slides. We have done the same thing elsewhere. Wherever a river has been dammed for public purposes, and has thus increased in width, the Government have contributed to the extra cost of the bridge, and here, the bridges being required for the public convenience, the Government have thought that it was only fair to maintain them, on account of their being required for the canal and for the slides.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec Centre). Has the Government undertaken to maintain the Suspension Bridge over the falls between Ottawa and Hull?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That bridge never belonged to the city. It was built by the Province of Canada and was never a local bridge.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec Centre). But I understand the bridge is going to be built. On the same principle would the Government be disposed to build a bridge over the St. Lawrence at Quebec?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is a wide question. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will postpone it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems the Government make this expenditure on the principle that the public buildings are under charge of the Dominion police. That principle will apply to every municipality in the country where there are public buildings. Dominion officials in St. John, Halifax and Toronto all escape taxation, and if that is the principle upon which they are going to give Ottawa, so highly favored already with Dominion expenditure, this further privilege, then every other municipality will have

the same right. If the Government think that Dominion officials ought to be taxed and assessed like other citizens, upon their income, the Government should put all other cities on the same footing, and say that Dominion officials should pay the same taxes as other individuals upon their income. I think some years ago there was an enormous drain put down in Wellington street in this city at the expense of the Dominion, but when we ask them to do something for St. John they will not pay a cent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was a sufficient drain for the city, but the Government required a separate drain on account of the new building. We had to make a large basement and make it perfectly dry, on account of the archives that were to be deposited there; therefore the Government required a deeper drain, and had to pay for it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I disagree with the argument advanced by the Minister of Public Works. I would like to know what right we have to extend to the city of Ottawa one kind of treatment and another kind of treatment to other cities and towns throughout the country? The other day we passed an item of over \$8,000 for the purpose of keeping up a park for the city of Ottawa, that the civil servants of the Government who do not pay taxes, may have some place where they may loiter around and take their ease. Now, I say the people have just grounds of complaint against the Government for acting in this manner towards the city of Ottawa, and giving it advantages which it does not give to other cities. Not satisfied with that, the Government must pave the streets for Ottawa. If we feel that we ought to do something for the people of Ottawa, let us put an item in the Estimates and give it to them, and not give it to them in the indirect manner we are doing now. I say it is not a proper thing, it is not a just thing, to tax the rest of the country for the benefit of Ottawa, and I do not see upon what principle the Government can defend it.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not wish to prolong the discussion with reference to the appropriation to improve the park in the city of Ottawa. I think there are members in the House who will have a distinct recollection that an agreement in full and in detail was submitted to the House some years ago after negotiations, if I may so term them, had taken place with the city officials of Ottawa, when it was agreed that the Dominion should assume the management of Major's Hill Park, and they should also take over the street from Dufferin bridge to the extent of the property which belongs to the Dominion, and keep it in repair. It was also decided that some other compensation should be made in reference to the bridges, Dufferin bridge and the bridge crossing the Ottawa at the Chaudière Falls. If my recollection serves me right, the leader of the Opposition at that time, after a full discussion of the subject, approved of the arrangements that had been made. I am not discussing now whether that was proper or not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What year was that?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not remember the year, but I think a consultation of the Debates will show that the statement I am making is correct. My recollection is that the leader of the Opposition at that time, after discussing the matter across the House, approved of the arrangement for this reason: that whether good or bad, from the fact that the Government of the Dominion held so much property that was not taxable, and for the reasons given by the Minister of Public Works, they should contribute a certain sum to the maintenance of these roads, to assist the corporation in lieu of that which the corporation was deprived of, by the exemption from taxation of civil servants.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Why not treat other places in the same way?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not aware there is any other capital of the Dominion in the Dominion. I am not aware that the Dominion has any similar buildings in any part of the country. I know there are properties owned by the Dominion in every city and nearly every town, but I do not think they are at all analogous to the buildings in the city of Ottawa. However, I did not rise with the intention of defending the original agreement or of entering into that question at all; I merely rose to state this fact, that this is the first time any objection has been taken to these appropriations made under the agreement which was submitted to Parliament at the time.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Last year objection was taken to it.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is right. Questions may have been asked, but the principle upon which those appropriations were made was not attacked in the manner it has been attacked to-night. It may be a question in the future whether that agreement shall be continued, and it will be for Parliament to determine the question; but I have simply to repeat, and I am confident my statement is correct, that when the arrangement was made and submitted to Parliament, and it was accepted without opposition, the appropriations made in the Estimates at that time were accepted by both sides of the House.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Admitting for the sake of argument that the hon. gentleman is right regarding the bridges and Wellington street, what reason can the Government assign for assuming the cession of Major's Hill?

Mr. BOWELL. Major's Hill is the property of the Dominion, and did not belong to the city of Ottawa. The Government thought it better, the property being at the capital and belonging to the Dominion, that they should take it and keep it in proper repair, just as they do Jacques Cartier Square.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I want to know the reason why the Government undertook that expenditure? If Ottawa thought there was too much property not paying taxes, the Government clearly had power to dispose of that property, which at one time was thought of by their predecessors. I remember the question was discussed by the Government which preceded the present Administration as to whether they should dispose of that property. Then the principle, so far as paying taxes is concerned, would have been disposed of; but in preference to taking that step, the Government authorised the city to take it under their own care and expend their own money on it under the condition that it was to be taken back at such time as the Government might require it. Then, when the present Government came into power, they cancelled the arrangement, and if they cancelled our arrangement, I suppose when we get into power we cancel theirs, and I hope the day will come when we will be able to cancel that outrageous agreement and put a stop to it. I suppose when a change of Government occurs, whoever may be called upon to deal with this question will not tolerate such an agreement to be continued at the present time, by which that park is handed over for the benefit of the citizens of Ottawa. I notice that a large sum has been spent there on Langevin avenue. I do not object to having a Langevin avenue here or elsewhere, but I do object to the city of Ottawa being improved at the expense of the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. BOWELL. You have Mackenzie avenue down there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a very good name, but there is no such intention in regard to it.

Telegraph Lines..... \$17,500

Mr. JONES (Halifax). As I understand we pay all the expense of maintaining the light at Cape Race, I think in—
Mr. BOWELL.

structions should be given to the operator to report all vessels that pass and signal to them. I understand it is not done at the present time, and I think instructions should be given that it should be done. The report might be sent to the ports for which a vessel is sailing; the expense will be trifling because the message will pass over the Government line.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the line extend as far as Belle Isle?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, it is going in that direction. We have a small sum annually to extend the line until we reach the limits of the Province of Quebec.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far are you at the present time from Belle Isle?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose 280 miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you pay for the maintenance?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. There are two or three operators on the line and they are paid small salaries.

Mr. KIRK. I desire to know from the Government if it is their intention to extend the short line telegraph line to Sherbrooke, and to the harbors on the southern coast of Guysboro' county. The telegraph line follows the shore from Halifax to Sherbrooke, when it is extended up into the county and runs inland for a distance of 50 miles. I should like the Minister to consider the advisability of extending the line from Sherbrooke east along the shore. It is a dangerous coast, and a good deal of shipping passes that point. I think it is very much in the interest of shipping and commerce generally that the line should be continued, from Sherbrooke to Port Hillford, a distance of about 20 miles.

Experimental Farms—buildings, fencing, &c \$70,000

Mr. FISHER. Can the Minister of Agriculture give us an explanation with regard to what has been done on those farms?

Mr. CARLING. Dwelling houses and stables have been erected, and fencing has been constructed on the experimental farm here.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What did the dwelling house cost?

Mr. CARLING. I think the contract price was about \$7,000.

Mr. FISHER. How much for the director's house?

Mr. CARLING. I believe the Minister of Public Works will be able to state. I think the contract price is something between \$9,000 and \$10,000.

Mr. FISHER. What did the other houses cost?

Mr. CARLING. \$3,500 each, I think.

Mr. FISHER. Before this vote passes I think we ought to have a little more definite information about those matters. We were asked last year to vote \$80,000, and we are now asked to vote \$70,000 more for buildings on the experimental farm.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in thinking I refer to the experimental farm here. This is for the buildings on all of the experimental farms.

Mr. FISHER. Do I understand the Minister to say that all the money we voted last year has been spent?

Mr. CARLING. I think not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This \$69,975 we are asking for will cover the whole expense.

Mr. FISHER. Can the Minister of Public Works give us a statement of what amount will be required altogether

for the director's house, for the other houses and the barns, and also for the fencing? I understood from the Minister of Agriculture the fencing is included in the vote.

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The residence of the superintendent will cost \$7,800, which I suppose will include heating; the barns and stabling \$17,200 complete; and the whole of the residences for the staff amounts to \$18,140. The fencing will amount to \$4,000 or \$5,000 at 15 or 16 cents a foot.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Do you propose to commence operations on the farm in Cumberland county at once?

Mr. CARLING. Operations have been commenced on the farm in Nova Scotia. The superintendent, Col. Blair, is now there and is making preparations to commence the spring work.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are you going to put up your buildings at once?

Mr. CARLING. There is a house sufficiently good on the land for the superintendent. Some other buildings will be started this summer.

Mr. FISHER. Is it intended to put up any more buildings on the farm than those already started?

Mr. CARLING. I think not to any extent.

Mr. MARA. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he has yet commenced the buildings in British Columbia or engaged the farm?

Mr. CARLING. It has not yet been engaged, but we expect to commence operations this year, in the way of fencing and preparing the buildings.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I ask how the hon. Minister has come to overlook the Province of New Brunswick altogether?

Mr. CARLING. When the Bill was brought down here, it provided that one station should be selected for the three Maritime Provinces, and the site selected is considered the most central and most favorable.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me, as Nova Scotia gets nearly everything going in the Lower Provinces, and particularly the county of Cumberland, that the hon. Minister might have looked around to see if he could not find some other place for these buildings. If he had asked me—of course they never consult me—I could have pointed out a dozen very desirable and very eligible places in New Brunswick, where I am sure the people would have appreciated this large expenditure of money for such a public improvement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to enquire of the Minister of Agriculture whether it is true that he has purchased a part of the Bell Farm in Manitoba for an experimental farm?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely the Government had land enough of their own without purchasing land which they had already sold to other people. What sum did the hon. gentleman pay?

Mr. CARLING. I think the price paid was \$12 an acre.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, it does appear to me that to pay \$12 an acre for land in Manitoba, where we must have a superabundance of land of our own, is a very extraordinary proceeding, and looks very much like a waste of public funds.

Mr. FISHER. I am very glad to get these figures from the Minister of Agriculture, and to find out that this expenditure has not been greater than it is. I do not wish

to criticise, especially at this late period of the Session, but I think the hon. Minister will have to make a few more arrangements for the proper carrying on of the work which I trust will be initiated there very soon. I would also say that I think it rather fortunate that some of the houses built there have a very small amount of underpinning or cellar, and I fear that the hon. Minister will, in a short time, have to change them.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the committee would allow me to go back to the item regarding dredging, which is passed, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works as to what he intends doing in relation to removing the bar at the entrance of the Miramichi harbor, and whether any intention exists of performing a portion of that work during the coming season?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Probably the hon. gentleman was not here when I stated, with regard to these different votes, that the places where the dredging was to take place could not now be determined, because the list is now being made of the places requiring dredging, and as to what the cost will be in each case. I do not know whether the Miramichi river will require more money than other places, but my attention will now be given to that harbor, since the hon. gentleman has brought it to my notice.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you not think it would have been much more in order, and more satisfactory to gentlemen who put questions, if the hon. gentleman had come prepared to tell us where he intended to make these expenditures? I am afraid that the county of Northumberland, which does not send a member who is at the beck and nod of the Premier, will come out very short.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Serve him right.

Mr. MITCHELL. That may be the way you view it, but I do not think that is the way public affairs ought to be administered. I do not wish to protract this matter, but I would be very glad if the Minister would let me know tomorrow whether he is going to do anything to improve the Miramichi harbor this season?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would also desire to know from the Minister of Agriculture what his reason is for purchasing land in the North-West at \$12 an acre when we presumably have plenty of land of our own?

Mr. CARLING. I explained that a short time ago, when the subject was under discussion. The different sites offered were well considered by Professor Saunders, who, after examining all the different localities, reported to the Government that this was altogether the best site, being on the line of railway, which was a matter of considerable importance. To get Government land, we should have had to go a distance from the railway, which would have been inconvenient.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In the discussion which took place on the Pacific Railway guarantee, the extreme limit of value assigned even by the Government to lands in the North-West was \$3 an acre, and they quoted several times the opinion given on this side of the House years ago that these lands were worth \$3 an acre. Now there should be some very strong reasons assigned by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture for the purchase of land at \$12 per acre, when we know there is such a large amount of land owned there by the Government. How many acres is the farm?

Mr. CARLING. 600 acres.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Was there not in the immediate vicinity land equally good. Was there not another 600 acres on the land?

Mr. CARLING. I think not, and this is convenient to the village of Indian Head. It has a variety of soil, is well watered and is considered cheap for the situation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What did the Bell Farm Company give for it?

Mr. CARLING. I understand they gave \$6 an acre; and to bring it to its present state of cultivation, it cost them as much as we paid them for it. The report of Professor Saunders is that it is a very cheap farm.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). They spent \$6 per acre more to bring it to a high state of cultivation, and then when they could not make it pay, they get the Government to take it off their hands and recoup them for their expenses, notwithstanding the fact that the Government have land of their own in that direction equally as good.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I happen to know that, at this moment, in the immediate vicinity of Winnipeg, there are large quantities of land offered at much lower rates, and I believe that if the Bell Farm or any lands in that vicinity had been put up to auction, they would not have realised one-half or perhaps a quarter the sum the hon. gentleman has given. All over the North-West, it would be extremely difficult to sell land at anything like the rates the hon. gentleman has given, and I take it for granted, because the hon. gentleman has not said there are, that there are no buildings or houses upon these lands.

Mr. CARLING. There are some, but not of any particular value.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a very extraordinary price to have to pay in the North-West for 600 acres.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I happen to know a little about that section of the country, as the farm is within a few miles of where I reside, and I must say the section of land which the Government selected is one of the best sections, to my personal knowledge, in the whole country. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture will remember that last Session, when he first spoke about locating those farms in different sections, I requested him to be very careful in the location of the farm. I told him that notwithstanding I lived at Wolsely, and what little property I have is there, and however anxious I might be to have that farm located at Wolsely, by all means not to locate it there or anywhere except the best place he could find. Last fall Professor Saunders went up the country to locate the farm. Mr. Bedford and Mr. Mackay, both practical and successful farmers, more than commonly successful, examined the land, to my personal knowledge, because I accompanied them through the district from Moosomin to Moose Jaw. They drove from station to station over it, and there was a committee of citizens at each particular station appointed to view certain sections of the land which they considered good sections, and they selected finally the land at the Bell Farm, a mile this side of the station. Two ravines run through it, there is a fine water supply, and there are some three or four buildings, but they may not be of much use. The whole section is broken, and to break it must have cost \$5 an acre. That would be of great advantage to the Government, besides the land is good land, well adapted for the purpose in every respect. I heard people say the company paid \$9 an acre for it to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I know that the section is a most admirable one, and had I owned it myself I would have not taken \$12 for it. I think the choice is a good one; and notwithstanding I would have liked to have the farm in my own town, I think the Government made a wise choice.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is one advantage in paying \$12 an acre, and that is that it fixed the price of land in the North-West. I am not going to find fault with the price. I have property in the North-West for which I paid cash a good many years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would you take \$12 an acre?

Mr. CARLING.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have been offered and refused within six weeks \$10 an acre for it, and every acre I sold, I sold for \$15 an acre.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is it?

Mr. MITCHELL. It is on Portage Creek, about six miles north of Portage la Prairie. I do not find fault with the price paid for the land, but I think that with 100,000 acres which the Government occupy, it is rather a reflection on the land that the Government have to go outside of their possessions to buy land for that farm. I have always heard the Bell Farm spoken of as a favorite spot, from its location, its topographical character, water facilities and other advantages, and I do not think I would cavil very much at the price paid, looking to my own experience.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I do not think that from the eastern boundary of the Territory of Assiniboia to Qu'Appelle Station, you can find land along the railway that is open for entry or that the Government own. It is all taken up and homesteaded. It was considered important also, from a business standpoint, that this land should be near some railway station. Everyone knows that in those circumstances the land is already taken up, so that they could not get land of their own because the land is homesteaded by different parties.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to ask the Minister why they decided to locate the experimental farm at Brandon?

The CHAIRMAN. The vote for the experimental farm was passed some time ago. We returned to another item at the request of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and I have permitted the debate to go on so far, but I think we should observe some rules of order, even in committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my hon. friend might be allowed to put his question.

Mr. WATSON. I simply want to ask why the farm was located at Brandon?

Mr. CARLING. We had a number of sites offered to us in the Province, and, after very careful consideration, this was thought to be the best for the experimental farm in Manitoba, considering that it was near the town of Brandon, that it was well watered, that it had all the appliances required for an experimental farm, and was near the line of railway, which we considered a very important matter, that it was easy of access to the public, and was in all respects suited for an experimental farm. I think the hon. gentleman himself told me that we had selected the best site in the Province, with the exception of one at Portage la Prairie, which is within the constituency he represents. I think the hon. gentleman will admit that this is a good selection.

Mr. WATSON. It is true that this site is alongside one railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, but it is only one railway, while, if the Government had selected the site at Portage la Prairie, they would have given to the travelling public the advantage of two railways, because that is where the Manitoba and North-Western branches from the Canadian Pacific Railway. At Brandon, all the travelling public cannot see the experimental farm, whereas, at Portage la Prairie, everyone would have been able to see it. I know the land which has been selected, and I suppose it is good for the purpose, but I do not consider it is the best farm that could have been selected for that purpose. Of course, if the object in view is to allow the general public to see the farm, it would have been much more central and much more accessible to the general travelling public at Portage la Prairie.

Ocean and River Service..... \$207,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose in a sense this may be considered in connection with the item above. I would wish first to ask the Minister of Finance whether we are to understand that the item which has heretofore been authorised by statute for mail subsidies and steamship subventions is to disappear altogether? I notice that there is no reference to it in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the amount paid to the Allan Line?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government have notified the Allan Steamship Company of the termination of that contract next spring, and that is done with a view to leave the Government perfectly free to be in a position to secure, if possible, a fast line of steam communication between Great Britain and Canada, something more in accordance with the rapid means of mail and passenger transit which exists elsewhere.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, how do you propose to authorise yourselves to pay the Allans anything? The reason I ask is that apparently here the statute has expired. Nothing appears to be authorised by Statute in these Estimates, as the hon. gentleman will see, and in the Supplementary Estimates he has not brought down a farthing for that purpose.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Being authorised by statute, I supposed it can be paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does not say so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I observe that it is not carried out for 1888-89, but if the statute authorises that payment, until the notice is given under the contract on the part of one party or the other, it must be paid.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is put down as a decrease.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is true, but I think that is simply to show that it is not intended to be permanently continued. We do not propose to continue the service after the 1st July, 1889, but I see the point to which attention has been called, and I will make a note of it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I hope the Government will not go to the great expense which I see some parties are advocating with reference to a very fast line of steamers, which must necessarily involve a very heavy outlay for two reasons. One reason is the expense, and the other is that such a line would be useful only for mails and passengers, and would prevent the carriage of freight, which is a very important matter in connection with the railways of the country. If, by a moderate increase in the subsidy, the Government could obtain a six days' service between the old world and this side of the water, that would be a great improvement, but anything involving a twenty-knot service would require an enormous subsidy, because steamers of that capacity can only be run at a very heavy expense and take very little cargo. Those fast steamers which run from New York only take from 600 to 800 tons of cargo, while such vessels as the *Parisian*, which may be called 15 knot boats, carry about 2,500 tons of cargo, which goes over the Government railways. I hope the Government will not lose sight of this when the arrangement is made for a new contract.

Maintenance and Repairs of Government Steamers, \$130,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). With reference to the maintenance of Dominion steamers, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine whether the supplies are obtained by contract or are distributed about promiscuously, so to speak. Last year I commented on the amount which was paid for coal, which was considerably in excess of the price paid by private

individuals. I naturally presumed that the credit of the Government was as good as that of any private individual, and that they should secure their coal on as reasonable terms. Perhaps the Minister might inform me how the supplies are obtained and at what rate?

Mr. FOSTER. All this coal is supplied by contract. Tenders were asked for a supply of coal at different places. We have contracts at Picton, at the Joggins, at Parrsboro', at Cow Bay and at Sydney. Our vessels take coal wherever they need it, even though it may be a little higher per ton than at other places, the slight extra coal being more than made up by the saving in time and expense on board ship.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What do you pay in Halifax?

Mr. FOSTER. We do not take any at Halifax. We get coal at Sydney, but we have a deposit of coal at Halifax.

Rewards for saving life and life-boat service..... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase of \$2,000 in this item, for this reason: We have about 20 stations where there is a life-boat service. Heretofore only a part of them have been organised, and now the rest are being organised. By being organised I mean having some person to take charge of them, with an organised crew composed of volunteers. We do not pay the volunteers for the whole year, as we do not take their whole time. They have so many drills to perform each year, and we pay them for each drill. There is a responsible officer over them to conduct their drill, to whom we pay a certain sum.

Mr. PLATT. The Minister speaks of them as a volunteer crew, although I understand that they enlist under certain terms, and sign enlistment papers and a regular agreement whereby they pledge themselves, under certain penalties, to obey their officer and perform their drill. That can hardly be called a volunteer crew.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend may object to the name. I do not know that I could give any better one. Of course, they only drill a certain number of days each year, and they are paid for the times they drill. It would be impossible, under those conditions, to put them under penalties to be present each time. They are selected by the captain, and they are generally those persons who live near by, and may be called upon at any time of danger, and for their regular drill. It does happen sometimes that a person goes away and someone else has to be taken.

Mr. PLATT. I want to ascertain whether these men who are enlisted or enrolled on the captain's books, are invariably the same men who drill and are paid for drilling. I know that, in many instances, it is not convenient for a volunteer to go out to drill, and the captain takes in another person from the shore who performs the drill and receives the pay. I do not know that there is any great harm in it, but the more closely a crew is kept in practice, the more efficient they will become in the drill. I think every exertion should be put forth that the same men should be drilled each time, in order that we may have efficient crews. Now, I see there was a large appropriation last year for watches and opera glasses, I suppose for gratuitous rewards for saving life. Can the Minister tell us in what way he ascertains that a man merits a reward? Sometimes a large number of men are engaged in a rescue. In what way does he obtain his evidence?

Mr. FOSTER. The evidence, I think, is carefully and fairly taken. For instance, if a foreign vessel takes care of a ship-wrecked crew, if one of our vessels is wrecked or in danger, and the crew taken on board another vessel and are cared for a certain time, these things are reported to the Board of Trade at the nearest port, and the Board of Trade takes the evidence and sends it to the department here.

Mr. PLATT. I refer more particularly to the crews on the inland waters. Wrecks are likely to occur where they have not the advantages you speak of.

Mr. FOSTER. If such a thing occurs on the inland waters, an investigation is made. We have regular forms upon which a report is made. The captain or the officers of the vessels that have been wrecked, and who have been saved, fill up a form and send in their statement with reference to it, stating that they were wrecked, how they were taken care of, and all other such information. We are very careful in the examination of these cases, and I think probably no rewards have been given that were not well earned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my hon. friend cannot be reproached with undue extravagance in the matter of watches, for he seems to have purchased thirty-four watches for distribution for \$364, which is a little over \$10 per watch. Now, I am no friend of extravagance certainly, but I think a watch that is to be presented by the Dominion of Canada to a person for saving life, might be worth a little more than \$10.

Mr. FOSTER. They are sometimes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me rather a shabby sort of recognition.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not only watches that are given; besides, the reward depends upon the merit. I sent away a watch the other day which would have satisfied the desire of my hon. friend, I think, if he had seen it, because the case was a very meritorious one. There are other cases where we wish to mark the sense of the department, and that the danger has not been very great, and in these cases a watch costing \$10 is a very pleasing recognition, and is always very gratefully received.

Mr. PLATT. Ten dollar watches are practically as good in these cases as twenty-five dollar watches; it is better to increase the number of watches rather than to increase the price. On very many occasions a number of people assist at the wrecks, and some of them are overlooked in the matter of rewards, and a great deal of hard feeling consequently arises. That is why I drew the Minister's attention to the fact that where a large number of people are engaged at a rescue their efforts should be recognised. There was a case at Weller's Bay when several men were overlooked, and they will not be as ready to assist in case of danger at another time. I would like to ask the Minister how many boat-houses have been built during the year? Have more been built than the two mentioned in the Public Accounts?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say exactly. I think about six or seven during the course of the year.

Mr. PLATT. How are these buildings erected—are they built by contract?

Mr. FOSTER. They are built by contract in some cases. In other cases we send our own foreman to the place, and he buys the material and superintends the erection of the building. If we consider the tenders are too high, we send our foreman down to do the work. We have done that in several cases, and have saved a considerable sum of money, the work being done at prices lower than the tenders sent in.

Mr. PLATT. I see an item: building boat-house, J. S. McCuaig, \$339. Was he considered the contractor or foreman of the Government in that respect; in what way did Mr. McCuaig assist?

Mr. FOSTER. He superintended the building of the light house, and he gave his whole time to it while it was being built. He bought the material and sent the bills to the department, and after being examined they were paid.

Mr. FOSTER.

He was given a certain percentage upon the cost of the building for superintending its erection.

Mr. PLATT. That is to say the more the building cost the more he would receive?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly; it was a percentage on the amount.

Mr. PLATT. That is not a very great inducement to build cheaply.

Mr. FOSTER. It was built very cheaply and very well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to find fault with any stroke of economy, for they are scarce enough, but I desire to make a suggestion with regard to this matter of watches. The custom in England is to give medals where crews have been engaged in saving life. I should think, unless the hon. gentleman has struck a vein in a matter of watches, and is able to get them extraordinarily good and extraordinarily cheap, in a good many of these cases it would be better to give medals rather than to give watches to the crews. I know that the medals given in England by the Royal Humane Society, and I think by the Life-Boat Society, are very much prized by the seamen. I am aware that those medals have been handed down as heirlooms for a generation or two. I think it would be a better way of rewarding merit, if men succeeded in saving life.

Mr. FOSTER. The men appreciate something that they can use, and would rather have watches than medals. We get watches with as good works for \$10 as for \$25 or \$30, and they are substantial timekeepers, although there is not the amount of finish and case on them, as with expensive watches.

Mr. PLATT. Are the instructions to the captains and crews, as laid down in the hon. gentleman's report, furnished to each member of the crew?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; they have been provided this year for the first time.

Mr. PLATT. I must congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the measures he has put forth, and I think successfully put forth, to increase the efficiency of the life-saving service. It is very gratifying to perceive that the work has been undertaken in a proper spirit and that good results have been obtained.

Mr. BRIEN. Is it the intention of the Minister to organise a crew on Pelee Island, where the life-boat is and has been for some time?

Mr. FOSTER. A boat-house is being built or has been built there.

Investigation into wrecks, &c. \$1,500

Mr. JONES (Halifax). With respect to this item, I desire to ask the Minister of Marine, or the Minister of Justice, whether the Government could not undertake some system whereby investigations into wrecks would be rendered more effective than they are at the present time. Under the present law if a vessel has been cast away, as is sometimes the case, and the underwriters have every reason to believe that there has been foul play and the vessel has been wilfully cast away, they are very unwilling to take legal proceedings against the parties, because, in the event of failure to convict, the offender turns round and enters a suit for defamation of character against the company or individual in whose name the suit is commenced. In all cases of that kind it should be the duty of the Government to make those investigations, because they stand in a very different position from the position of underwriters when they make an arrest. I am aware of several instances where proceedings have been taken. In one or two instances the parties were convicted; in other cases the complainants failed to prove the case,

and they had to compromise a suit for defamation of character. I think such proceedings should be undertaken by the Government, in the interest of commerce, and not initiated by private individuals. If this course were pursued, there would not be so many accidents along the coasts and on the high seas.

Mr. FOSTER. We are guided by the Act which we have on the Statute-books. In certain cases the Government do make investigations. By Order in Council they appoint persons to make the investigation and report to the Government. It is done in all cases where the case is an important one or where there are special charges made in regard to the management of the vessel, and the Government is specially asked to look into the matter. In those cases the Government appoint a commission, hold an investigation and bear the expense.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says where there is an important case of the loss of a vessel an investigation is made. The loss of a schooner might not be considered a very important one, but it is just as important, so far as the underwriters are concerned. The frequency of the losses and the immunity from conviction lead to a repetition of the offence. I think the Government should make the investigation. They say that the duty rests with the underwriters. That is just what I want to point out to the Government, and that is where the difficulty comes in. The Government should step in and bring offenders to justice in that case the same as in other cases, and not to leave the prosecution for the underwriters, when if they failed to succeed in a case, they are threatened with an action at law. I hope the hon. gentleman will consider that. I know it is the law now, but I think it should be remedied.

Montreal and Quebec River and Water Police \$40,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. On this vote I would ask, who is the captain of the water police at Quebec?

Mr. FOSTER. Benjamin Trudel.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is it the intention of the hon. Minister to retain him in the service?

Mr. FOSTER. It is; for the present.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is the hon. gentleman aware that he was convicted of perjury after trial by jury?

Mr. FOSTER. I am aware that there was a trial and a conviction in the first place, in which there was an appeal and the conviction was voided.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The jury found him guilty of perjury and he got off on a technicality, but the moral conviction is there. It was entirely on a legal technicality that he got off, because the evidence was at variance with the indictment. If the indictment had followed the evidence which was adduced in the case, the conviction would have stood, but the court decided on that technical point, and not on the merits of the case. If the conviction had been on the merits of the case, and the jury had come to a wrong decision the matter would be in a different position. But when a man is convicted of perjury, and although he may escape the punishment technically, it seems to me a great outrage that the Government should appoint him to such a position. Then, with regard to another matter, I do not see why the Government of the whole Dominion should be saddled with the expense of the harbor police at Montreal and Quebec. In St. John and Halifax we have got to rely on our own police for the protection of the people, but in Montreal and Quebec we find that this charge is put on the Government. It is true there are special fees which are exacted on shipping for that purpose, but this is a charge to some extent on the revenues of the Dominion, and I do not see on what principle it can be defended, unless the

Government take charge of all such police forces. In the harbor of St. John there are more vessels than in Quebec. There are not such a number of large vessels it is true, but there are many large vessels there, and there is a considerable floating population in the summer, and all through the year, which is different from Quebec. The Dominion allows nothing for the harbor police there, and the expense is borne by the citizens. I do not see upon what principle this charge should be made on the Dominion Government, neither do I see upon what principle a man is appointed head of the Quebec police who stands upon the records as having been convicted by a jury of perjury after a fair impartial trial.

Mr. FOSTER. I acknowledge for the moment it is an anomaly that Montreal and Quebec should be provided with police in this way, but there seems to have been good reasons for it at the time the Act was passed, and we have been working under that Act since Confederation. There is a fee which is paid by the shipping for this purpose, and if my hon. friend will look at the report he will find that, from 1870 to 1887, the average cost to the public, outside of the fees that have been collected, has only been about \$2,000 per year.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It was \$17,000 last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Take the whole expenditure from 1870 to 1887 and deduct what came in from fees, and it will be found that it cost the country only about \$2,000 a year to maintain the force. With reference to the port of Montreal especially, there is some agitation now to have the charge of the harbor taken over by the city police, and that the shipping be released from that fee. Mr. Trudel has been our officer in Quebec for a number of years, and he has always proved himself a good officer. I am not a lawyer nor have I had time to look at the evidence in his case. I simply take it that the court pronounced that Mr. Trudel was not guilty of the charge. With regard to the moral crime I have not looked into that matter.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There is no doubt but that it is on a technical point he got clear. I think the Minister of Justice will support me in the position that so far as the merits of the case were concerned the jury found him guilty. The judges of the court of appeal did not pass upon that but simply upon the question that the evidence varied from the charge in the indictment. We all know that a party is given the benefit of a legal objection, such as this man has availed himself, and got clear through the astuteness of his counsel. The moral position in which he stands before the community is, that a jury—the proper tribunal to investigate those facts—found him guilty of perjury. There are instances in the books where men who had been convicted of a crime, and when there was not the slightest doubt of their guilt, have escaped on a technicality. Any lawyer will know this, and not only a lawyer, but I think the hon. Minister himself will know that this is the fact. The moral guilt remains the same, however. It seems to me that the Government should not appoint him as one of their paid officers to that position, and his appointment seems to me to be on a par with what they did when they allowed a man found guilty of corrupt practices to be appointed to a position on the eve of an election, and when they permitted a convict to be appointed as a returning officer.

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot confirm what the hon. gentleman has said as I have not studied the evidence.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). He was let off on a technical objection.

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand the conviction was against him, but there was no evidence that he used the language with which he was charged, and the conviction was for giving testimony that he was not charged with. He was

charged with one thing as far as I know and convicted of another. It may be, in the evidence there is something morally wrong but I have not studied it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The charge was that he stated a certain fact to the effect that the money was received from one person, and the evidence showed that it was received from another, but the fact remains that the statement he made and which he swore to, was untrue.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not having been charged with having made that statement he had no opportunity to defend it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The whole thing was fully gone into with regard to the evidence on the charge in the indictment, and the whole matter was fully investigated, and my hon. friend knows that it turned entirely upon a technicality.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not know anything of the kind. It is not technical if a man is charged with arson, and the jury convicted him of larceny.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I only judge of the report I saw in the papers.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. Minister of Marine is aware that this item which we are now discussing is an item that was there, previous to what we call the present union of all the Provinces. When Ontario and Quebec were united, they paid these amounts, and I suppose it was fair enough. But ever since Confederation it has been a subject of complaint from the people of the other Provinces, that we should be called upon to pay the expense of maintaining the harbor police of Montreal and Quebec. Now, by an Act recently passed, we have assumed the debts of the Montreal and Quebec Harbor Commissioners, and I think the time has arrived when this item should be taken from the Estimates. I find that last year the total expenditure on this account for Montreal was \$17,413, and for Quebec \$22,935, making \$40,349; the receipts were: at Montreal, \$10,450, and at Quebec, \$12,483, making \$22,934, showing a deficiency of \$17,414. Now, it appears to me unfair, after we have assumed these large obligations for the benefit of Montreal and Quebec, that this country should be burdened with this deficiency. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that there is a prospect of Montreal taking over the police, but I am afraid that he will find that if the citizens of Montreal see that they are likely to incur such an expenditure as these returns show, they will be very unwilling to assume the responsibility. Therefore I think the time is opportune for removing this item from the Estimates, and I give notice that on concurrence I intend moving that it be struck out.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the hon. gentleman quite misunderstands the nature of this charge. The question of taking over the Lake St. Peter debt has nothing whatever to do with the question of harbor police. He complains that it is a hardship that the people of the Dominion should pay for the maintenance of the harbor police in the cities of Quebec and Montreal. He forgets that the source from which that payment is made consists of collections from the shipping for whose benefit the harbor police are maintained. The hon. gentleman has quoted statistics to show that there has been a deficiency last year of \$17,000. He is right this far, that I do not think we should be called on to vote a deficiency year after year. But, as I explained on a former occasion, it depends entirely on the number of ships visiting these harbors whether or not there will be a deficiency. When the department under my administration found that the tonnage dues were not sufficient to meet the expenditure, we brought in a Bill to increase them a little beyond what was actually required, so as to even up the cost with the tax. That continued for three or four years, when we found that we had to bring in another Bill to decrease them, when

Mr. THOMPSON.

the average trade of shipping warranted it, so that we might not collect more than was necessary to maintain the force. That is a fair way to manage it, and I have no doubt that now that the attention of the Minister is called to this large deficiency that he will remedy it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What have we to do with it at all?

Mr. MITCHELL. We have everything to do with it. It is for the benefit of the shipping, and I do not suppose you want the cities of Montreal and Quebec to maintain a police force for that purpose.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We do it in Halifax and St. John.

Mr. MITCHELL. You may do it in those ports of Halifax and St. John, where the tonnage is not at all commensurate with that of these large and important ports. One reason why we have maintained this system is that we found it in practice when we went into Confederation, and it has been fairly successful in accomplishing the object for which it was originally established, that of maintaining order on the vessels. If my hon. friend had been in Quebec on certain occasions during my administration of the department, and had witnessed some of the scenes enacted there, he would have seen how necessary it was to have a police maintained for the protection of the shipping; and what right have the cities of Montreal and Quebec to keep up a force for that purpose? No, it is right that the present system should be continued; but I am sure that the Minister of Marine will next year feel bound to bring in a Bill increasing the tax on shipping sufficiently to cover the deficiency which has been pointed out.

Mr. LOVITT. I object totally to the principle the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) lays down. Why should we not as well ask the Government to provide a police force to guard strangers who come into a city? There is no real difference between doing that and protecting ships that come into a harbor. I think his idea is preposterous. You might as well say that the Government should have a police to protect the floating population in a city. I am surprised to hear him make such a statement.

Mr. MITCHELL. If my hon. friend will recall some of the occurrences that took place at Quebec when the crimps defied the city police, tore men out of their fore-castle beds, and threatened to shoot them if they would not desert.

Mr. LOVITT. I was there.

Mr. MITCHELL. If he was, I would like to know whether he would not, for the sake of this trifling sum, prefer seeing order maintained there to having these scenes of violence and outrage. My hon. friend asks why we should not establish a police to protect strangers coming into a city. It is the property as well as the persons of the ship owners that are protected in this case, and why should the ship owners not pay for that protection. It is done in almost every port and why not here?

Mr. LOVITT. I have seen in the city of St. John the same things that the hon. gentleman relates as happening in Quebec.

Mr. MITCHELL. I doubt if you ever saw crimps going on board vessels, taking possession of them, and making the crew desert under penalty of being shot, and in one case actually shot a sailor for refusing to desert.

Mr. LOVITT. I have seen it dozens of times.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My hon. friend says this tax should be regulated so as to meet the expense, but why should not the citizens of Montreal regulate that tax?

Mr. MITCHELL. They have not the power.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Give them the power. They have the power of appointing policemen.

Mr. MITCHELL. They have no power of raising a tax off shipping.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is their duty not only to protect life but to protect property, and they appoint the policemen to protect property. The hon. gentleman cannot point to any maritime port in the world where the charge is not borne by the port.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will give my hon. friend an illustration to show that it is impossible to carry out his idea. A vessel arrives in the port of Quebec and anchors two-thirds of the way across the river in the vicinity of Lévis. The crew mutiny. The captain hoists a signal, and the police put off and take possession.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Why cannot the city police do that?

Mr. MITCHELL. Because they have not jurisdiction.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Give them jurisdiction.

Mr. MITCHELL. Better make the laws before you find fault with the existing system; do not abolish a system that works well before you change the law and provide for a new one.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If at Black Rock or at Douglstown a mutiny arose, would not the police be sent from Chatham.

Mr. MITCHELL. The case is not parallel, because Lévis and Quebec, which are on opposite sides of the river, are not in the same county, while Chatham and Douglstown are.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec Centre). There is more than that. Frequently the river police go a long distance from the city, not only outside what may be considered the city proper, but as far as Patrick's Hole off the Island of Orleans and Cap Rouge, nine miles above Quebec.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Give the city police power to go there.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec Centre). It cannot be expected that the city police of Quebec will do police duty nine miles away.

Mr. ELLIS. It is absurd that a rich city like Montreal, into which all the wealth of the Dominion flows, should not be compelled to support its own police. If the people of Quebec are not able to protect the ships that come to their port against the citizens of that place, they had better disband their organisation altogether. The hon. gentleman says that the citizens of Quebec—crimps—make trouble on board ships. Well, that occurs in our own port, and our city is compelled three or four times a year to send the police out into the Bay of Fundy. What we are discussing now is the opportunity of getting rid of this charge which the country should not bear; but if the laws do not reach a case like this they can be made to reach it.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend fails to notice this distinction: that the city of St. John and the county of St. John are on both sides of the harbor; but that in the case of Lévis and Quebec there is one county on one side and another on the other, and it is no part of the duty of the citizens of Quebec to guard the river on the Lévis side, nor have the city police jurisdiction. Should trouble occur on board a vessel lying on the Lévis side, the city of Quebec officers cannot go there because they have no jurisdiction.

Mr. LOVITT. We are not finding fault with the river police, but to say they cannot go to Lévis is absurd; they

need not go. The people of Lévis are a French population who give no trouble.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman has not said whether it is the intention of the Government to retain the captain of the water police in the service?

Mr. FOSTER. When the first finding of the jury was given, I commenced an investigation into the matter, but an appeal was immediately taken, and I did nothing until I could see the result of the appeal.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Minister must be aware of the state of police affairs in Montreal, and the revelations that took place there last fall. It is highly important, therefore, that the chief of the staff should be a man whose reputation is not smirched by a charge so serious to his reputation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). A question has been raised as to jurisdiction. On that point I do not pretend to offer an opinion, but, as there may be something in it, and I should be sorry to take any action which might in the meantime prevent protection being given to property there, I will not move this Session, trusting that the Government will drop the item next Session, and, if they do not, I will take action upon it next Session.

Removal of obstructions in navigable rivers, including removal of wreck of *Ottawa* in River St. Lawrence..... \$14,000

Mr. MITCHELL. How is it that the same sum is voted this year as last year? Was that amount expended in the removal last year of the wreck of the *Ottawa*?

Mr. FOSTER. \$10,000 is a revote for that purpose, and the other \$4,000 is the usual amount for the removal of wrecks.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no portion which is a revote.

Mr. FOSTER. I think \$10,000 of this is a revote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the hon. gentleman's estimates are not correctly drawn, because in all other cases, the revote is stated in a separate column, but it is not in this.

Mr. FOSTER. There should be a statement of the revote here. The amount of the contract for the removal of that obstruction was, I think, \$12,000. By this time, probably more than two-thirds of the wreck have been removed, and the contractor hopes to have the whole removed this season. The essence of the contract is that the contractor should not be paid until the whole is removed, but some small advances have been made.

Mr. MITCHELL. Under the contract, does the contractor get the wreck materials, or do the Government get the benefit of that?

Mr. FOSTER. The contractor gets the wreck materials.

Maintenance and repairs to lights, fog whistles, buoys and beacons, and humane establishments. \$329,000

Mr. EISENHauer. I brought to the notice of the Minister of Marine the great necessity there is for an alarm buoy to be placed at the eastern entrance to Lunenburg. A petition was presented to his department three years ago, and during the two Sessions I have been here, I have been endeavoring to press this matter on his attention, but nothing has been done. The largest portion of the fishing fleet there come in and out by the eastern entrance. The channel is very narrow there, and there is a very large sunken reef at the east point, and there are a number of sunken shoals laying off Cross Island. Our fishermen seem

to think that they are so well acquainted with those shoals that they can come in there even in very thick weather. Some vessels have been wrecked there during the past few years, and their cargoes lost. I think the department should pay some attention to this matter. As the hon. gentleman knows, the port of Lunenburg is now a very important port. It has nearly 100 sail of fishing vessels, besides about twenty vessels in the West India trade. There is a fog-alarm on Cross Island, but after that is passed there is nothing else to guide vessels through this dangerous passage, and I hope the Minister will pay some attention to this matter. I understand that he has some buoys of this description under construction, and I hope he will see that one of them is placed at this dangerous spot during the present season.

Completion and construction of lighthouses and fog-alarms \$40,000

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to reduce this item by \$10,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has been good enough to send me a list of the amounts to be expended under this item. They are as follows:—

Range lights at Byng Inlet, Georgian Bay, Ontario...	\$ 400
Beacon or range lights, on or near Stag Island, River St. Clair, Ontario	400
Range lights at the Lime Kiln Crossing, Detroit River, Ontario	2,000
Fog-alarm at Pelee Point light, Lake Erie.....	10,000

I should like to enquire of the Minister of Marine how it comes that the fog-alarm at Pelee Point costs so large a sum as \$10,000? Other fog-alarms are put down at \$3,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the cost of the fog-alarm itself, but it is the place on which it has to be put. We have a light-house there, and this is upon a pier at a very difficult point, and that will require large repairs. This is in the track of the large traffic between Lake Erie and the upper lakes, and it is a very dangerous point, and there has been a great demand for a fog-alarm there. I have taken advantage of the repairs this year to make the pier a little larger and to place the fog-alarm upon it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The rest of this statement is as follows:—

Beacon light on wharf at Ste. Anne de Beaupré, below Quebec, Quebec.....	\$ 200
Fog-alarm at Bicquette Light Station, Rimouski County, Quebec.....	2,000
Lighthouse on Norton's Point, Bathurst Harbor, Gloucester Co., N.B.....	600
Lighthouse on Folly Point, Westmoreland County...	1,000
Beacon light on pier at Anderson's Hollow, Bay of Fundy, Albert County, N. B.....	200
Steam fog-alarm at Meagher's Beach, N. S.....	3,000
Automatic buoy for Bantam Rock, off Baccaro Point, N.S.....	1,250
Automatic buoy for the coast of Nova Scotia.	1,250
Two bell buoys to be located on the coast of Nova Scotia.....	2,000
Beacon light at Belliveau's Cove, Digby Co., N. S...	200
Light at Cold Spring Head, Cumberland Co., N.S....	1,500
Light and fog-alarm at Bonilla Point, B.C.....	4,000

Total..... \$30,000

Mr. LOVITT. The Minister will remember a petition which was presented to him for a light on Elwin's Island, Yarmouth county, which was very numerously signed, and in fact was signed by his own officer Captain Scott. The hon. gentleman promised last season that he would go down himself to see it, but he did not. It is a very dangerous place and, if he is proposing to reduce this vote by \$10,000, I think he might give us a light there. I see there is a light to be put at Anderson's Hollow in the Bay of Fundy. Certainly it is not as much required there as it is on Elwin's Island.

Mr. EISENHAUER.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an estimate in another place of \$10,000 for a special work in the Lower Traverse, in the River St. Lawrence. \$40,000 is the usual vote that has been taken for years for the construction of light-houses. With reference to that island, I passed through the channel last summer. There is a light-house at Pease Island about two miles from the northern shore of Ellenwood Island. There are two passages there, I believe, which are fairly well defined; I suppose the difficulty is in foggy weather, and I think we shall have to build a light-house there at some future time.

Mr. COOK. I believe the hon. Minister last year promised the then member for Halton that he would erect a beacon light at Point Baril, on the north shore of the Georgian Bay.

Mr. FOSTER. I promised this to the then member for Halton. He came to me several times with reference to a light-house at Point Baril, and I proposed to him to undertake the building of it himself, and I would put a certain amount in the Estimates for it. I gave him the plan, but somehow he failed to go on and build it, and the scheme fell through in that way. I think if he had carried it out, it would have been built economically. It is not my fault that it was not carried out.

Mr. COOK. It is a very important point, and there are steamers lying there all the time. It is a difficult place to approach, and very rocky.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to ask the Minister if the sum intended for British Columbia includes the erection of a lighthouse at the point which lies opposite Cape Flattery?

Mr. FOSTER. The lighthouse and fog-alarm for which this sum is put in the Estimates are meant for that point, and the Boards of Trade, the shipping interests and the member from Vancouver Island have represented to me the importance of that work.

Mr. GORDON. I am very thankful that the hon. gentleman recognises that point as one of the most important on the coast. I am glad to see that his department is looking after the interests of the Province.

Mr. LOVITT. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to complaints that have been made about the fog-alarm at Yarmouth Cape, that it cannot be heard.

Mr. FOSTER. We had some correspondence about it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Has the Minister come to a conclusion about putting up a light-house at Baril Point. It is the most important point on the whole of that coast. I understand that the Minister and the lumbermen had made an arrangement between themselves for the building of that light, and I am sorry that it has not been carried out. I would also ask the Minister to send his officers to inspect the light in the mouth of French River, as there is a great defect in it. The timber needs to be cut down.

Mr. FOSTER. The department has the matter now under charge.

Signal Service..... \$6,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is the signal service which is carried out on the coast of the river and the Gulf of St. Lawrence as far as Newfoundland, at posts where vessels are signalled and reported to the head office at Quebec, so that it is known in Quebec and Montreal when vessels come and when they go, and what is the state of the weather, ice, &c.

Maintaining buoys, &c., in the St. Lawrence River below Montreal..... \$7,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That will have to be doubled now.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the same vote.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Harbor Commissioners paid part of that under their old arrangement, and we only paid a portion of it. Where is the balance to come from?

Mr. FOSTER. We gave them so much, and they attended to the whole service.

Salaries and Disbursements of Fishery Overseers
and Wardens \$225,500

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think you will have to let that stand until we get the report from the department.

Mr. FOSTER. It will be impossible to get the report before the House rises. I have explained the reasons to the House.

Mr. COOK. I have some remarks to offer in connection with a fishery overseer on Georgian Bay. I believe it is not the custom of the Government, and especially of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, to allow their officials to become public agents and election heelers. There is a gentleman who at one time lived in the village of Victoria Harbor, who at the last election, and at all elections since I have known him, has taken a very deep interest in political matters. I would not find fault with him for exercising his franchise or assisting his party at elections, but I do find fault with him when he used the influence he possesses as a Government official to promote party purposes. I find fault when I know that he promised electors in different parts of the county bordering upon the shores where his jurisdiction extends, that if they would support the Conservative candidate he would give them permits to fish at any time they desired. Is the hon. Minister in possession of that fact?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not.

Mr. COOK. A local newspaper publishes an article which I will read:

"Considerable dissatisfaction is felt in some places along the shore of the Georgian Bay on account of the fishery inspector, Mr. F. G. M. Fraser, giving certain parties permission to net fish during the close season. Of course, the fishermen see the wisdom of Mr. Fraser's action easily and support him, but lots of sober-minded men and fishermen to whom the privilege has not been granted express a different opinion—and express it pretty strongly too. It seems strange that when there is posted up in every fishing town, village or hamlet in the Dominion, proclamations forbidding under most severe penalties the capture of pickerel between the 15th of April and 15th of May, and of maekinongé and bass, between the 15th of April and 15th of June, the inspector should be empowered to extend a verbal permission to whoever he pleases, to break this law and to set their nets without let or hindrance. All fish that may be caught in the seine are therefore the lawful property of the fisherman, although the spawning season has now fully set in and the amount of young fish destroyed in their embryonic state will be incalculable, no restriction will be put upon the number thus destroyed. There are many who say that Mr. Fraser is exceeding his power when he allows this course to be pursued; but we have every reason for saying such is not the case. The Government is to blame, for giving him this privilege. Having it, he has a perfect right to use it. But what will be the consequence of this enormous slaughter of fish-spawn. Will it not be felt in the future when our natural heritage becomes worthless through a too liberal policy? One of the most important matters the nation has to deal with is the conservation of our fisheries."

Did the hon. gentleman give that privilege to the fishery overseer, Fraser, as stated in that article?

Mr. FOSTER. I understand the charge is that Mr. Fraser gives permits to whosoever he pleases to fish during the close season. Neither Mr. Fraser or any other officer has such an authorisation from the department. I do not believe he has done it; but now that the matter has been brought to my attention by the hon. gentleman, I will look into it.

Mr. COOK. I know he made those pledges, because some of the parties to whom he made the promise—that if they would support the Conservative candidate at the last general election, he would grant them this privilege—refused to accept the conditions on which he proposed they should

obtain it. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he proposes to allow such a condition of things to exist?

Mr. O'BRIEN. While I know that officer to be a very ardent politician, I do not believe, as a matter of fact, he did anything of the sort. I do not believe the statement. I know the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) would not make, on his own authority, any statement unless he knew it to be true, but not having heard the charge before, I venture to say, knowing Mr. Fraser, that it is without foundation. He is a most efficient officer.

Mr. COOK. The hon. gentleman says he has taken an active part in politics.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. gentleman will not tell me that a man receiving a salary of \$100 a year is to be debarred from taking any part in politics. I venture to say Mr. Fraser did not do what he is charged with doing in that matter.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I am glad to hear the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) declare that the small salary of \$100 should not debar any man from taking active part in politics, because I wish to call the attention of the Minister to a case. There was a man in my constituency who was fishery warden at a small salary, who has been dismissed. He, like Mr. Fraser, was an active politician, but his views differed from those of the Government; but as regards using any official position it is certain that he did nothing of the kind, and he did only what he thought was right. In 1885 a letter was written to him by the inspector. It is in these terms:

"Sir,—Information from very reliable sources has reached the Minister that you are openly and covertly using the influence your position as a paid officer of the Government gives you, as a political canvasser and strong partisan for the party opposing the Government whose officer you are.

"Strong influence is being brought to secure your dismissal, and if you still use your official influence against the Government, you can hardly be surprised if your dismissal follows."

Mr. O'BRIEN. That was official influence.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) complains of is official influence being used. But the hon. member for Muskoka said Mr. Fraser was an ardent politician.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I deny that he used his official influence.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I am taking the statement ardent politician, and is it to be supposed that a man with a salary of \$100 or \$150 a year is to close his mouth with respect to politics. As to the hon. gentleman talking about official position, I cannot understand that a man with a small salary can have any official influence; for the statement is perfectly absurd, unless it is in the direction pointed out by the hon. member for East Simcoe—where an official breaks the law by giving permits to fish during the close season. There was not the slightest chance in the case I mentioned to use official influence, and in fact he took very little part in the election. During 1887 he took part in the election. On the 20th of June he received the following letter:—

"Sir,—I have the honor, by direction of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General has been pleased to dispense with your services as official overseer in St. John county, N. B."

He then wrote to ascertain for what reason he had been dismissed, and he received the following letter:—

"Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 5th inst., and in reply to state that I am commanded to inform you the change of fishery officer at St. Martin's was made in the public interest and for the betterment of the service."

This gentleman who was dismissed was commended by the department and by the inspector for the efficient manner in which he discharged his duties, and he was stated to be one of the best fishery wardens in New Brunswick. No doubt

he was dismissed because he chose to vote for myself and my colleague in the election of 1887, and a man was put in office who has never made a single report or done anything whatever in looking after the fisheries, but he happens to be a brother of one of my strong opponents. In this case I consider a gross injustice and unfairness has been done towards this officer, who, I believe, has now in his possession a report of the department stating that he was an efficient officer. I understand that the present man, although I say it subject to correction, has done nothing except to receive his salary.

Mr. SPROULE. If this rule laid down by the hon. gentleman is held good, there are officers in my part of the country that might have been dismissed some time ago. Although they are active politicians since their appointment to the office in 1874 or 1876, no persons have paid any attention to it whatever, and they have enjoyed the same privileges as other members of the community who have the privilege to exercise the franchise.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). A man ought not to be dismissed for that.

Mr. SPROULE. Although they have been strong partisans, put in their place by the Mackenzie Government, and have taken an active part in the elections, no person has ever complained of it nor do I complain of it now. I do complain that the money paid to those fishery inspectors in different parts of the country is like money thrown away. They are appointed to look after small streams through the country, and I know that fishing is carried on there with nets in season and out of season. We usually see those men once a year when they put up a notice telling the people what is the fishery season, and the penalties for fishing in the close season, but that is the last we see of them during the year. They draw their salaries and they do not protect the fish, nor do I think there is any special reason for protecting them. It seems to me that if there was no fishery officer within 100 miles, the fish would be protected as well as they are now by those officers, who receive their salary and do nothing for it.

Mr. COOK. I never found fault with this gentleman canvassing. He has always taken an active part in politics, but I say that the Government has dismissed a man for simply exercising his franchise in the constituency of my hon. friend for St. John (Mr. Weldon). I draw the attention of the Government to the fact that this man Fraser has not only been canvassing, which I do not wish to charge him with, but he has violated the law by issuing permits to fish in the close season.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it with authority?

Mr. COOK. The hon. gentleman says he has no authority.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman must not say what I did not say. I did not say anything of the kind. I said that no fishery officer has discretionary power given to him to give verbal permits during the close season. Permits are sometimes given, and close seasons extended but by the orders from the department. That is different from the giving discretionary powers to an officer.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). They are applied generally.

Mr. FOSTER. Generally; as far as a district is concerned. They may apply to a certain river and not to all.

Mr. COOK. I do not know on what authority those special permits were given by the officer.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman certain from his own knowledge that such has been done?

Mr. COOK. I only know from this article.

Mr. FOSTER. I complain that a man who has always proved himself a good officer as far as the department is concerned should be condemned by my hon. friend from
Mr. WELDON (St. John).

St. John (Mr. Weldon). My hon. friend from St. John took an assertion of the member for East Simcoe that permits were said to have been given by this man as proof of the fact.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I said I would assume the statement of the hon. member for Muskoka.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend said more. He turned round and said: Here is a man who has been giving away permits.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That is the case if the statement was true.

Mr. FOSTER. The first principle of law should have guarded my hon. friend from St. John from making such a statement without proof.

Mr. COOK. I ask the hon. Minister if he gave this officer any special authority?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no knowledge of any special authority, but I have about 800 fishery officers, and I should have to look the matter over before I expressed an opinion on that question.

Mr. COOK. As regards the political complexion of it, I can assure the hon. gentleman that this man is a politician, but I do not want to make any charge against him on this ground. I was told at the last election that he was using those permits as a means to secure votes. I find an article here in a newspaper which is about as truthful as anything that will emanate from any department, or from the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The Minister is wrong in saying that I took the statement of my hon. friend from East Simcoe. I stated if what the hon. gentleman said was true, this man was not only acting as a politician but he was using the authority of the Government or otherwise to violate the law. It is stated that Mr. Skillen was dismissed in the interests of the public. I should like to know why he was dismissed in the interests of the public and on what grounds?

Mr. FOSTER. A fishery officer is not a permanent officer and many of those officers are dismissed from year to year. A man may be a very good officer and yet there may exist very good reasons why changes should be made.

Mr. COOK. I expect the hon. gentleman will investigate this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I told you that I would do so.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I want to know the reasons why in June, 1887, after the elections, Skillen was dismissed right in the middle of the season, when he had a certificate that he was a good officer.

Mr. PLATT. Before you pass from Ontario, I wish to ask some explanation from the Minister as to the instructions he gives his officers in the Province of Ontario, especially in regard to inland waters—waters that are not navigable—and about which there is a question of the jurisdiction between the Dominion and the Provinces. Great difficulty has arisen in those smaller lakes in Ontario, as to the control over them by the fishery inspectors of the Dominion. I understand that during the close season the Dominion officers have control, but during the open season there is a difficulty as to whether the officers have control as to the method of fishing, as to how they should issue license, and as to the principle of riparian rights. I think the hon. gentleman answered a similar question last year, and that they are refusing to grant licenses in those smaller waters. Still a difficulty has arisen, because Dominion officials, whether by authority or not, do attempt to exercise authority on some of the smaller lakes of Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. The matter is now being attended to by the department. We do not allow our officers to issue any

licenses or take any fees on waters which are clearly provincial waters, and we are now making out a list of those waters which clearly fall under the jurisdiction of the Local Government and we intend to withdraw our officers largely, if not entirely, from those waters. There may be a number which are debatable, and as to those I intend to have a conference with the Ontario authorities, when I hope the matter will be decided amicably, and some arrangement will be come to so that there will be no clashing and no duplication of officers.

Mr. PLATT. I wish to bring a fisherman's grievance to the attention of the Minister, not to charge him with anything in connection with it, but merely to seek his influence on behalf of the fishermen. He knows that a large number of the fishermen in the Province of Ontario are poor, and the fishing is generally done by a system of gilling nets. In the construction of those nets three kinds of twine are used. The fishermen, being poor and liable to have their nets destroyed, employ the close season and winter months in constructing their own nets, and their wives and families could employ their time profitably in that way. But recently some change has taken place in customs resolutions by which a duty is imposed on one class of twine while it is not on others. The finer class has been made to rank as thread, and has been made liable to a duty of 20 per cent., so that the price of the gilling twine used by the fishermen has largely increased. The three classes are denominated as sturn twine, salmon twine and white-fish twine. The white-fish twine is that which the fishermen use, and while the net can be brought in duty free, the twine of which it is made is taxed, so that there is this anomaly that the manufactured article is admitted free while a duty is imposed on the raw material. I trust that the influence of the Minister of Fisheries will be used with the Department of Customs to have this anomaly removed.

Committee rose and reported progress.

FIRST READING, &c.

Bill (No. 139) respecting the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company.—(Mr. Fisher.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.05 a. m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 19th May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS WITHDRAWN.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the orders of the House for Bill (No. 68) to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company; Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Ontario, Manitoba and Western Railway Company; and Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Emerson and North-Western Railway Company, be discharged and the Bills withdrawn, and the fees remitted less cost of printing and translation.

Mr. EDGAR. At this stage of the Session there is no other course left except to take this step, but I really think the Government and the chairman of the Railway Committee should explain why it has become necessary to allow these Bills, some of which are very important Bills

and desirable in the public interest, to have been delayed so long without having been considered by the Railway Committee, and in fact without a meeting of the Railway Committee being called for the purpose of considering them. I suppose the Government felt a difficulty in allowing some of these charters to be granted because the arrangement by which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were to abandon their monopoly rights had not been formally carried out by this House. But since the House has passed upon that subject, there has been plenty of time for the Government to have taken action in this matter. I think this is the second Session that the Bill for the railways from Winnipeg to Lake Superior has been thrown over in this way. The House is entitled to some explanation in regard to the matter.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is aware that when these Bills came before the Railway Committee it was deemed desirable they should be deferred, on the statement I made that the Government wished to consider them. Having considered them, the Government were convinced that they could not proceed with these Bills for the same reason that we refused to proceed with similar Bills the previous year, because the lines would interfere with the contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. gentleman says: Yes, that is no doubt so.

Mr. EDGAR. I did not admit it was so as regards the railway from Winnipeg east.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Then a measure was laid before the House respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and their contract for the purpose of settling that difficulty and having the monopoly clause in their contract disappear, leaving the Government free for the future. That Bill passed this House. But the hon. gentleman says now that that Bill has passed, what objection should there be to passing these railway Bills under consideration. The Bill has not yet passed, it has come back from the Senate and there are amendments to the Bill; and until it becomes law, the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company still holds good. Under these circumstances the Government do not think they are free to proceed with these Bills. The time left between now and the end of the Session is too short to have the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill sanctioned and these railway Bills taken up and considered. Therefore I made this motion. It is the only course left, and if those gentlemen wish to bring back their Bill, they will have an opportunity next Session.

Mr. EDGAR. With the permission of the House I would say, that the hon. gentleman's explanation does not satisfy my mind, because the third reading of those railway Bills could have been held over to the close of the Session.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). My friend deserves the thank of the House for having brought this matter under consideration. Those people made their application in all good faith. They anticipated they would have been able to get the Bill through, and they were informed that there would be an agreement between the Parliament of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway, which would enable them to get charters this Session. Some of them have made arrangements in the old country for raising the funds for the construction of those roads, and although we have made provision to settle the difficulty between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Dominion, allowing railways to be built there, the Government by the course they are now adopting gives the advantage to the Canadian Pacific Railway for another year. I ask you, Sir, is it a fair thing? Is it a proper course to pursue, and is it a proper thing to treat the people of the North-West in this manner? The financial arrangements are made for the construction of these roads, and yet we are still leaving in the hands of the

Canadian Pacific Railway for another year before we grant any charter for the construction of those roads. I say it is unfair to the people of the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman objects to this motion of my hon. friend, he can easily withdraw it.

Mr. EDGAR. That is not fair. We do not object to the motion.

Motion agreed to, and Bills withdrawn.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY MORTGAGE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman opposite will remember that we were promised the mortgage in this Canadian Pacific Railway matter. The Minister of Justice, if I remember aright, said he would make all possible exertions to bring it down. I want to know if it is ready yet?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is not ready, and it cannot be brought down. It is not a question of the actual work of preparing it, but it involves the consideration of some most important safeguards, and those have to be sanctioned by the Governor in Council, and require careful consideration. It requires much more consideration and care than we possibly could be able to give it now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am willing to accept the hon. gentleman's explanation, but I must remind the Government that this was distinctly promised before the Bill was passed through.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And in very good faith.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am aware that such a document would necessarily be one that would require a good deal of consideration, and I accept the statement. I think in a matter of this kind, that the document should have been prepared simultaneously with the passage of the Bill, because it seems to me you ought to have your agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway so far perfected, that there could be no possible chance of any dispute or any difficulty arising between the two contracting parties.

MEMBERS' INDEMNITY.

Mr. TROW. It may be out of place for me to ask a question, but I do so merely to get information for hon. members on both sides of this House. I understand from the account that there is a misunderstanding in reference to the sessional allowance of members. In the absence of some members for weeks at a time, we find that they have been paid during this Session of Parliament and other Sessions, by making a reduction of \$8 a day for the days they were absent out of their total indemnity. It appears that members who were only a few days present received their whole \$1,000 with mileage, and were given credit for the whole Session refunding \$8 a day for the days they were absent. The question arises whether that is the rule, and if that rule is to be adhered to there are members who wish to know whether they should receive only \$10 a day during the time they have been present, or whether they would receive their whole sessional allowance and refund the \$8 for each day they were absent. A few years ago we find that one member who was unseated during the Session received his sessional allowance for two Sessions, although he was only here part of one Session. He received nearly \$2,000 while he was only here one-third of the Session. There should, I think, be some established rule understood by all the members.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The law prescribes what members of Parliament are to get for their sessional allowance, and what deductions are to be made. There can
Mr. WILSON (Elgin.)

be no doubt, as the statute is quite clear and beyond any ambiguity. I am not at all aware of the special circumstances the hon. gentleman has reference to now, but we will enquire and let the hon. gentleman know to-morrow.

Mr. LAURIER. The difficulty is this: the statute provides that if the Session lasts for 30 days the Session allowance is to be \$10, and if the Session lasts more than 30 days the allowance is to be \$1,000. There are some members who have been elected just a few days ago. Some persons contend that they are entitled only to the thirty day allowance for the days they sat in the House. I would claim they are entitled to \$1,000, deducting \$8 a day for each day they have not sat in the House. The statute, if I construe it aright, is that if the Session lasts more than thirty days the sessional allowance will be \$1,000, and that if a man sits, one, two, three, ten or thirty days, and if the Session is more than thirty days, then the sessional allowance is \$1,000 less the number of days he has not sat. This was the principle that was maintained in the case of the hon. member for Northumberland, who received not only one but two allowances.

Mr. MITCHELL. What Northumberland does the hon. gentleman mean?

Mr. LAURIER. It is not you. There are more Northumberlands than one, and you are not the one I referred to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman be a little more specific in future where such a serious charge is made.

FAREWELL ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As the House knows, the Senate has adopted an Address to His Excellency the Governor General on the occasion of his regretted departure from Canada to assume distinguished duties in another part of the Empire. The Address passed by the Senate (p. 1561) is expressed in such appropriate language, and in such eloquent terms, that it would be exceedingly presumptuous for me to add any expressions of my own in addition to the language used by the Senate. I do not think I am called upon to make one single remark in addition, and I now move, seconded by my hon. friend Mr. Laurier:

That this House concurs in the Address from the Senate to His Excellency the Governor General, on the occasion of his approaching departure, and expressing sincere regret at the termination of His Excellency's official connection with Canada.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, in seconding this Address, I will follow the example of the right hon. First Minister and content myself, at this stage of the Session, with adding no remark whatever. As the hon. gentleman has said, the address speaks for itself, and the sentiments which it conveys are not, I am sure, the mere formal, conventional expression of perfunctory lip courtesy, but they are the deep expression of the feelings which the Canadian people at large entertain towards His Excellency and towards the illustrious lady who has exhibited during her sojourn amongst us, all those noble womanly domestic qualities which are ever dear to the British and the Canadian heart.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved, seconded by Mr. Laurier:

That a Message be sent to the Senate, acquainting their Honors that this House has agreed to the said Address by filling up the blank with the word "Commons."

Motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved third reading of Bill (No. 117) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act, chap. 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Mr. LAURIER moved in amendment :

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole in order to amend the same, so as to provide that a revision of the lists take place in all electoral divisions where the election of the sitting members is controverted.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Edgar,	Meigs,
Armstrong,	Edwards,	Mitchell,
Bain (Wentworth),	Ellis,	Paterson (Brant),
Beausoleil,	Fisher,	Platt,
Bécharé,	Gauthier,	Rinfret,
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	Rowand,
Bourassa,	Gigault,	Ste. Marie,
Bowman,	Gillmor,	Scrivner,
Brien,	Holton,	Semple,
Campbell,	Innes,	Somerville,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Landerkin,	Sutherland,
Choquette,	Lang,	Trow,
Chouinard,	Laurier,	Turoot,
Cook,	Lister,	Watson,
Couombe,	Livingston,	Weldon (St. John),
Couture,	Lovitt,	Welsh,
Doyon,	Mackenzie,	Wilson (Elgin).—53.
Dupont,	McMullen,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Grandbois,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Bergeron,	Guillet,	Perley (Ottawa),
Bowell,	Haggart,	Porter,
Brown,	Hall,	Prior,
Bryson,	Henderson,	Reid,
Carling,	Hesson,	Riopel,
Carpenter,	Hudspeth,	Roome,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jamieson,	Shanly,
Chapleau,	Jones (Digby),	Small,
Chisholm,	Kirkpatrick,	Smith (Ontario),
Cimon,	Landry,	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Stevenson,
Cockburn,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Taylor,
Colby,	McOulla,	Temple,
Oorby,	McDougald (Pietou),	Thompson,
Costigan,	McGreavy,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Coughlin,	McKay,	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	McLellan,	Wallace,
Daoust,	McNeill,	Ward,
Davis,	Madill,	White,
Dawson,	Mara,	Wilmot,
Denison,	Masson,	Wilson (Lennox),
Dickinson,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wood (Brockville),
Foster,	Montplaisir,	Wood (Westmoreland).—74.
Gordon,	O'Brien,	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Godbout) and the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) have not voted.

Mr. Fiset. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I was asked to pair off with the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Guilbault), and I thought I could not refuse to do so.

Bill read the third time and passed.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 132) respecting a certain agreement between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. EDGAR. What are the amendments ?

Mr. THOMPSON. It appears that the company has not, by any of its legislation heretofore, obtained the power to make the mortgage which is required by the agreement, and the first amendment is simply to insert after the word "money," in page 1, line 27, the following words: "Which bonds the company is hereby empowered to issue." The second amendment is to declare that they have power to secure the mortgage. The third amendment simply repeats

the section of the agreement in relation to the Emerson branch.

Mr. EDGAR. It seems to me this clause simply covers the agreement entered into between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, except the additional power of issuing the bonds, which should have been in the Bill originally.

Amendments concurred in.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting subsidies to be granted to certain railway companies, and toward the construction of certain railways mentioned.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

(In the Committee.)

To the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company, for 22 miles of their railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Eganville, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 49 Victoria, chapter 10, for a railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Eganville, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$70,400.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway in operation ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway was chartered during the present Session by Bill No. 175, from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, in or near the village of Renfrew, to the village of Eganville, thence to a point on the Georgian Bay, at or near the village of Parry Sound, about 132 miles, and the section of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Eganville, 22 miles, the most eastern section of the road, and the object of the resolution is to insure the subsidy granted to the railway between these points two years ago, 22 miles at \$3,200 per mile, or in the whole \$96,000 to the Ottawa Parry Sound Railway Company. In fact, the amount is less in this resolution than that which has already been voted. It is simply to enable the company to bring Ottawa and Montreal in direct railway communication with the Georgian Bay on Lake Huron, by a very direct route. It is to carry out the resolution of two years ago, and the amount asked is less than the amount then voted.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the Government have some information as to the feasibility of the line of road proposed up the valley of the Bonnechere to Parry Sound. The Government must be aware that some time ago that was the line proposed for the connection of the Canada Central with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that, on account of the reports by the engineer in charge of the road, the Government found that owing to the gradients on that line it was impossible to build the road, and eventually changed the location of the line to Pembroke. I suppose that this company have some information by which they may be able to build the line through there, other than that with which the Government were furnished some years ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. colleague, the Minister of Railways, who is not able to be in his place in the House, informs me that he has looked carefully into this, and is satisfied it is a perfectly feasible route, and one that will best answer the purposes for which it is intended.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We are not making an additional charge, and, therefore, though not to be understood as in any wise approving or consenting to the policy, I am not going to dwell particularly on the sum granted, but the point I want to understand is this: what guarantees have the Government that this particular railway, for illustration sake, has means to go on with this work? Now, we have had several discussions as to the extreme inexpediency of granting what are known as bogus charters, or charters, at any rate, which men get hold of for the purpose

of selling, and some very disgraceful transactions are known to have occurred with reference to charters which have been. I think unadvisably, granted by this House. I think my hon. friend beside me suggested, and I think I suggested myself, that where subsidies are given, the Government should take precaution to make certain that the parties were able to build the roads. And I think that the best plan would be to provide that a considerable deposit, in proportion to the size of the railway, should be placed in the hands of the Government, to be forfeited in the case of a company that came here, got a charter, obtained a subsidy, and did not proceed with the work. I should like to know if the Government have any information as to the solvency of this company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must remember that none of these parties can do anything or can get a dollar of money from the Government unless they make a contract with the Government. The responsibility of making that contract, as my hon. friend says, is no doubt a very serious one, involving that the parties must show that they have the means of carrying the work through. I believe my hon. friend the Minister of Railways has taken good care in all the contracts he has made to see that the parties had the requisite ability to carry out their work; but, in any case, not a dollar of public money can be obtained by them unless the work is performed under a contract entered into with the Minister of Railways.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt that is true, but it does not meet one point which is of public importance, and that is that the control of a charter like this, carrying with it the grant of a considerable amount of public money, should not be allowed to go into the hands of persons who may make merchandise of it, who may sell it, and I know no means by which that can be prevented better than by requiring a deposit to be made, and forfeiting that if the parties do not go on with the work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite recognise the importance of the point taken by the hon. gentleman, and no doubt that would be a very good way, if it were not for one reason. The object of most of these grants is to help companies that have not sufficient private capital, and to assist them in carrying out important works. If the parties were obliged to raise the amount and to deposit it and to lose the advantage of a considerable sum of money, it might embarrass parties who otherwise could go on and complete works which we consider in the interests of the country. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman is well worthy of consideration, and I agree with him that every possible means should be taken to prevent trafficking in railway charters. The object is to assist deserving enterprises, but not to allow speculators to traffic in these charters.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would it not be well to provide in the Bill that these companies shall only obtain a charter on condition that they shall not sell it. Make that a condition precedent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That also might be a matter well worthy the consideration of the Railway Committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the Railway Committee, the Minister of Public Works, to this point. My hon. friend from South Oxford has called attention to the fact that, during the sittings of the Railway Committee, I called attention to the tendency there was in this country to traffic in railway charters, and that I had suggested that the committee should take steps to hedge the granting of charters in such a way that merely speculative charters not be obtained.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. MITCHELL. That suggestion met with the approval of the committee, and I suggested that the chairman should take some steps in that direction. He stated then that steps would be taken before the close of the Session to prepare a set of regulations to meet the case. No doubt, owing to the pressure of business it has not been possible for him to do that, and no doubt also, on my part, I have been guilty of neglect in not again calling attention to that matter, and this has led to its being overlooked; but I would suggest that during the recess the hon. gentleman should have prepared such rules and regulations as might guide the committee in granting these charters. That might save a great deal of time to the committee, and would also prevent a great deal of scandal in regard to such matters as have taken place in the past, but which I hope may not occur again.

To the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, for 46 miles of their railway from Bridgewater to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, in the Province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, not exceeding in the whole \$147,200.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I see that this road, as the resolution reads, is from Bridgewater.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It should be from Lunenburg. That is a misprint. It should read:

From Lunenburg to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, for 46 miles of their railway in the Province of Nova Scotia.

That will remove all ambiguity, as the appropriation last year was for the whole road.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I understand that, in subsidising part of this road last year, it was intended that the money should be expended in the county of Annapolis. I am gratified to find that, at last, the Government have fulfilled the pledges which they made in reference to this road. In the Session of 1886, the Government subsidised 31 or 32 railways, and strenuous efforts were made by the late member for Lunenburg, Mr. Kaulbach, to obtain a subsidy for this railway; and I find by the discussion which took place on that occasion, that several members referred to a memorial which was sent in, signed by fifteen members of this House, praying for aid to this road. In 1887, when the matter was brought up, the Minister of Railways stated that this was the first intimation he had heard of this road. I must say that I think that was very unfair to the late member for Lunenburg, if what he stated in the county was true, that he had made these representations.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure that must be a misprint. It is impossible that the Minister of Railways could have said that.

Mr. EISENHAUER. I do not think so. I think some hon. members here heard him make that statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then it was an entire misapprehension. I am informed that what the Minister of Railways said was that it was the first he had heard of it during that Session, that is, during the Session of 1887.

Mr. EISENHAUER. Not only was the pledge given then, but there was a letter which was written by the Minister of Railways and was used in the county, and very strenuous efforts were made by the hon. member for Annapolis and myself to have the pledge carried out. The best we could do was to get a subsidy for half of this road, and when I complained of the way in which we were treated, a threat was made that, if I did not keep quiet, the whole vote would be struck out. I think that was very unfair. A great deal of work has been done on that road, and I am sure that the road is entitled to much more consideration than those 30 odd railways which were subsidised a few years ago. It is very unfair to the company, who have spent a great deal of money in consequence, and it has retarded the construction.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite right in stating that in 1886 the Minister of Railways stated that this road would be provided for; but, at all events, the Government would submit to Parliament at a future day the means for providing for this road. There is no doubt about that; and when the Government subsequently were asked to fulfil that promise, they were assured, the parties interested were assured that that promise would be carried out. A year ago we provided a subsidy for a part of the road because we thought that would answer the purpose, and we would let the balance lie over until this Session in order to provide for the rest of it. But when the company came to act under their subsidy, as the hon. gentleman has stated, they found that they could not make their financial arrangements unless they had a positive assurance that the Government would submit to Parliament at this Session an application for the balance, and this is in fulfilment of the pledge given to that company during the recess, and which enabled them to make their arrangements, and to complete the other part of the road. Consequently, I have put this in general terms over the same line of railway. It makes the subsidy as originally promised.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When was the last Order in Council passed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not able to state that. When the company represented to the Government that they could not take advantage of the subsidy that had been given to them, unless they had a positive assurance that at this Session the balance would be provided, the Order in Council was passed, but I was not in the country myself at the time, and therefore I am not able to state to the hon. gentleman the date it was issued.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). With the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) I am glad this vote has been brought down, though I believe it has been brought down from different motives from those given by the Minister of Finance. Last year, it will be remembered, we took exception to a vote for a part of the road, because it prevented the completion of financial arrangements in New York to get a sum of money to carry on the whole work. Shortly after that, however, there was a very important event transpired in the county of Annapolis—the seat of the hon. gentleman for Annapolis was contested, and that hon. gentleman, acting with the friends of the railway in that county and in Lunenburg, proposed that this might be made the means of obtaining an additional subsidy for this road, provided that the petition against him was withdrawn. To that condition the petitioner and the gentlemen in the county of Annapolis, who were interested in this road, agreed, and withheld the protest against the hon. member for Annapolis, who visited Ottawa and who secured the passage of a Minute of Council, of which the people of Annapolis were made aware, and of which the vote now before the House is a confirmation. I merely mention this as being the *modus operandi* by which the vote was secured. It was given under these circumstances, and not, I believe, from the highest sense of public duty which should have influenced the Government to give the vote years ago. It will have the double effect of securing the member for Annapolis in his seat by allowing it to go unopposed, and it will have the effect of securing the completion of this road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is very hard to please hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend the other day pressed me to fulfil this promise and bring down this vote, and when we bring it down, he then ascribes improper motives. I was not in the country at the time, but I cannot believe there is any foundation for the statement of the hon. gentleman, that a corrupt arrangement was made. The Government were bound by their pledge on the floor of this House to provide for the balance of this road. They

thought they could divide it into two years, and when the company represented that the vote taken last year would be useless, unless the Government would, in the most formal manner, pledge themselves to submit the additional appropriation, they did so, and it being here, I think everyone ought to be satisfied.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is quite clear that it was merely a coincidence.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I wish to make one statement which will show emphatically the incorrectness of the statement of the hon. member for Halifax. The Order in Council was signed quite a while after the time had expired for the parties who were urging the petition against me in the county of Annapolis, to go on with their petition; consequently, that shows there was no corrupt arrangement at all with reference to the payment of the subsidy.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says that the Minute of Council was passed quite a while after the time had elapsed for the contest being proceeded with, but the hon. gentleman will not, I hope, for the sake of his own credit deny that there was such an arrangement in the county of Annapolis, and that the hon. gentleman made a proposal to the other side, to the parties who were anxious to secure the completion of that road, and were ready to proceed against him when they thought they might disqualify him. The hon. gentleman's proposal was not only to secure a Minute of Council, which he did secure, but that the Government should let the contract for that road immediately. That was the arrangement to which the hon. gentleman was a party, and that is the reason why the subsidy was given. While I am satisfied that the road is at last to be completed, I do not think we can congratulate ourselves that the Government have at last been driven to give this assistance to the road in order to retain the seat for the hon. member for Annapolis, instead of giving it from motives of public policy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a very ungracious statement to make.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I meet this assertion with an unqualified denial. I never made any such proposal to any one that has had any relation to the road whatever.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think we must get on. I propose to strike out "from Bridgewater to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway," making it apply generally to the whole line the same as the other.

To the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company, for three miles of their railway from the end of the present subsidized section to Massena Springs, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,700 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$9,600.

Mr. SCRIVER. I would call the attention of the Minister of Railways to what I think is an error. I do not suppose the Government propose to subsidise a railway in the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. We have done that, occasionally.

Mr. SCRIVER. You propose to do it, according to this resolution. Massena Springs is 20 miles from the boundary line in the State of New York. Moreover, the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway ends at the boundary line and not at Massena Springs.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will strike out the words "to Massena Springs."

To the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, for bridging the several channels of the Ottawa River at Culbute and west thereof, a subsidy of \$31,500, to be paid out monthly as the work progresses upon the certificate of the Chief Engineer of Government Railways, in the proportion which the value of the work executed bears to the value of the whole work undertaken, and for three miles of their railway extending from a point three miles east of Pembroke, to Pembroke, in the Prov-

ince of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$9,600, provided that the entire work subsidised upon this railway shall be completed within four years from the passing of this Act, the subsidy granted by this Act not to exceed in the whole \$41,100.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the estimated cost of the bridges?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The amount we propose to give is 15 per cent. of the cost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is to say, that about \$200,000 is considered to be the cost.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, in round figures.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Does the expression here, "bridging the several channels of the Ottawa at Culbute and west thereof," cover the bridging of the whole of the channels between the Province of Quebec, north of Allumette Island, and the Province of Ontario. The Minister of Finance will probably remember that there are a number of channels there; first, the Culbute channel, to which special reference is made. Allumette Island intervenes in the next channel, and is about five miles in width, and there are two or three other channels.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is to cover the whole.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). And the amount paid will be in proportion to the cost of the whole of these bridges?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the resolution provides that the subsidy shall be extended over four years. The present Act gives the company only until 1st September, 1889, to complete the road. Is the insertion of the four years the result of an application on the part of the company, or is it the general policy of the Government?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is the general policy of the Government.

Mr. HAGGART. Was not the subsidy given the year before on condition that this bridge should be built by the company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is possible; I will give the information to the hon. gentleman. The Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway extends from Aylmer to Pontiac, a distance of 88 miles. By the Act 47 Victoria, chapter 8, this road was granted a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile on an estimated distance between those points of 85 miles. The present resolution covers the difference between 85 miles and 88 miles; the distance is found absolutely to be 88 miles. Three miles at \$3,200 per mile is equal to \$9,600. This road, moreover, crosses the Ottawa River. The estimated cost of bridging the channels is \$210,000. Owing to the heavy cost of bridge construction, it is found impossible to proceed with the erection of those bridges under the general subsidy of \$3,200 per mile. The road having been built up to or near to Ottawa, 71 miles to Aylmer, the resolution proposes to give assistance in the construction of the bridges to the extent of \$31,500, making the total additional subsidy \$40,100.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister of Finance probably remembers that in 1884, when this company was subsidised, it was brought to his attention that the contractor and sub-contractors had not been paid, and an engagement was made by the Government that the claims of the contractor and the sub-contractors should be fairly met out of the subsidy then granted. I am informed, and I believe my information is correct, that several claims were placed in the hands of the Government amounting to \$25,000 or \$26,000, and all those claims have been satisfied with the exception of four, so far as my memory goes. Those

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

creditors are: Bate & Co., \$1,814; William Brown, \$515 Russell, Forbes & Co., \$617; A. Workman, \$105. These claims have not been paid for some reason which I do not know, but so far as I am informed, they were exactly on the same footing as claims made and dealt with and paid out by the company. I have no reason to doubt that the same treatment should be extended to those creditors as to the other creditors, and they should be paid out of the subsidy

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The promise was made by the Minister of Finance when he was Minister of Railways. There was a sum set aside for meeting those claims, and a schedule of the claims was supplied by the contractor, Armstrong, to the company. I happened to be one of the trustees appointed by the company to pay those claims. My recollection of the matter is, although I am speaking from memory and I have not the papers by me, that all the claims upon the schedule furnished by the contractor to the company were satisfied. I did not catch the names of the gentlemen to whom the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Laurier) referred, and whether those claims were upon that schedule or not. I am not prepared at the present moment to say, but all claims furnished by the contractor, who had the contract from the company, were satisfied in some way or other by the company out of the money appropriated to pay those claims. I think my recollection is that the contractor, Armstrong, with whom the company dealt directly, did not consider that Perreault had any legal or legitimate claim.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He had a claim of \$172,000 or \$171,000 against Armstrong.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not know anything about the claim of Perreault himself, and if he had a claim for \$170,000 it may be that this claim put in is largely spurious for all I know. It appears that Armstrong did not recognise it as a claim. But it cannot be denied, I believe, that the claim was to some extent a legitimate one. I understand that these parties whose claims I have given all supplied goods to Perreault, who was a sub-contractor of Armstrong, and the goods therefore went into the construction of the road. This cannot be denied. Under such circumstances, whatever might have been the reason for Armstrong setting aside the balance of the claim of Perreault, so far as these four creditors were concerned their claims were legitimate ones.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will ask the Minister of Railways to have this matter carefully investigated. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) will forward a memorandum of these claims I will direct the special attention of the Minister to them.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I will give an explanation to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). There was a difficulty between Armstrong and Perreault, the latter of whom was sub-contractor for nearly the whole length of the road, and there is a suit between him and Armstrong, who was the contractor of the company. Armstrong contended that he had supplied funds sufficient to pay for all the labor given and the supplies obtained. When the Minister of Railways, through a favor not as a matter of right, said a certain sum would be paid for labor supplied for the work, a list was given in amounting to \$18,000 or \$20,000. The Minister of Railways, careful for the interests of the laborers and those who had furnished necessary supplies for the building of the road, placed \$25,000 aside. Trustees were appointed, and I can say that the company not only paid those \$25,000 reserved by the Minister, but they paid \$10,000 more, so as not to have any claim directly from people who had worked on the road or furnished the contractor with supplies. The difficulty between the sub-contractor Perreault and Armstrong is still before the courts.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says the principle admitted by the Government was that all those parties who had actually supplied the contractor were compensated.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Not the whole of them, for that would amount to \$200,000. I understand 20,000 were put aside. In addition to those people there were others who supplied goods which went into the construction of the road, and according to the principle admitted at the time they had the same reason to be treated fairly as the others.

Mr. LAURIER. If the money paid to this contractor, by the company had been legitimately employed, those parties would have been paid.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid we cannot settle that matter here, but if the hon. gentleman gives me the names I will ask the Minister of Railways to carefully consider it. My hon. friend sees that a commission was agreed upon by the claimants on the one side and the company on the other, and that they paid all that was reported after a careful investigation to be due.

Mr. LAURIER. I am only answering the Secretary of State. I quite understand that the Minister cannot go there and so far it is satisfactory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to know who furnished the statement that the hon. gentleman made to the House as to the cost of the bridges. That was, I suppose, supplied by the company's engineer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. By the Minister of Railways.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has he satisfied himself that that would be the cost?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On the report of one of his own engineers?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, quite so, that matter has been investigated.

To the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company for 84½ miles of their railway from Port Arthur towards Crooked Lake, in lieu of the subsidies granted by 48-49 Victoria, Chapter 58, and 49 Victoria, Chapter 10, for the construction of a railway from Murillo Station to Crooked Lake, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$271,200.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to correct that, by substituting Gun Flint Lake, instead of Crooked Lake.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is a vote of \$271,200 for this railway. For what purpose and on what grounds do the Government recommend this to the House?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will see that this was voted before, and has already been granted by the House, as, in fact, almost all those subsidies have been, with the exception of the Central Railway Company, and the Quebec Central Railway. All those votes practically have been already voted by the House, and those resolutions are merely in reference to some change in the location of the lines.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to know, because I do not remember, the innumerable grants that have been made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is cited on the face of this resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I know, but for what purpose?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The object of this is to run a railway from Port Arthur through a very rich silver and iron mineral district, and in which at this moment a very large amount of capital is being expended in its development. It runs to the boundary in a south-westerly direction

from Port Arthur. The promoters were rather ambitious in their first charter, and the object of this is to apply the same mileage rate to a much shorter line.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are the parties.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Sir Alex. Galt is one of the principal supporters of this road and I know that he has been once or twice in England in connection with raising the required amount of capital. This makes a change in the location of the line without at all increasing the amount of money. I believe altogether this is a very much better location than the former one.

Mr. COOK. Is this the road contemplated to run through Duluth?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I dare say it will ultimately. It would be quite easy to carry the road from the end of this at the boundary, to Duluth.

Mr. COOK. I suppose it was Mr. Wilkinson, of bribery notoriety in the Local Government, that brought influence to bear on the Government to give the grant. He is largely interested in mines up there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have never heard that before. I can assure my hon. friend it is new to me, as I do not know that gentleman has anything to do with it.

Mr. DAWSON. The object of the road is to open up a very fine agricultural and mineral district at the same time. It passes through the White Fish Valley where there is a great deal of the very finest agricultural land. It touches on the Silver Mines, Beaver Mountain, Silver Mountain, and reaches the boundary line at Gun Flint Lake, where it touches on the great iron range of Minnesota. Last year there were exported from that iron range 400,000 tons of iron ore to a place called Two Harbors, twenty-two miles to the eastward of Duluth.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did the hon. gentleman mean 400,000 tons from the Canadian side?

Mr. DAWSON. No; that was from the American side, and the same range in which they got that iron runs across to the Canadian side. The Americans were exploring on the Canadian side since last year. They had diamond drills and were successful in discovering an immense extent of this same iron ore, which is considered to be the finest ever yet discovered, and has been practically tested and proved to be the finest yet discovered for the manufacture of bessemer steel. A subsidy was granted some years ago for this line, and this is simply a renewal. As has been explained the line is somewhat shorter than the former one proposed. One of the principal promoters of the line is the gentleman who was my adversary at the last election, Mr. Burke, and Mr. Marks and all our leading people at Port Arthur are concerned in the enterprise. They have associated with them English capitalists, and they have already graded ten miles of the line and have admirable surveys made from one end to the other. The line is now sure to go on and to be carried to completion, and it will develop a fruitful and a rich section of the country.

Mr. COOK. Is Mr. Conmee, the member of the Local House, interested in this?

Mr. DAWSON. I believe he is.

Mr. COOK. Has he obtained a grant from the Local Government for this?

Mr. DAWSON. Not a dollar, but they promised one.

Mr. COOK. I expect this will only end in smoke too.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The information given by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) is very interesting, and we were all pleased to hear it, but

surely the member for Algoma, after what was stated by the Minister of Finance a few weeks ago, does not attribute this discovery to Americans who went there with diamond drills, or other such base mechanical plant. The Minister told us that this was discovered by reason of the tax that was put on iron.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think this is the same locality.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, yes, it is.

Mr. SPROULE. I am sorry to see that this opposition is from Ontario members, where Ontario is getting so little.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We are not opposing; we are only making enquiries.

Mr. WATSON. I regret the Government have not seen fit to aid and assist roads in the west, which have applied for cash subsidies. This is the only road west of Lake Superior that has received a cash subsidy from the Government outside of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Other important roads have asked for cash subsidies and have been refused, notably the Hudson Bay Railway Company. I do hope that at the next Session of Parliament at least, that the Hudson Bay Railway Company may receive a cash bonus. It has been explained by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Railways before, that it is very hard for companies to construct a road on a land grant, and the Hudson Bay Railway Company find themselves in that position and have asked for a cash subsidy. I do not suppose it is necessary for me to mention the importance of that undertaking to the North-West. I hope that in a very near future the Government will see fit to assist roads in the west by cash subsidies as well as roads in the east. While land grants are valuable, still it is very hard for a company to float its scheme simply on a land grant. It appears to me that many of these cash subsidies for railroads in the east have been granted on account of concessions to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is felt by many people in the east that every subsidy and every concession granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should be charged to the west. I think that is a great mistake, and such an idea should not be allowed to prevail in this House.

Mr. MCKAY. I regret that the Government has not granted a subsidy to a railway in the section of country which I come from, which was applied for this Session, and also last Session. The railway I refer to is the South Ontario Pacific, which was intended to give Hamilton, Brantford, St. Catharines and a large section of country in western Ontario, access to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The municipalities in that part of the country have very largely aided railways for the purpose of gaining access to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and also for the purpose of securing railway competition. We now find ourselves shut off from any competition by connection with that railway. Although the Government have not seen proper to grant us any aid this year, we hope they will give our claims fair consideration in the future. We are asking nothing more than is just, and we feel that the claims of that part of the country for railway accommodation are very great. Other parts of the Dominion have been given the same advantage that we are asking for, and I hope the Government will take our claims into consideration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend, and every member of this committee will see, by looking over the resolutions, that the Government have adhered as stringently as they possibly could to the policy adopted this year of granting no additional subsidies. Only two exceptions have been made, and they rest on very exceptional circumstances. One has already been referred to, that of the line from the Windsor and Annapolis Railway to Lunenburg. The grant to this railway is in pursuance of a positive pledge made on Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

the floor of this House two years ago. That, of course, hon. gentlemen will see we could not recede from. The other grant, which also stands on an exceptional basis, is to provide for a line from Lévis, opposite Quebec, to the Short Line Railway, known as the Atlantic and North-Western Railway, which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are under contract to carry down to the ports of St. John and Halifax, so as to provide connection in our country between our winter port and the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The present vote is an extension of the grant formerly made to that company. With the exception of those two grants, which rest on exceptional circumstances, there is absolutely nothing in these resolutions to extend what the House has already appropriated; and I can only assure my hon. friend who has just addressed the House that it was with the deepest regret that the Government were obliged to turn a deaf ear to the representations made by the very large deputation which came from that section of the country which he speaks of, and stated in very strong and forcible language the great importance of giving assistance to the railway communication to which he has referred; but they felt the same reluctance in a number of other cases, notably in my own Province. It was represented and very forcibly, that the Counties of Shelburne and Queen's were the only counties in the Province of Nova Scotia which were absolutely left without any railway connection with the other portions of the country; and although we felt the strong claims which they had to consideration, yet this year, in conformity with the statement I made to the House, while our policy was not changed, it was absolutely necessary to call a halt, and not increase the public burdens in this direction at present. Therefore we have been obliged to postpone a number of important claims from the different Provinces—Quebec, New Brunswick, Ontario and I may say the North-West. The hon. gentleman who had just referred to the question of the Hudson Bay Railway, is aware that Parliament has appropriated a very large land grant for that work; but I quite recognise the truth of the statement the hon. gentleman has made, that in the first instance it is almost impossible to construct a railway out of a land grant. The reason for this vote to which he has taken exception, in contrast with what has been done in the North-West, is that the land along the line of this railway from Port Arthur to the boundary do not belong to us, but to the Province of Ontario, and, therefore, we could not assist it in any other way than in the way the House determined two years ago to assist it, namely, by a money subsidy. I trust that at a future Session the Government will be in a position to give much more liberal consideration to those great and important projects to which the hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have drawn attention, than is possible on the present occasion. These resolutions embrace a number of roads for which practically all this money has been voted before, except the two companies to which I have alluded.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). I am afraid that this subsidy will not be sufficient to secure the construction of that portion of the railway to Chicoutimi. The amount is only \$96,000, and the distance is 62 miles from the present terminus at Lake St. John to Chicoutimi. It would seem that this resolution is not quite correct. The subsidy granted last year was not granted to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company; but it was granted to a local company for a line from the terminus of the Lake St. John Railway at Lake St. John to Chicoutimi. I think I may say without fear of contradiction that that company was formed for no other purpose than to make some money out of the subsidy. They never could conceive the idea of building such a branch as an independent line. Last year the Lake St. John Railway

Company tried to get a subsidy, but they were opposed by this local company; and, unfortunately for the Lake St. John Company, there were some persons in the local company who had a good deal of influence over the Government. The local company went to the Lake St. John Company and said: If you want to get the subsidy give us \$20,000, and we will consent to the transfer of the subsidy to your company. That sum was so extravagant, compared to the total amount of the subsidy, that the Lake St. John Railway Company positively refused. At last the company yielded to a certain extent, and they had to promise \$6,000 to that hoodling company, for it was nothing else, the president of which was the late Tory member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay, and the directors of which were all friends of the Government, expecting to derive some benefit out of their influence with the Government. They got that \$6,000, so that practically the Lake St. John Railway Company are getting the subsidy less that amount. I think, therefore, that the subsidy should have been increased by so much, which, through no fault of their own, the Lake St. John Railway Company have to pay to the local company.

Mr. AMYOT. I would suggest that the word Chicoutimi be changed. The terminus is not Chicoutimi, but the railroad passes through Chicoutimi and goes to Ha Ha Bay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That will not affect the location, because it says "towards Chicoutimi or from Chicoutimi."

Mr. LANGELIER. It does not matter much this year, because the company will have to come back again to get an increased subsidy, for it cannot with this amount reach Chicoutimi.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This subsidy will not prevent the parties coming back if they find it necessary.

To the Temisconata Railway Company, for 20 miles of their branch railway from Edmundston towards the St. Francis River, in the Province of Quebec, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 50-51 Victoria, Chapter 24, a subsidy of \$100,000.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). There is a mistake in the resolution. It should be "St. John River" instead of "St. Francis River."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It should be St. John.

To the Quebec Central Railway Company, for the construction and completion of a line of railway from Saint Francis station to a point on the Atlantic and North-West Railway, near Moose Head Lake, 90 miles, in lieu of the balance of the subsidy, unearned, granted by 47 Victoria, Chapter 8, a subsidy not exceeding \$23,345 per annum for twenty years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on the bonds of the company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Strike out \$23,345 and substitute \$21,191.54 and add at the end: "such annual subsidy for twenty years, representing a grant in cash of \$288,000." Also change "Moose Head Lake" to "Moose River."

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec). Have the Government ascertained that that subsidy will be sufficient to enable the company to build the railway? I think they asked \$500,000 last year to build it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think there is any doubt of their being able to build it with this subsidy.

To the Central Railway Company of New Brunswick, a grant as subsidy (the road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 lbs. per lineal yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed authorising their transfer to the company) of 4,052 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to the St. Martin's and Upham Railway Company, now forming part of the Central Railway, which rails and fastenings stand in the Public Accounts as an asset of \$33,612 54.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to call the attention of the hon. the Finance Minister to the necessity of seeing, when bargains of this kind are made, that the railway should be run. This St. Martin's and Upham Railway does not run in winter at all, nor does the Kent Northern. I will not find

fault with the latter because the proprietor did as well as he could, but the St. Martin's and Upham road ceases to run in winter entirely. The Caraquette road closed up last winter at a very awkward time, when a number of the merchants of St. John were trying to make shipments of fish to the West Indies, as an experiment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that this resolution will go a long way towards accomplishing the object he has in view, because the company go to the expense of railing their track with new steel rails, and until they do that they cannot obtain any advantage from this resolution. This will render the company much more likely to continue to keep their road open than formerly. I do not think there was any condition made, when these rails were originally lent, of the kind the hon. gentleman refers to, but it would have been a very proper condition.

Mr. ELLIS. With regard to the Caraquette road, I think the Dominion has given it about \$180,000 so far, and that road was shut up all winter, so much so that it became a matter of enquiry in the Legislature.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That was very wrong.

To the Elgin Petitcodiac and Havelock Railway Company of New Brunswick, a grant as subsidy (the road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 lbs. per lineal yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed authorising their transfer to the Company) of 2,201 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to the Elgin Branch Railway, now forming part of the Elgin, Petitcodiac and Havelock Railway, which rails and fastenings stand in the Public Accounts as an asset for \$4,252 82.

To the Kent Northern Railway Company of New Brunswick, a grant as subsidy (the road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 lbs. per lineal yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed authorising their transfer to the company) of 2,549 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to this company, which rails and fastenings stand in the Public Accounts as an asset for \$58,334 27.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Will there be any time fixed for making this change?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, but they cannot obtain possession of the old rails until the track is laid with new steel rails, so that they get no benefit until they make the change.

To the Halifax Cotton Company, of Nova Scotia, a grant as subsidy (the road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 lbs. per lineal yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed authorising their transfer to the company) of 233 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to the company, which rails and fastenings stand in the Public Accounts as an asset for \$1,335.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister of Finance to explain this. An amount of \$69,000 was paid by the city of Halifax for constructing that siding, and it appears to me that, if any grant is to be made, it should be made *pro rata* to the city of Halifax. I have no objection to the granting of the amount, but I think it should not be granted to the Cotton Company when the city actually paid for the siding. Then, I presume that the Cotton Company have no control over the branch as against the public, but it is open to the public?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume so—certainly.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I know that an impression prevailed that the company could control it in some way, but I understand that is not the case, and it should be so stated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This does not change the position at all. Whenever they put the new steel rails, whoever the owners of the road may be will receive the old rails.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The road belongs to the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think so.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is a part of the Intercolonial Railway, and I think the Government should return this

amount to the city of Halifax, as the road belongs to the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think so.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It must belong either to the Government or to the company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We let them have the rails and we run the road, but I do not understand that this road belongs to the Government, because, if that were so, this would be entirely unnecessary, as the rails would be ours.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understand that a part of the cost was paid by the company and there was some expenditure by the Government, and \$9,000 was paid by the city of Halifax.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That was an assistance which was given to the company.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If you are going to make a rebate, the taxpayers of Halifax ought to have a share.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The citizens of Halifax simply gave, as we gave, some assistance to the company to build the road.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes, but if you are making a return, the citizens of Halifax are entitled to a share.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are not making any return, but simply enabling the company to change the old rails for steel rails.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). But it is a Government road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think so. If it were so, this resolution would be entirely unnecessary.

To the Steel Company of Canada, in Nova Scotia, a grant as subsidy (the road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 lbs. per lineal yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed authorising their transfer to the company) of 597 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to the company, and which rails stand in the Public Accounts as an asset for \$11,964.66.

To the Albert Railway Company of New Brunswick, a grant as subsidy (the section of road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 lbs. per lineal yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed authorising their transfer to the company) of 726 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to the company, and which rails and fastenings stand in the Public Accounts as an asset for \$14,665.45.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think that is in the hands of a receiver at present, and is taken out of the hands of the company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That will not affect it. If the receiver puts down new steel rails, we will have to give the iron rails to the receiver.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It is the same in regard to the Chatham branch.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

To the Chatham Branch Railway of New Brunswick, a grant as subsidy (the road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 lbs. per yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed authorising their transfer to the company) of 958 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to this company, which rails and fastenings stand in the Public Accounts as an asset for \$24,439.84.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may state to the Minister—not that I can very accurately speak of it, but from general information—that the chief proprietor of that road has already laid a very considerable portion of it with steel rails, two or three years ago, and I suppose it will be understood that that is a compliance with this provision if he completes it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If he puts new steel rails there, he will have a right to the old rails.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know that he laid down the new steel rails. The old rails were so bad that he had to lay these new rails, but what I want to know is, if the new

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

rails were laid two or three years ago or one year ago, if they are good steel rails, whether that will be considered a compliance with the terms of the resolution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think so.

On resolution 2,

All the lines, for construction of which subsidies are granted, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August next, and be completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications, and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, and which the Government is hereby empowered to make; the location also of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; and all said subsidies respectively, payable in cash, shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister or upon completion of the work subsidised.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I should like to ask in what condition the Short Line Railway is, when it will be opened, and what the savings will be in distance between Montreal and St. John and between Montreal and Halifax, because it has been stated that, owing to changes in the route, the saving will not be so great as by the route originally contemplated. I would also like to ask in what position the negotiations are in reference to the Western Counties Railway, as to filling up the gap between Annapolis and Digby. Perhaps the Minister might tell the House at what time the operations there will be commenced.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman did not give me notice of these questions, because I would have been in a position to give more precise information than I can now. I should be afraid from memory to estimate the saving in distance by the Short Line Railway, but I think I can get the figures from the engineer, and at a future stage, probably to-night, I may be able to answer the hon. gentleman. I may say that I understand that it is anticipated that, in September, the road will be opened to St. John, and the other portion of the road from Harvey Junction to Moncton will be immediately proceeded with and completed within the time stated in the contract. I will, however, get the exact distance from the chief engineer of railways, and make a statement to-night what that distance will be. I regret to say that the information has been somewhat unsatisfactory with reference to the arrangements that Mr. Plunkett was making in England within the last few days. A hitch has occurred. I was informed by Messrs. Baring that the matter had been arranged, and that a very powerful syndicate had engaged to underwrite the bonds, that the money was all forthcoming, and that the matter was settled. But some legal question has arisen between Mr. Plunkett and the parties with whom he was making the arrangement, so that I believe the matter is not at this moment in so secure a position as I was led to understand by a communication from the Messrs. Baring a short time ago.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am very sorry to hear that any hitch has occurred; but, in the event of satisfactory arrangements being concluded, is the hon. gentleman in a position to say what course the Government will pursue with respect to undertaking that work? The Minister of Railways informed us last Session that, in the event of negotiations failing with private parties, the Government would immediately proceed to undertake the work themselves. A considerable time has now elapsed. We supposed, from the information we had of Mr. Plunkett's negotiations, that he would be able to carry through this consolidation scheme, and I regret very much that there has

been any failure in that respect. But if such should unfortunately prove to be the case, and he should not succeed, will the Government then undertake the work? Will they allow it to remain any longer, or will they not proceed, as was intimated by the Minister of Railways last Session, to have that gap completed without more delay?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is aware that the House has authorised the Government to put in that gap themselves, and they attach the greatest importance to that gap being completed at an early day. I have no doubt that unless satisfactory arrangements can be made promptly to carry out that 15 miles that is required to connect the Windsor and Annapolis Railway with the Western Counties Railway, and give us direct communication between Halifax and Yarmouth, the Government will promptly undertake the work.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 149) to authorise the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

Bill read the first and second times, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to add after the words "completion of each section of the railway" the words "to the satisfaction of the Minister of Railways."

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why not say to the satisfaction of the department?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think we had better say the Minister, because the Minister must have a report from his engineer; so it amounts to the same thing.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY—PAUPER IMMIGRATION.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to make a motion, but I have a few words to say before we separate on a question which I have twice brought to the notice of the Minister of Agriculture, a question that is attracting a good deal of attention in my Province at any rate, and especially in the chief cities. Hon. gentlemen will, I dare say, recollect that I interrogated the Minister of Agriculture some weeks ago, almost a month ago, on the question whether the Government had seen fit to take precautions to prevent unfit persons from settling in Canada, in view of the large immigration which was expected. After that I brought the subject a second time under his consideration with respect to certain resolutions passed by the city council of Toronto, who declared on their authority as municipal officers that a considerable number of such persons had in the past been made chargeable on the public rates. I do not know whether the Minister's attention has been directed to the subject, but since that time there has been a considerable number of complaints in the newspapers pointing out that a large number, or, at all events, an appreciable percentage of these persons who were coming out, were persons who had been apparently shipped to this country by divers charitable institutions and municipal bodies in England, for the purpose of getting rid of weakly and infirm persons who were apt to become a charge on their parish rates. Now, I happen to know that is a practice which has been had recourse to more or less by English parish authorities on several occasions, and I know also that the American authorities

have had to take rather severe steps to prevent that country from being made a sort of dumping ground, as it was properly called, for the refuse of the European population. I entertain myself, and a good many other gentlemen entertain, rather strong views as to the expediency of preventing that, and I take this opportunity of pointing out to the Minister, and also to his colleagues, that they must be held responsible if, in the present immigration which is now coming to Canada, any percentage of those persons, such as I have described, are allowed to land on our shores, without steps being taken either to punish those who land them or send those persons back to the land from whence they came. There appears to be a likelihood that this evil to which I have alluded may assume considerable proportions. I have received private despatches from one or two quarters, in which the parties intimate that the statements made in some of the newspapers, notably in the *Mail* newspaper, are not exaggerated, and that a certain percentage, how large I cannot say, but that a certain number of persons, who are unfit to become good or useful settlers, are now being landed in Canada; and, therefore, I desire to take this occasion of pointing out that the Government has been warned once, twice and thrice over against the risk, and that apparently the Government have not taken, and are not taking, any efficient steps to prevent that class of persons being brought into this country; and I would add this, that I have myself over and over again interrogated persons who were brought to this country by the representations of different immigration agents. I am unwilling to believe that the regularly authorised agents of the country could have made such representations as those poor persons alleged to have been made to them, but I have no doubt whatever that a great many of the agents of the railways and steamship companies are utterly unscrupulous in inducing persons to come to this country either as assisted immigrants or in any other way. They care nothing whether those persons are fit or unfit to become settlers of Canada, and I am inclined to believe that in the future the evil will increase unless tolerably stringent steps are taken by the Government to make it very unprofitable and very unpleasant for any steamship company or any association whatever to be concerned in bringing that class of people here; and, further, I am strongly of the opinion that many of those persons should be returned to the country from which they came at the expense of the parties who landed them on our shores, and particularly the steamboat companies. I have many times, as I have said, conversed with those persons who came here, and I think that inducements were held, which were impossible of fulfilment, and they are brought here sometimes under circumstances of extreme hardship, and very often have to make their way back again. That is the lesser of the two evils, and I would far rather that such persons should find their way back again than remain here. There is another point to be considered, and it is this: that a very considerable number of our own people are leaving this country, and when you bring this class of persons here you, to a considerable extent, contribute to drive out persons who form a much more valuable class of the population, our own people. I think before we part the Government should give us some assurance that effective steps will be taken in this matter. If the Minister of Agriculture will examine some of the reports made, which appear to be credible, and which to a certain extent were confirmed by the statements made, as I have said, by private parties in communications made to me, the hon. gentlemen will agree that there is a risk that this may become a rather serious evil, and that the Government should take steps to render this kind of thing impossible for the future.

Mr. CARLING. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the Government are quite alive to the necessity of preventing

pauper immigration coming into this country, and, as I stated before when the Estimates were under discussion, steps had been taken by communicating with our agents in England, Ireland and Scotland, and also with the steamboat companies and their agents, and protesting in the strongest manner against any pauper emigrants being brought to Canada. With regard to the statements that have been made by my hon. friend as to pauper immigrants being dumped into the city of Toronto, I may say that a statement of that kind was sent to the department and also to the Immigration Committee. The Immigration Committee as well as the Department of Agriculture wrote back to the city of Toronto asking for particulars, and up to the present time we have not received any reply. We wanted to ascertain where those immigrants came from, and exactly how many there were, and when they were dumped in Toronto, so that we could make enquiries to where they had come from, and protest against their being brought into the country. I can only assure my hon. friend that I am quite alive to the necessity of preventing unsuitable immigrants coming to the country, and I am sure the Government will take every step possible to prevent such immigrants arriving here.

Mr. TROW. I am under the impression, Sir, that this matter has been somewhat exaggerated. We all know that during the winter season a number of people from the rural districts who cannot get employment congregate in our cities and towns, and that the result is they become objects of charity. I know from the papers published in the old country, which I consider very good authority, that all those who were sent out here by benevolent and charitable institutions are thoroughly inspected, before they leave these homes, by medical men, and that a very small proportion, not more than one-seventh of those that are in those homes, are sent out here. It is, I believe, the best class as a rule that are sent out. In the city of Stratford, in which I reside, it is a pleasant sight to see those little waifs walking around and taking an airing under their respective teachers at certain hours in the day. We can see that in many instances they have a more healthy appearance even than our own children. I believe that the matter has been exceedingly exaggerated. Our country requires population, and if we can get children reared to the ages of 10 or 12 years, brought out from the old country, it is very desirable that we should have them. I deprecate the policy of individuals, and of the Government, in endeavoring to check those from emigrating, for we require immigration as our lands are totally useless without settlers. The moment they come here they add something to the revenue of this country. They must add to it being consumers, and in a very short time they become producers, and thus add to the wealth of this great nation as we do ourselves. If we had a million of such waifs spread over the Dominion—in Manitoba and the North-West, in the Lake St. John region, and in many other portions of Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, and Ontario, where there are plenty of lands for settlement, it would be much better for the country. It would be much more preferable, instead of checking immigration of that description, that we should have thousands come out here of the proper class.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend wholly misunderstand me and probably did not listen to what I was saying.

Mr. TROW. Yes, I did.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was not referring to the immigration of children from those homes at all. It may be good or it may be bad, and I have nothing to say about it. I was referring to a totally distinct and most undesirable class of immigration, and I know, whether the hon. gentleman does or not, that a considerable number of pauper and infirm immigrants, who would be a charge on the parish rates at home, have been brought to this country.

Mr. CARLING.

I know, if my hon. friend does not, that in England the parochial authorities have attempted, and are attempting, to send a considerable number of that class here, and I know, if my hon. friend does not know, that they have been charged in my own city of Kingston to a very considerable extent on the benevolence of the inhabitants. I am informed that the case is the same in Toronto and other towns. I speak only of what I know, and I have seen a number of immigrants brought out here who ought never to have been sent out as settlers to Canada; people who were not fit to be settlers, and who could only be charges on the country. I know perfectly well from experience of the old country in former times, and from what I know is taking place there now, that the English parochial authorities are constantly disposed to get rid of those burdens and to shift them on other countries. The immigration expenses out here have become so very trifling that it is far cheaper for the parochial authorities in the old country to pay the passages for those people than to keep them for a single half year in the poor-house at home. There is a risk here, and I think that the Minister of Finance, who has paid attention to the subject, knows that there is a risk. As to the absolute percentage I cannot speak, but the thing has been done, is being done, and in my judgment—but that is only a matter of opinion—is likely to be much more extensively done, unless you take pains to prevent it. But the children in what are called the Barnardo and other homes are a totally distinct class, and I have not made any reference to them, because I do not know anything about them. It may be and perhaps is the case, although it is disputed, that the greater portion of those poor little waifs—who certainly do deserve compassion if any human beings do—are brought out at a sufficiently early age to become valuable citizens. What I refer to is the pauper immigrant who cannot be made and never will be made a very good settler.

Mr. SPROULE. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation I may say that this subject has engaged our attention at considerable length. The only two districts in Canada from which complaints about immigrants came were the cities of Toronto and Montreal. Upon investigation it was found that every single one of those parties complained of in the city of Montreal, was employed at remunerative wages and was doing well. So far the complaint was not by any means well founded, and I believe it was disproven. The committee sent back to Toronto for information to find out how many immigrants were complained of, their nationality and every information about them, but up to the last sitting of the committee such information was not received and we have no information as regards Toronto to let us know whether the evil was great or small, or to enable us to remedy it. At all events those were the only two places in Canada from which complaints came.

Gen. LAURIE. As I have had a good deal to do with assisting and bringing emigrants to this country and advising people to come out here, I may perhaps contribute a word to this discussion. The immigrant from England is advised to come out here in the spring and he is told that this is the time when there is plenty of work. Spring in England and here are not exactly at the same time, and the emigrant starts under the impression that he will arrive in this country when the spring work is going on. He arrives in March. The farmer does not want a large amount of labor then, and as the immigrant is landed in a town he is forced to remain there and the people feel that he is a burden upon them. They would rather he did not come. They complain that he is an unsuitable and undesirable immigrant because the unfortunate man is unable to get work. Over and over again the immigration agent at Halifax has written to me in March and April, asking me if I could find work

for immigrants. The steamships can only bring a certain number at each passage, and those who arrive early cannot get work; the immigration agent does his best to place them, but in spite of every effort a certain number remain idle on his hands. But now the case is different. He writes:

"A short time since I could not get the places to put people into, but now I cannot get people to fill the places."

There is the secret. The immigrants come before the work is ready for them in the agricultural districts, and necessarily they are left in the towns until that work opens up. Then there is more than enough work for them

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not want to prolong this discussion, but as chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Colonisation, I may be pardoned if I say a word or two with reference to what has fallen from the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I agree with him that it is the duty of the department to use every effort in their power to prevent the immigration of the pauper inhabitants of workhouses. This subject, as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has stated, was brought to the attention of the committee by a resolution passed by the City Council of Toronto, and that resolution was supported before the committee by Mr. Jury on behalf of the Knights of Labor. But both the resolution and the statements made by Mr. Jury were indefinite as to the kind of people who were seeking employment in Toronto. We were unable to ascertain from the statements made before the committee whether those people who were willing to work during the winter for \$3 a week were immigrants who had come out during the past season, or natives of Canada, or persons who had resided in the country a considerable length of time. I do not propose to refer to the other matter to which the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) has referred, because that is not, as I understand it, the objection which the hon. member for South Oxford makes. His objection is that pauper immigrants ought not to be allowed to come to the country. I entirely agree with him, and the Committee on Immigration and Colonisation took the same view, and if the Government adopt steps to prevent the immigration of these pauper immigrants, I think they will be doing a good work for the country. I do not think, however, that an able-bodied immigrant coming from the other side of the water, who is able and willing to work, ought to be prevented from coming to Canada because he happens to have no means. It is the infirm and those who are unable to help themselves, and who are likely to be made a charge upon the charitable institutions of this country, who ought to be prevented from coming here if possible, and I think that might be done by the department making representations through the High Commissioner to the parochial authorities in the old country. A complaint also came to the committee from Montreal, indirectly through Mr. Jury, that certain Belgians had been induced to come to this country, as they supposed under the authority of the Government of Canada, by a Mr. Wattela, who had used paper on which he had printed the heading of the department of immigration in Canada, and who had made contracts with them to come to Canada, promising them a certain rate of wages. Those immigrants came to Montreal, and the complaint made was that the agreement which Mr. Wattela had made with them had not been carried out, that work was not found for them at the rates agreed upon when they left their own country. That was something which the Government had no control over, and which it was impossible for them to provide against. But on investigation it was found that although they were disappointed in the engagement they had made with Mr. Wattela, they had all found employment shortly after their arrival in Montreal. So that the complaints made to the committee were very limited in number, and the evidence given before the committee went to show that the evil did not exist to so great an extent as was repre-

mented, or there would have been stronger representations than those that were made. But if the evil exists, I think the department ought to adopt such measures as will prevent that class of immigrants to whom the hon. member for South Oxford refers, from coming into the country.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. member for South Oxford said that he knew of his own knowledge that a number of these parties had been brought to Kingston, and were now a charge on that locality. We have an immigration agent at Kingston, a very excellent man, who makes a report to us every month of the number and class of immigrants who arrive there, and we have not received from him any report that any such as the hon. member describes have been dumped down there. But if the hon. member is aware of his own knowledge that a number of such parties have been brought to Kingston, I shall be exceedingly obliged if he will let the department have the information—the names of the parties, where they came from, how many, and who brought them to the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will cause a communication to be made to the hon. gentleman; but I did not refer to this season's operations, but to the assistance which had been given by charitable societies and persons in Kingston to that class of persons. It was what one might call the *débris* of last year's operations that I referred to, not this year's. And I do not know that they were brought to Kingston. They trooped back, I suppose, as is commonly the case.

Mr. CARLING. I would like to obtain information about those persons who become a charge on the municipalities; but I believe that in many cases they are people who go to the large cities from the country. I know that in the city of London, which I represent, and in other cities are to be found people who have become indigent and paupers and have drifted there from the country, and I fancy that when the returns are obtained it will be found that a large number are from rural districts. However, I shall be glad if the hon. gentleman can give the department information as to those parties he mentions, either as to this year or last year. I can assure the hon. member that the Government are taking every precaution to prevent anything like a pauper immigration being brought to this country.

Mr. LAURIER. I think there can be no doubt that in certain parts of Europe the municipal authorities have been in the habit of sending to this country paupers who have been a charge on them. They are to be found both in the United States and in this country. Whoever has been in Quebec could not but feel sad at the condition of these people, and could not but realise at once that they were not fit to be immigrants at all, and could be of no service to the community, but, on the contrary, a charge upon it. The hon. gentleman says that he will take steps to prevent this; but what steps will he take? As I understand, he will instruct his agents in Europe to protest against these people being sent out here.

Mr. CARLING. The Government have power under proclamation to prevent these people landing, and if we find through our agents at Halifax or at Quebec that any large number of them are being brought to the country, we shall issue a proclamation to prevent them landing.

Mr. LAURIER. I was going to remark that the United States authorities would not hesitate, in certain instances, to avail themselves of a similar power.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether any steps have been taken to get Mr. Baker to return to Qu'Appelle, and whether he is really now as much needed up there as the hon. gentleman sup-

posed he was, when we were discussing this subject before? The hon. gentleman knows that the election in Russell is over, and there is not the same urgent necessity for his presence in Russell that there was three weeks ago, and I am sure the House will be interested in knowing whether Mr. Baker has been instructed by the hon. gentleman to return to his post of ordinary duty, seeing the extra work is ended.

Mr. CARLING. I may state to my hon. friend, who takes such an interest in Mr. Baker's welfare, that Mr. Baker had a perfect right to ask for leave of absence, and it is not usual to refuse leave when asked for, especially as Mr. Baker is a very good officer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No doubt, he is a very good officer.

Mr. CARLING. He is a very good officer, and a highly respectable man—a man who at one time represented a constituency in the Local Legislature. I believe he is now at Qu'Appelle attending to his duties, after having visited his friends in the county of Russell.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has not dealt with Mr. Baker exactly in the same way, in consequence of his exercise of his perfect right, as he dealt with the French translators, who were endeavoring to exercise their perfect right.

Mr. CARLING. I am not aware that Mr. Baker has taken upon himself to abuse any member of Parliament or vilify his character.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It is not my intention to prolong the discussion, nor would I have made any remarks whatever had it not been for the remarks made by the hon. member for East Grey. That hon. gentleman virtually ignores the statements of those who have made complaints in reference to immigrants in Montreal, when he said the complaints made were totally disproved.

Mr. SPROULE. I said with regard to parties not being employed; I did not say with regard to the difference between the wages they expected to get and the wages they got.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Well, with regard to the parties not being employed, I totally differ from the hon. gentleman as to the proof which he believes to be substantially correct. We have letters and statements from parties living there that these people were not employed and were in need, and that they had been totally, or nearly so, neglected. Now, what proof have we to the contrary? We have two letters, one from Mr. Daly, immigration agent, and the other from the other immigration agent in Montreal. I should say that the opinions of parties not interested should have as much weight with the House as those of the agents, who are interested in showing that they attended to their work and whose interest it is to make as favorable a report as possible. I do not wish to say a word against immigration, but I say that the course suggested by the hon. member for South Oxford is the proper one for the Government to pursue. They should exercise vigilance to see that those immigrants who come here should be of the right kind; and I hope that in the future the Government will see that we have a better class coming to this country than many of those who have already been sent out.

Mr. SPROULE. If there is anything like authentic information to be had, we have reason to believe that we have it. The hon. gentleman discredits the Government agent who wrote the report, giving the names of these men, where employed, and what wages they were getting, and who showed that the lowest wages were \$1 a day, and the highest \$2.50 per day. I do not see what better informa-

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

tion we could have. We have further the evidence of another gentleman, who, I believe, is a reputable man, to the same effect.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before you leave the Chair, Sir, I would like to ask the Government how item 12, "for grounds around public buildings at Ottawa, \$9,500," is spent? Is that for the purpose of keeping up the conservatory?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is expended in keeping the grounds and the conservatory and the gardens around the buildings in good order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What does the conservatory cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say just now, as I have not my memoranda here. There are two men employed there, and, of course, during the summer, two or three more to look after the gardens.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I mention this because the other day I visited that institution, and asked the caretaker if he would give me a flower. In reply, he said he had received instructions not to give out any flowers, that they were used exclusively for the Ministers' tables. I would like to know just how much we have to pay for the Ministers' flowers.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would call the attention of the Government to the fact that during this Session there have been ninety-nine Orders of the House granted for returns. I have endeavored to get a few returns that I ordered very early in the Session, one as early as the 27th February. That return is not brought down yet, and there are two others. Three returns have been brought down. The Minister of Agriculture brought down one a short time ago. But I would call the attention of the Government to this point: If we are to discharge our duties as an Opposition, we must be furnished with the necessary information to enable us to examine into the public expenditure. There are several returns that I have asked for in regard to matters which I was very anxious to examine into which have not been brought down, and it is impossible for members on this side of the House to discharge their duties if they are not furnished with the returns which are necessary to enable them to investigate the public expenditure. I find that during this Session there have been ninety-nine returns ordered, and up to this date only thirty-nine have been laid before the House. That is virtually about one in three, and sixty returns have not been brought down. I do not think members make motions for the mere fun of making them. They certainly have some object in asking for a return. I suppose it is impossible to expect, at this late stage of the Session, that we should get these returns; but, if this system is going to be continued next Session, it must cripple the members of the Opposition in discharging their duty to the country, and the country expects us to discharge our duty as well as it expects hon. gentlemen opposite to discharge theirs.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Whenever the House orders returns, the Order of the House is sent to the department to which the matter belongs, and there they prepare the papers as fast as they can. Some of these returns involve a great deal of work—some of them the work of months. I do not know what special returns the hon. gentleman speaks of, but I believe that the departments work as well as they can in getting up the returns for the House. I agree with the hon. gentleman that they ought to be prepared as fast as possible and sent down to the House; and I may say further that I think, whenever they are ready, they should be sent to the Clerk of the House during the recess, so that they may be accessible to members who desire to look them up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I might be permitted to suggest that possibly the Government are a little too

careless in allowing returns to go without considering whether they can be granted within a reasonable time and without informing members whether they can be got during the Session. Sometimes hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House move for returns, without at all intending to inflict a great amount of work on the departments; and the Ministers and those who have happened to be in the Ministry know that some of these will involve a great deal of labor and a great deal of expense, and I think it would be better for the Government to consider these motions for returns a little more carefully than they have been in the habit of doing before they are granted. The policy apparently has been to grant these returns as a matter of course, without stating whether they can be brought down during the Session or not. It is clear that one-third of all the returns ordered during the Session is a very small proportion to be brought down. I think that, this Session, scarcely one half of the returns moved for in previous Sessions have been ordered, but scarcely one-half of those ordered have been brought down.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think the Government ought to answer the enquiry of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) with a laugh.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With a laugh?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, the hon. gentleman has forgotten that he laughed, but that is the only reply we have yet had from the Government benches in reference to the grounds. My hon. friend made an enquiry so as to bring the expenditure on these grounds under the attention of the House and the country. The observation which was made to him by the caretaker shows that this expenditure has been incurred for the special benefit of Ministers. We have salaries voted for the payment of Ministers, and we vote the travelling expenses of the Ministers which, when they are travelling on public business, are paid for out of the public treasury; then we have a large sum paid for the cab-hire of Ministers which has been supposed to be a personal charge upon the Ministers themselves formerly, but has been charged against the public treasury when Ministers were seeking their own comfort rather than the public interest; but, when the Ministers have taken charge of the greenhouse here, and the flowers which are intended for the adornment of the grounds, and when they give special instructions that those flowers are intended for the adornment of the tables of Ministers when they are giving dinner parties, I think the public ought to know it; they ought to know whether this is in accordance with the line drawn by the Speaker in reference to my hon. friend when he was taking some ladies to the gallery the other day or not. The general impression in years gone by has been that Ministers stood on the same footing as any other hon. member of the House. I believe the expenditure on these grounds amounts to many thousands of dollars a year, and I would like to know whether, after all, it would not be better and cheaper in the public interest to pay the Ministers \$2,000 or \$3,000 a year more and get rid of this particular charge which is made in their interest and on their behalf. Of course it is all right that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches should have an opportunity of discharging their public duties with efficiency and with dignity, and with that ability which so eminently distinguishes so large a number of them, especially the ability which they exhibit in regard to the masterly inactivity which has attended upon their proposed legislation. But I think the charge has been made by my hon. friend and the statement which was made to him, as he says, that the greenhouse is the exclusive preserve of the Ministers of the Crown—that it is intended for their exclusive use and benefit, that it is to provide flowers to adorn their dinner tables when they invite their guests,

and entertain them in order to promote that personal cordiality which ought to exist between Ministers and those who support them, in order to smooth down the differences which sometimes occur, and of which we saw one example this Session when there was almost a disruption created between the First Minister and the Minister of Finance, when we saw the First Minister compelled to eat humble pie and to change his policy in the face of Parliament—suggests that perhaps more flowers may be necessary to smooth over these difficulties and to add to the comfort and pleasure of the hon. gentlemen and those who support them. We ought to know what the facts are, and we ought to have some information from the hon. gentleman before we adjourn. I suppose they are anxious to get away. I am sure I am.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You have only just come.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think they might take this opportunity of telling the House what the situation is, and what are the special claims of Ministers upon this portion of the public expenditure?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose we must accept this as the masterly review of the Session by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). It is a sort of omnibus speech, for he refers to a great many subjects. In regard to the flowers, of which an hon. member was deprived, as he says, because they were wanted for some Minister's table, all I can say is that, if my colleagues have been getting flowers from the conservatory, I am very badly used, for I have not had my share. Then the hon. gentleman talks about cab-hire. I have a pretty good lill for cab-hire. I am an old man, and my house is a good distance away, and I am afraid that, as long as I hold my present office, the Canadian taxpayer must consent to pay for those cabs. The hon. member for South Oxford says he thinks there is a good deal of laxity in the granting of motions for returns. I suppose the hon. gentleman looks back to his own experience as a Minister, and I think he remembers that was a fault of his Government, if it be a fault, and of every Government. It is a delicate thing to refuse a motion for a return, and my experience has been that whenever a motion for a return has been refused there has been a great deal of grumbling, and the Government are charged—at all events, when we were in Opposition—I have heard it often charged against the Government: Oh, it is an attempt to suppress or conceal matters, when returns have been refused. But it is true that hon. members are too apt to move for returns when they are not wanted, when they can be of no use in the public interest; sometimes from curiosity, sometimes for the purpose of getting a hit at somebody else, and sometimes from utter ignorance of the quantity of work that the return involves, and the consequent expense. If the Opposition to-day would support the Government in objecting to returns that were moved for, when the mover does not explain at the time the object that the return is asked for, I think there will be fewer returns asked for, and a very considerable saving of money.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I suggested to the hon. gentleman was this: I agree with him that it requires a very strong case to refuse a member a motion for a return, when he declares in his place in Parliament that he wants it. I suggest that the Ministers, who understand what will be involved in a particular return, should be at pains, instead of passing it as a matter of course, to explain to the member that such and such a return will take a long time and involve a considerable amount of cost. My hon. friends behind me, I know, are all reasonable men, extremely reasonable, and do not want to inflict unnecessary trouble on the departments, or unnecessary cost on the country; and if the Minister states that particular returns will be costly, I am sure my hon. friends will

not press for them, unless there be a very good reason. If, after a Minister makes such a statement, then the hon. member chooses to say, I admit all that, still, I require it, then I would advise that the return be granted, as a rule, unless there is very strong ground to the contrary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Put the responsibility on the member.

Mr. McMULLEN. The returns I asked for were in connection with colonisation companies in the North-West. Now that return was ordered more than two months ago. I wished to learn the number of colonisation companies, the amount of money they have paid out, the settlers they have brought in, and the cost of inspection. I asked, also, for a return, on the 27th February, in connection with the cost of a law suit, the Queen vs. the St. Catharine's Milling and Lumber Company. That cannot be a very expensive return.

Mr. MITCHELL. There was a lawyers' bill in it, of great length.

Mr. McMULLEN. I dare say it would be lengthy, and we want to know what the amount of those costs were.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I want to mention another matter that was brought to my attention last night, which I consider of so much importance to the farming community of this country that I must bring it before the House. A gentleman was talking to me last night about the experimental farm, over which the Minister of Agriculture presides with so much ability. It is well known to the House that the agricultural farms cost a large amount of money, which is expended with a view of directing greater attention to the cause of agriculture. It appears that last year, on the experimental farm in Ottawa, a large quantity of roots was raised—the Minister of Agriculture will testify if I am rightly informed—and the department selected men to take charge of those roots. They housed them and paid no attention to ventilation, and in the spring when they came to take the roots out, they were all rotten. And an hon. member called and said: "Why, these roots should have been ventilated, and if they had been ventilated, they would not have rotted." The man in charge said "I give you to understand, Sir, that this is an experimental farm."

Mr. SPROULE. They are getting ventilated now all right.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. Minister of Public Works did not reply to the hon. member for Grey with reference to the necessity of this green-house. For what purpose is it kept up? He says there are two or three men there. Why should the country be called upon to pay two or three men simply for keeping up a green-house? We are told at last that the flowers are not for the Ministers' tables, but, what is the necessity for the expenditure under that head?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The green-house is for the purpose of keeping plants ready for the spring. The flowers are kept there during the winter and in the spring they are transplanted. They are probably being transplanted at this moment on the gardens on these grounds. If we had no green-house, we should have to purchase the flowers every spring.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You can buy them for one-quarter or one-half less.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the same everywhere that there are large gardens. We have a place where the plants are removed in the fall in order to keep them during winter until spring. The hon. gentleman knows all about that in Halifax.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Since the Speaker gave up having dinners, there is no necessity for flowers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. AMYOT. I beg to communicate to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence a small matter which is important to the parties concerned. The following letter is communicated to me:—

"OTTAWA, 7th May, 1888.

"SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 23rd ultimo, I am directed by the Minister of Militia and Defence to inform you that the names of Silas Alexander Ramsay, John D. O'Neil, Ira James Barwis and Wellington Edgar Bowell, have not been returned as entitled to certificates for land grant or scrip.

"In order that their claims may be entertained, it is necessary that this department may be furnished, through the general officer commanding the Militia, with a certificate of service from the officer under whom the above mentioned applicants served.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"HENRY PANET, Colonel,

"Deputy Minister Militia and Defence.

"JAMES WALKER, Esq.,
"Calgary, Alberta, N. W. T."

Major Walker, of Calgary, transmitted the same to me with the following letter:—

"I enclose you communication from the Militia Department, which explains itself. You will remember these men were on scouting duty, north of Calgary, and drew pay as such on pay roll signed and certified to by you. I believe as scouts in other parts of the Territory received the scrip, these men should be entitled to it also. Would you please take the matter in hand for them, and if possible furnish the Militia Department with the necessary certificate."

Mr. Speaker, I must say that when I left Calgary I received a letter from Major General Strange who had been commanding in the North-West, and he asked me to send a report of the operations of the 9th, and of the usefulness of the 9th in that part of the country where it had been scattered here and there. I sent that report, and I never saw it afterwards published or referred to. It showed part of the work done by the French battalion in the North-West, which has been suppressed. I do not know upon whom the responsibility rests—but what the 9th Battalion did there has not been made known to the country and certainly this is unfair, for both the public and the battalion have a right to know what work was done in the North-West. I expect that between the close of this Session and next Session a remedy will be introduced for that omission which is a very serious one. There was part of the report of Major General Strange suppressed, and the whole of my report concerning the 9th Battalion has been suppressed. As to these men to whom I have referred, I am sure if they are entitled to scrip and did not receive it, it was not my fault. I am only stating the facts that occurred, as it is my duty to do. Their names will be found in the many thousand vouchers which I signed when at Calgary, where I was acting as commandant of the force there, being the senior officer. I was left there without any instructions except on two points, which I need not particularise. As such commander I signed all sorts of vouchers, and the names of these men will be found there. If they are entitled to scrip, I think enquiry should be made in the matter, and they should receive the scrip as did any others who served the country during those troubles.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There can be no possible objection to enquiry being made again in reference to the names to which the hon. gentleman has just referred. The hon. gentleman must understand that the scrip was given under a statute passed by Parliament, and it was impossible for the department to go beyond the strict letter of the law which specified the special cases in which scrip should be given. I will make it a point to look into the matter again; but the return, which speaks for itself, and which the hon. gentleman has just mentioned, evidently indicates that those men would not be entitled to their scrip, otherwise there can be no possible reason why they should have been kept out of it. As to the other point to which the hon. gentleman has referred, the report of Major-General Strange, that matter has been brought up before Parliament already,

and it was then shown by the report and by the answer given by the Major-General that that portion of the report which referred to the military operations had been published. There could be no reason why any portion of any report should be kept out of the general report which was published and laid on the Table of Parliament. However, this is a matter which again can be very easily ascertained by referring to the report which the Major-General has made and which was presented through me to Parliament.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not want any exception to be made in the case of those men to whom I have referred, but I simply want their case to be treated the same as other cases. If they are entitled to scrip under the statute it should be given to them, and that matter should not be affected by the question as to whether part of a report was suppressed or not, for I wish to see justice done to them. As to the fact of the suppression of part of the report of Major General Strange and the whole of my report, I do not wish to bring this matter up now, and I only mentioned it incidentally; but I hope the hon. gentleman will again look into the matter and see that justice is done, and if not I will call attention to it next Session.

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

(In the Committee.)

Fishery overseers, N.B. \$16,000

Mr. MITCHELL. I have received information from my county that a good many fishery overseers have received notices of dismissal. I should like the Minister to explain how this has occurred.

Mr. FOSTER. When I came into office and became a little acquainted with the fishery inspection and the way in which the protection of the fisheries was carried on, I began to make enquiries into the whole matter. As the result of complaints, which were very numerous and coming in from all quarters, as to inefficiency in the protection of the fisheries, I gave general instructions to the officers in the different Provinces to report all cases of inefficiency, my intention being to dismiss all inefficient men and to appoint in their place special guardians, persons who were to be employed for the time required at so much per day during that time. With respect to the county of Northumberland I found in the office a number of reports from Inspector Venning. I asked him for a confidential report upon the efficiency of the fishery protection in New Brunswick. Among these counties reported on was the county of Northumberland, and the inspector reported against a number of wardens, as they were called, who were receiving \$25 or \$30 a year and whom he said were altogether inefficient. They looked upon the post as a sort of sinecure and that they were entitled to the pay without doing very much for the protection of the fisheries, and the inspector recommended that they be dismissed and instead of having so many of those smaller officers, we should parcel out the district among good officers as overseers and give those officers the option of employing what special guardians they needed during the principal season during which the fisheries should be protected, at a certain rate per day. I carried out that recommendation, and the result was a number of dismissals of that kind. I have now parcelled out that part of the country in which this charge took place under overseers, and have given them authority to employ up to a certain number of special guardians during the principal portion of the season, paying them at the rate of \$1.25 a day. When the principal season is over those men's services will cease. This accounts for what the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has heard, and I may say that having adopted this system for two years, and to a large extent last year, I have not only the

report of Mr. Venning, but I have reports generally from the county of Northumberland that the fishery protection has been very much better than during the preceding years, and this is attributed to the better system of protection. Not one of those officers has been dismissed for political reasons. I do not ask what the politics of any of the men are, and I have told my fishery inspectors in every Province that if they show that any fishery officer is neglectful of his duties and inefficient, if that fact is reported and the report is sustained, I will dismiss that officer and employ another.

Mr. MITCHELL. After that explanation, which is a very reasonable one, I may say that as the Minister has adopted a policy different from that which has prevailed for many years, I have nothing further to say about the matter, because his policy, if it succeeds as I hope it will succeed, will be all the better for the interest of fishery interests. The hon. gentleman has anticipated me by stating that none of these changes were made for political reasons. I am glad of that, because I should be very sorry to see politics imported into either the removal or appointment of an officer. What we want is to obtain the best officers. Previously we endeavored to obtain good men, but some of them no doubt have got old and may have become inefficient, and if the hon. gentleman requires the removal of certain of these, who may have been reported upon as inefficient, I cannot say very much against it; but I am glad to find the hon. gentleman has stated that no political reasons have inspired the removal of any of those men.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There appear to be no less than ten fishery wardens in the county of Victoria, N.B., to whom \$515 were paid. That is an entire waste of money, for I cannot understand what they have to protect.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that the amount of money which is expended for the county of Victoria is a very small amount, if I mistake not. There has to be cared for, not only the head waters of the St. John, but also the Tobique River, which is a valuable salmon stream, and a large proportion of that money is expended for the protection of the Tobique River.

Mr. PRIOR. I wish to ask the hon. the Minister of Marine whether he has done anything with regard to the deep sea fisheries on the British Columbia coast. This question is a matter of great moment to British Columbia, as, from the few researches that have been made in regard to those fisheries, it has been proved that if the Government would spend some money to develop them, they would be as valuable as those on the Atlantic coast. I also wish to ask the hon. Minister if anything has been done with regard to the lobster fishery on the Pacific coast. There is no reason, it seems to me, why the lobster fishery should not assume gigantic proportions on the Pacific, as well as on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. FOSTER. As regards the lobster fishery, I may say that it was my intention if possible, to transfer live lobsters from the Atlantic coast to the coast of British Columbia. My hon. friend will remember if he has taken an interest in this subject and I know he has, that the United States Government made an attempt to transport lobsters to the Pacific coast, and that they met with a failure. I had some experiments carried on last year, so as to ascertain how long lobsters could be kept alive and under what conditions; first, during warmer weather, and afterwards during the colder season. I had arranged to send a shipment out to British Columbia in the late fall but after making the arrangements they fell through on account of the impossibility of getting a sufficient number of lobsters at that season of the year. A certain amount of expense was incurred in that experiment but the money has not been lost as we have received full information as to how long lobsters can be kept.

I intended this year to have a shipment made, but when I was in the United States the fishery commissioner at New York informed me that he intended to make an experiment in that direction this year, and I concluded that it would be wiser to allow him to make his experiment and then to adopt his methods if they were successful, and to avoid his errors if the experiment was not successful. With reference to the deep sea fisheries on the Pacific coast my hon. friend knows that I sent out a vessel the year before last, but that vessel was a little late in starting. Last year I intended to follow that up, but the vessel I had chartered and made arrangements with, went out sealing and did not get back as early as was intended, and I did not wish to meet the same difficulty on account of the lateness of the season as in the previous year. This year I intend to send our own steamer there about the middle of July, to make six or eight weeks experiments with reference to those fisheries.

Mr. LOVITT. Would the hon. Minister inform me from the result of his experiments, how long a lobster can be kept alive?

Mr. FOSTER. The experiments showed that they could be kept alive eight or ten days. A lobster was sent from Campbelltown, or near there, to Ottawa and it was alive and kicking when it came here, that was about ten days I think.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) I wish to ask the hon. gentleman for some information about this fish-breeding. Of course the expenditure for fish-breeding, if it were successful, would be very popular, but so far as I have been able to judge from the experiments made near my own home it has not been at all the success which we all anticipated and desired. We have a hatchery near Halifax, started by the Government during the time that my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was in power. From that date up to the present moment there has not been a greater quantity of fish in that neighborhood than before. On the contrary there appears to be a falling off in the quantity. I hold in my hand a petition which I think was presented to the department by my colleague from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) from the inhabitants in that district. A copy of that address was handed to me, signed by 106 of the most respected people of that neighborhood, and I have a reply from the department saying that the petition was got up and signed by people who were not aware of the nature of it. I would remind the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that there are signatures to this petition of gentlemen of such high standing in that locality, that if he was acquainted with them he would immediately come to the conclusion that they would not have signed it unless they thought it was necessary. Some of the most prominent residents in Halifax, of both sides of politics—for politics does not enter into the question—and some of the most prominent professional men and merchants, who live at Bedford, during the summer season have signed this petition. They all come to the conclusion that the fishery in that neighborhood has been partly destroyed, and they ask that the Bedford basin shall for five years be protected from having nets set there, or any fish taken, with a view to restoring it to what it was previous to the establishment of this hatchery. As I said before I think those gentlemen who reside at Bedford would not have signed a petition of that character, if they had not the most positive information and believed that the statements made there are perfectly correct. I know so far as regards the immediate surroundings of Halifax where the young fish have been placed, that it has not had the desired effect, and that so far from the salmon fishing having been increased there it has rather fallen off. In some places there have been more fish taken, but in other places less. I dare say I shall be told by the Minister of Marine that they have reports from their own officers to the contrary, and I do not mean to insinuate that those reports from their own officers are entirely incorrect, but I will say,

Mr. FOSTER.

that if they are not exaggerated they are very sanguine reports, and these gentlemen who are in charge of those fisheries are very anxious in making their report to the department, to show that their work is successful in order to justify a continued expenditure in that direction. I wish that the Minister would express an opinion on this question, as the information I have been able to get from reliable sources is, that the hatchery has not been a success. Will the hon. gentleman inform me whether he received this petition with reference to the closing of that river? The river requires cleaning out also, and I have no doubt if this were done and if net fishing were prohibited, the result would be to put the river in the position it was some years ago. I am not blaming the hatchery altogether for it. But I am only saying that the result appears not to be such as to justify such a large expenditure under that head. I am very sorry for it, because I was instrumental in placing it there, and I am very sorry our expectations have not been realised.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that the petition was received some three weeks ago, and I have had reports from my officers upon it; and, as the hon. gentleman intimates, those reports are not in accordance with the statements made by the petitioners. In fact, they controvert the statements made by the petitioners very materially, and state that the petition was signed under a misapprehension of the facts, and that many of those who signed it, when its real nature was brought to their notice, stated that they would not have signed it had they known its contents. However, the matter is under investigation, and I intend to look into it thoroughly. If there are any obstructions in the Sackville River which prevent the ascent of the fish for breeding purposes, I will see that they are removed. As to setting aside the basin, I would not like to say what decision shall be arrived at, because I have not yet had time to look into the reports on that subject.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I see that Mr. Rogers, the fishery inspector, received for salary and travelling expenses \$2,400, and there is also a charge of \$500 under the head of report in his name, and a royalty of \$200 paid to him for his fish-ladder. I suggested last year whether it would not be better to purchase his patent than to pay this large amount to him year by year.

Mr. FOSTER. The salary of Mr. Rogers is as given there, and his travelling expenses are paid, and are not very large. That \$500 may be an advance, which has been accounted for since. The royalty which has been paid to him for some years is \$20 for each fish-way we use. It is, I believe, in the main, a very good one. I do not think, however, that it would be wise to buy for use in perpetuity a fish-way which may be very good to-day, but may be superseded by a better one to-morrow. It seemed to me that the best principle was to pay for that which was used. However, that matter is under the consideration of the department, and correspondence is being had with Mr. Rogers for a settlement of the matter. I quite understand the objection to an inspector having power to say where fish-ways should be situated, when he is interested in the use of fish-ways.

Mr. MITCHELL. I quite agree with the view of the hon. Minister that it would be very impolitic to purchase the patent of a fish-way or fish-ladder for any given sum, because, as he says, from year to year improvements will take place. Now, I do not suppose there are a great many rivers requiring fish-ways.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). A great many.

Mr. MITCHELL. If there are it is quite as well for us to pay for each one required as it is to pay a sum for the patent. I must admit that there is an objection to an inspector recommending them who is interested in getting a royal-

ty on each one he recommends. Now, I would like to ask the Minister what has been the effect of these fish-breeding establishments so far as his more recent experience of the past year is concerned? I dare say that the hon. Minister will recollect that when this subject was under discussion last year a great deal was said as to whether these breeding establishments were useful or not. There was a very considerable opinion in this House that they were not useful. From that opinion I differed. From an experience of years I arrived at the conclusion that we had very much to learn about this fish hatching business. It is only from year to year, by close observation on the part of the men who superintend it, by the reports to the department, by the reflection of the department on those reports, and by the practical experience of the localities where they are used, that we can arrive at a conclusion as to whether the game is worth the candle or not. I believe the hatcheries are a complete success up to that stage of bringing into life the young fish, and while the natural food-bag remains. But the hon. Minister will recollect that I suggested last year that he should endeavor to get information from the practical men who superintend the hatcheries, as to whether they did not think the young fish were put into the rivers too early, at a time when they were unable to take care of themselves, and when they fall an easy prey to the trout, the perch, and other predaceous fish who frequent the waters where we breed salmon. If these fish hatcheries are going to be continued, it appears to me that there should be in connection with them a receiving pond where the young fish, which are now put into the water when they are two or two and a-half inches long, should be placed and fed until they are five or six inches long, and well able to take care of themselves. That could be done at a moderate expense. The present system is like putting a child of three or four years of age into the world to look after itself, instead of nurturing it until it is twelve or fifteen years of age. I would like to ask the Minister whether my observations of last year had any effect, or whether he has endeavored to ascertain from his officers whether there is anything in the suggestion; for, while I have my own opinion, I give way to the practical knowledge and experience of the men who are superintending these hatcheries.

Mr. FOSTER. This question is a very interesting one, and I wish we had time to discuss it more thoroughly than we have now. I have been following the subject since last year, and have had a number of practical testimonies sought for by my officers, which are embodied in the report, which I am very sorry has not yet been brought before the House, and which my hon. friend will find in the report when it is published. Those testimonies are extremely favorable in this matter. We know that we get the ova all right; we know that we take care of it all right; we know that it comes to maturity all right; and that we put it in the water and that the fish are fresh and lively. Then we lose sight of them and that is just where the critical period comes. With reference to fish hatchery operations in the United States, where probably they are carried on to a greater degree and with better success than in almost any other country, I do not think they are conducted in the way my hon. friend has suggested. It will be very difficult also to transport the fish when grown. Take 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 whitefish. It is difficult to have ponds enough to keep them in, and difficult to transport them to places where you wish to put them out. It is a question also whether, when they have grown to a certain size, their natural instinct impels them to go back to the place where they were taken out, or whether their instinct comes in the hatching itself. No doubt a large number of them are destroyed, as a large number of the naturally hatched are destroyed; and although I have tried to look into this matter thoroughly, I must say that it is dif-

flcult to have absolute proof. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe the fish hatcheries are useful, and, properly carried on, have an influence in the propagation and keeping up of the supply of fish, but I also am of opinion that one fish spawned naturally is better than half a dozen spawned artificially. We must not at all lose sight of the fact that it is a greater advantage to facilitate the return of the fish to their natural spawning places, and that a large proportion of our efforts must be given to the taking away of the obstructions to their return and protecting the fish on their passage up the river and during the spawning season.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the hon. gentleman doubts the efficiency of the hatcheries, it is a question as to whether such a large amount should be annually expended on their maintenance. I have been told that some of the young fish from some British Columbia salmon ova, which were distributed from Mr. Wilmot's hatchery at Newcastle, Ontario, have been recognised and caught in Lake Ontario, after they had partially matured, that is of the age of three years.

Mr. FOSTER. I learn from my deputy that one was found and that is now in the fishery exhibition.

Mr. McNEILL. One difficulty that occurs to me is that if you keep the fish alone so long and accustom them not to look for their food but to have it supplied them, laying aside all other difficulties that have to be encountered, you may meet this other difficulty, that, when turned out, they would have become so much accustomed to have their food provided that they probably would come to grief.

To provide for the cost, maintenance and repairs of fishery protection steamers and vessels \$100,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am sorry to see a reduction in that estimate. The hon. the Minister informed me the other day that he proposed protecting the fisheries as he did last year. Under any circumstances, whether we are to be under the *modus vivendi* or whether we are to be as we were before the passage of the treaty, there will be the same protection required to our fisheries, and even to a greater extent, because the Americans, having the right to go into our ports for bait and supplies, will have to pass over the three-mile limit, and we may possibly require more vessels than when they could not approach the coast at all. I hope the hon. gentleman is not going to relax in his efforts to protect our fishermen.

Mr. FOSTER. The reduction of the vote will not entail any reduction in the amount of protection. Out of last year's vote, a quantity of arms and ammunition was provided, which we have on hand. The same number of vessels will be employed this year as last, and the protection service will be carried out with the same vigor, and I hope, with increased efficiency. Last year we had Capt. Scott in charge, but I am sorry to say he is obliged to be absent in Europe on account of ill-health. Mr. Gordon, R.N., who, last year, was in command of the *Acadia*, will take his place.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope instructions will be given to the officers of such a nature that the annoying character of some of the seizures and the treatment of which the American Government complained will not recur again. I refer to the indiscretions of some of the officers, notably the officer commanding the *Terror*, with regard to hauling down the flag and that kind of business.

Mr. FOSTER. There was no trouble on that score last year.

Mr. MITCHELL. There was the year before.

Expenses in connection with the distribution of the fishing bounty and collection of the statistics..... \$6,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This seems to be a large amount, being 4 per cent. of the fishery bounties. These bounties

might be paid out of the custom house and other branches of the public service at a much smaller commission. You could get any one to undertake the distribution for $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. This certainly is an unusual commission in these days when people are willing to work for small commissions in paying out or receiving cash.

Mr. MITCHELL. If I recollect rightly, the Postmaster General reduced the commission on the sale of stamps to one per cent., and it seems to me he was more economical in that way than the Minister of Fisheries. I do not advocate that a reduction should be made. I do not think the sum is too large, considering the trouble and correspondence involved, but I speak under correction. I am only sorry the Postmaster General reduced the commission on the sale of stamps as low as he did.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an immense number of claims coming in, about 40,000 cheques in the course of a year, and those claims have to be attested and examined and tabulated, and cheques have to be made out for them. The large part of the expense is caused by the work of the staff here, and from personal observation, I know they are hardly worked during the period the cheques are being got out, from the first January to the first of June. Then we pay a small fee of 15 cents for every boat and 25 cents for every vessel claim. The customs officer before whom the claims are made and who examines them and distributes the cheques I think deserves some remuneration, and I do not think that is a very large amount to pay.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). These cheques are distributed by the officers of the department, and it is part of their duty to carry out the laws passed by Parliament. I cannot understand why the House should be asked to pay them any more for that than should be paid in any other branch of the public service. While I am on that subject, I might caution the Minister of Marine in regard to this expenditure. I am in possession of certain information which leads me to the conclusion that there have been very considerable frauds on the department committed from time to time. I have seen statements made by parties interested which, from the best information I have obtained, have been entirely at variance with the facts, that vessels and crews have been drawing the bounty, and in order to comply with the law, which I think requires three months' fishing, they have made these statements when they had not been more than a fortnight fishing and had been engaged in coasting for the rest of the time. The number and the names of the crews have not been properly represented. In fact there has been a system of misrepresentation throughout, and I could give the hon. gentleman confidentially the names of some who have been parties in these transactions. I merely bring this to the notice of the department, because I am aware that they are anxious that the money should be properly applied, and that the Minister would be the first to check any improper appropriation in that way, but I am confident that misappropriation has been made, and that parties have drawn bounties they are not entitled to. I would suggest to the Minister that he should be, if possible, more careful than heretofore in examining all these returns when they are sent in, so as to be perfectly sure that they comply with the law. I do not know how this can be done, and I have not thought the matter over sufficiently to suggest a reform, because I am aware that the department is not at fault, but that it takes the returns as they come from its officers, but it is perfectly certain that the department is imposed on.

Mr. FOSTER. It is impossible to find officials of the Fishery Department at every place where these claims can be filed to look after this matter, and very often the subject has to be left in the hands of the customs officers. I have no doubt that there may be some claims, out of the

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

very large number which are made, which may be fraudulent, and that is proved by the fact that strict and close scrutiny leads us to reject many claims when they are found not to be correct. I can assure the hon. gentleman that we are as careful as we can be.

Mr. EISENHAUER. The fishery officer at Lunenburg is nearly ninety years of age and is losing his faculties, that is, Mr. Jost, and several blunders have been made in consequence of his age and failing powers. I think a change should be made in that office, because, especially in regard to the bounties, several mistakes have been made. This is very important, because I believe a very large proportion of this bounty goes to the county of Lunenburg, and it should be properly distributed.

Superintendent of Insurance.....\$5,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice under item 25, which follows this immediately, that the Minister of Finance has forgotten to carry out the suggestion I made last year, and he promised to have attended to, for the sake of convenience, to separate the various subsidies paid to the Provinces. It is made a lump sum of \$4,188,454, and I mentioned to him that it would be convenient for reference to separate the amounts for each Province.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have had that done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not done here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry for that. I believe it is in print, and I will furnish the hon. gentleman with a copy, and will call the attention of the department to it, so as to have that placed in the Estimates in that way in the future.

Geological Survey.....\$60,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. \$60,000 has been the normal vote some years excepting last year and the year before. The sum voted for the general purposes mentioned of the Geological Survey has, since and including 1883, been \$60,000 each year, with the exception of 1885-86, when it was \$78,557.00. The extra \$18,557 was for the purpose of paying up balances on account of printing and other similar services which had been accumulating for several years previously. With a view to balancing the account the appropriation was reduced by about \$5,000 in 1886-87 and again in 1887-88, the current fiscal year, but, as the arrears have been wiped out, the amount of \$60,000 which was voted from 1883, is again asked for this service.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is the occasion for the increase?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have already explained that, last year and the year before, it was a reduction to make up the excess required for the previous year when the vote of \$78,000 was taken in consequence of our having to meet printing accounts for reports and maps and matters of that kind which has been accumulating for some years, and they were paid off by that vote, and it was to recoup the treasury that the amount was reduced \$5,000 last year and the year before. The sum now asked for is the same as the old one.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does the hon. gentleman think that the country gets a sufficient return for the money we pay for that purpose? I have spoken with a great many people who know something about this, and their opinion is that the money paid is not compensated by the work performed. No doubt a great many of the officers are very skilful, but a great deal of discussion took place during this Parliament and in the last Parliament on this subject, and I am sorry my hon. friend from Sherbrook (Mr. Hall) is not here, as he was chairman of a committee which made some report on that subject, but I am not aware that any-

thing resulted from the recommendations of that committee. I should like to know whether the Government are satisfied with the way in which that department is carried on. If they are, I think the public is not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will say to the hon. gentleman that while I think the Geological Survey has been a most valuable one, and indispensable, in fact, to the country, yet I think it is capable of improvement. I may say that our lamented friend had that subject before him, and he had made up his mind to make a considerable alteration in the organisation of the staff, and particularly to devote a greater portion of the labor of the survey to economic subjects, to make it more of a practical institution giving attention to such subjects as mining, instead of exclusively to the mere scientific operations that have been carried on for years under Dr. Selwyn. The late Minister being cut off, of course, I do not know exactly what his plans were, although I have a pretty good idea of them, and I think they can be carried out.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to hear the First Minister state that the attention of the Government has been devoted to making an improvement in the direction he indicated. We have vast mineral resources in this country, and it is of great importance that the people who are developing these resources, should be aided by any practical information they can obtain from the official documents in the possession of this department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That will be attended to.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is any portion of this vote applied to sinking artesian wells in the North-West Territories?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand there are two borers at work in the North-West, but the expenditures are not made under the Geological Department.

Indians, Ontario and Quebec..... \$42,739 72

Mr. DAWSON. For payment of annuities under the Robinson Treaty, \$15,500—I wish to draw the attention of the department to one thing with regard to this item. The treaties made with the Indians in a large part of Ontario are not being observed, or they are being evaded in one particular. In the Robinson Treaty, and the treaties subsequently made, it was stipulated that the Indians should have the right of fishing all over the territory as they had before held it; that they were to be at liberty to hunt and fish in every direction. As one of the commissioners myself, along with the Governor of Manitoba, in making Treaty No. 3, which covers some 50,000 square miles, we were very particular in explaining to the Indians that they would still have the right of fishing in the territories which they ceded. Now, how is that being carried out? Take the Lake of the Woods, for instance. Here is a very large inland lake, over which, I believe, the Government of Ontario now assume control, and in which it has the right of granting licenses to fish. I do not know that it has granted any licenses. I think the Government of Ontario has been particularly careful about this, after it was explained to them that the Indians had rights. But what are the facts? People have gone to the Lake of the Woods with all sorts of apparatus for fishing, they have nets of all kinds, machinery of all sorts, with which they scoop out the fish. Now, this large lake and the rivers flowing into it have been sufficient to supply 4,000 Indians with fish from time immemorial. There is an Indian population of some 4,000 around that lake and along Rainy River, which flows into it. These people depend very largely on fish for subsistence, and it is the same all through the Territories, around lakes far to the east. Now, Sir, Canadians and Americans from the other side go

there with all the appliances and improved methods of fishing and they scoop the fish out of the lakes and leave none for the Indians. It is the same with lakes near the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is another lake not far from Sudbury, called Whitefish Lake, about 24 miles in length and six or eight miles in width, and people have gone there with nets, or are about to go there with this improved method of fishing and they will scoop out the fish in the course of the summer and leave none for the Indians. The Indians all through that country are not very far advanced in agriculture as yet, they cannot cultivate for themselves, they do not grow enough to support themselves, and unless the fish are left them, they will, in a short time, become a burden upon the country, as the Indians in the North-West have been on account of the destruction of the buffalo. Now, if some means could be adopted of preserving the fish in these lakes, not of preventing people altogether from fishing in the ordinary way, but preventing speculators from going there and cleaning the fish completely out of the lakes, packing them in ice, and sending them all over the world. I think the Government would be doing an act of justice to the Indians. These fish are the only resource that is left to the Indians, and unless the Government step in and do something to maintain for them this means of subsistence, the consequence will be that the Government will have to provide for the Indians in some other way. The attention of the Government of Ontario was called to the fact that it was stipulated in the treaty that the Indians should have the right to fish in the inland waters. The Government, I am informed, said: We will not grant licenses to fish if you can show that the fish can be reserved for the Indians, we do not grant the privilege of setting pound nets and these other destructive appliances for fishing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did the treaty stipulate that the fish should be reserved exclusively for the Indians?

Mr. DAWSON. The treaty stipulates that the Indians shall have the right of fishing all over the Territories as they formerly had. Now if you permit the lakes to be depleted of fish, what becomes of the stipulation in the treaty that they were to be allowed the right of fishing as formerly? It was pointed out to them that they would have the same means of subsistence in regard to fisheries as they formerly had. What becomes of that stipulation if the white man is allowed to go wherever he likes, and to make a speculation in sweeping the fish out of the lakes and sending them to the markets of the world? I merely draw the attention to this fact of the right hon. Premier, who has always been extremely careful of the rights of the Indians. I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to this matter with a view to prevent the fisheries from being entirely destroyed and the Indians thus deprived of a food supply which should be theirs for ever.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The treaty, as the hon. gentleman says, provides that the Indians who come under it should have the right to fish in all the waters within the area surrendered. That, however, does not give them exclusive right to fish, and it appears the Indians do not object to ordinary fishing being done in those waters by other parties and they do not seek to prevent settlers from fishing there. But under the general principle applying to the protection of fisheries and for the prevention of the destruction of the fisheries, I think it is of very great importance that some steps should be taken, similar to those which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, to protect those waters from being depleted by fishermen and the fish shipped to a foreign market, thus depriving the settlers as well as the Indians, of that source of food supply. I think the Minister of Fisheries will have to look after this matter, and I shall have his attention particularly drawn to it.

Mr. DAWSON. The Indians make no objection to people fishing in the usual way with the rod and lines and even to setting nets; but they do object to terrible machines such as pound nets and nets five miles long being used.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think the hon. gentleman can interfere. Of course, the fisheries in the waters belong to the Crown as represented by any one of the Provinces. They stand in the same position as private proprietors.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Only, of course, within our powers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In connection with the vote for Indians in Ontario and Quebec I should like to enquire of the First Minister what were the circumstances under which a considerable sum of money is stated to have been handed over to the Indians of the Brantford reserve a few months ago. If I am correctly advised, this sum of money, \$28,000 or \$30,000, I think it was, was handed over to those Indians without the concurrence of the Ontario Government or the Quebec Government, and it is charged practically against those Governments. I observe by the reports of the Ontario Legislature that there is a lawsuit threatened between the Ontario and Dominion Governments on that head. It cannot be correct for the Dominion Government to charge the Provinces without their consent being obtained; at all events, it would be very inexpedient to do so. I should like to know what were the reasons that induced the hon. gentleman to act either without consulting with or against the remonstrances of those Governments, especially the Ontario Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I really am altogether ignorant of the circumstance of which the hon. gentleman speaks. I will enquire about it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did not the hon. gentleman notice a debate that took place in the Ontario Legislature.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I did not. I was not in charge of the department at the time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am speaking without definite information myself, but I noticed from a debate in that House that we were threatened with a law suit, which judging from our former experience, might cost us quite as much as the grant.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the matter to which my hon. friend refers is the overflowing of a portion of the Indian lands by a dam which was built very many years ago on the Grand River; and there is also the case of the payment of the Mississagua Indians for a reserve, also for lands situated on the Credit, not far from Toronto. I think the hon. gentleman must have paid the Mississaguas \$60,000, and the Iroquois or Six Nations \$30,000 or \$40,000, for their claims. The question is whether the right hon. gentleman has a right to recognise an old claim and to charge that to any of the Provinces. Of course, the Provinces claim the hon. gentleman has no such right. I do not know whether he has attempted to charge them, or whether he has recognised those as moral claims against the Dominion, or that the Dominion Government considers itself called upon to pay them. I understand that so far as the Mississaguas and Credit Indians are concerned, their claim was really paid for before the war of 1815, and the papers in the matter were burnt at the time the Americans destroyed York.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I really am unable at this moment to speak in regard to the point raised by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I will take an early opportunity on Monday to bring the matter up.

Mr. SCRIVER. Before these items are passed I desire to congratulate the Premier upon the success of the plan which I believe originated with him, but which was carried out by his successor, the late lamented Minister of the Interior, for the settlement of the difficulty between the Indians and the occupants of the land in the township of Dundee. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is aware of the report the commission made on the subject, that the recommendations of the report have been accepted by the settlers, that they have applied to the Quebec Legislature for the necessary legislation, and that in all probability this long vexed question will be settled. However, what I desire to say particularly is that it seems to me rather a hardship, in view of the large sum that the settlers are called upon to pay, that they should also be called upon to contribute a share of the expenses connected with that commission. A suggestion was made to the late lamented Minister of the Interior that all the expenses connected with that commission should be paid by the Government. What his determination was on the subject I do not know; but I am afraid that the sum placed in the Supplementary Estimates does not provide for the expenses incurred by the settlers in the employment of counsel and so forth. If not, I shall hope that something will be done in that direction hereafter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is very satisfactory, as the hon. gentleman says, to have that long standing dispute, which caused so much irritation and trouble among the settlers in Dundee, brought to a close. It was carried out very efficiently by the late Mr. White, who went down himself and looked into the matter on the spot, and the arrangement arrived at appears to be satisfactory both to the Indians and the whites. As to the question of the expense of the commission, I am not able to answer that point.

Mr. LAURIER. Can the hon. gentleman give the committee any information in regard to the Oka Indians?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A portion of them removed two years ago to the township of Gibson. The others have not yet gone, but it is expected they will go; these Indians are going there by degrees. Some object to leave the habitation of their ancestors; but the success of the Indians in Gibson is very remarkable, they are doing very well and the Indians at Oka go up there and see their friends, and I understand there is every probability that the whole of them will remove there. They cannot, however, be hurried and compelled to go, but we hope they will go by degrees.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I desire to bring before the hon. gentleman a matter about which there is much public rumor. A large portion of the eastern part of Ontario was never surrendered by any Indian band, there are no treaties between any bands or tribes of Indians and the crown in reference to the surrender of the Indian claim to the country in all this eastern section extending from the Ottawa to the frontier of Lake Ontario and the vicinity of Kingston. It is said that certain bands of the Mississagua Indians claim the country, although ceded, and the crown has parted with the title to private parties. I should like to know from the hon. gentleman whether the hon. gentleman is entertaining any such claim or not, because, I think, there would be very little difficulty in showing that there is no band of Indians which can by any possibility have any claim to the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Such a claim has been made, but it has not been entertained. I understand that the commissioners are arbitrators who are to meet to settle the various accounts between Quebec and Ontario. As far as we know that claim is not entertained, or looked upon with favor.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Government are not encouraging it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, not at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course the hon. gentleman knows that there never has been a surrender of the eastern portion of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The facts are these: Before the country came into the possession of the French it was in the hands of the Chippawa Indians who owned it, and the Six Nations after being armed, until Fort Frontenac was built, held possession of the country. The Mississaguas are marked in all the French maps as residing north of Lake Huron. They were not in this country at all until it became a British possession. I mention this to the hon. gentleman that now the country has been settled and surveyed he should not entertain any claim of that sort.

Mr. COOK. The Christian Island Indians have another claim. I have heard that their solicitor has been interviewing the Government with a view to endeavoring to do them justice. They claim a large portion of the land in Tiny Township and the town of Penetanguishene.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not able to answer my hon. friend on that point, but I take it they have a reserve.

Mr. COOK. Yes, they have claimed to own a large portion of the town.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MITCHELL. I see there is an increase of \$70 in salaries on account of the Indians in New Brunswick. Might I ask the Indian chief what is this for? I would rather have seen it for seed grain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The increase is on account of the appointment of Constable Barnaby at \$20 a year. Dr. O'Brien's appointment at \$100. \$50 of that having been provided for medical services at Big Cove, it proved to be quite insufficient.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Might I ask the hon. gentleman when it was that this practice of voting seed grain was begun?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has gone on for years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was not formerly so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been voted for a good many years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Was it before the Franchise Bill?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are the reserves in British Columbia being surveyed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Surveys for the Indians have been going on for some time and will be going on for some years yet. They are over a very large extent of country, as the Indians are living in small lots in the valleys between the mountains, and those are being surveyed by degrees.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is marking out the reserves from the general domain?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, that is it. Mr. O'Reilly is doing that work, and the British Columbia Government have such confidence in him that they have approved of his services.

Mr. MITCHELL. They thanked him, but they did not pay him any money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This work commenced some twelve years ago, and it was generally supposed that it would take some three or four years to complete.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You see the vote has been reduced several hundred dollars a year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This survey is marking out the Indian territories, so as to distinguish it from the domain of the Crown in British Columbia. Can the hon. gentleman tell us what land has been set apart?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. O'Reilly's report will show that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). One would suppose there were a great many hundred Indian reserves, when you look at the time over which it has extended.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be a long time before they are surveyed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Those lands surveyed for the use of the Indians become administered by this Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How was it before? Had the British Columbia Government control over the land?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The British Columbia Government had charge of the Indians under Imperial supervision. When the Union took place the same provision was in the agreement and the Treaty of Union, as was in the British North America Act by which the control and management of the Indians on their reserves was thrown on the Government of Canada.

Mr. MARA. Before Confederation the governor of the Crown colonies had charge of the Indians in British Columbia. I would like to ask the Minister whether he intends building the industrial schools he promised last Session? No action has been taken. The sites, I think, have not been selected, nor has anything been done towards commencing those schools.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been a good deal of difficulty of a religious nature in connection with these schools, as to who should have control of them, and where they should be placed; but the arrangements have been pretty nearly concluded. The suggestion is, although it is not finally settled, that there shall be one school at Kamloops, where I believe the Indians are generally Catholic, under the supervision of Bishop D'Herbomez, another at Metlakatla, and another on Vancouver Island. They will be undertaken immediately.

Indians, Manitoba and North-West Territories..... \$876,750

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It would be interesting to the committee if the hon. First Minister would state the condition of the Indians in the North-West. It has been rumored lately that there has been destitution among them. He might also state what progress has been made in the schools and on the farms.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report of the Indian Department goes into that subject fully. As to destitution, the reports are exceedingly exaggerated. The Indians, I believe, are in as comfortable a condition as Indians ever are. In some of the bands, from indolence, or disease or other causes, there are occasional instances of destitution. Whenever these occur, any of the Government officers who happen to be nearest the band, whether a land agent, or an

Indian agent, or a mounted police officer, takes care that no one is allowed to starve. Their instructions are also not to spoil the Indians by feeding them, because as soon as an Indian band find that there is food in the Indian store, they will hang about it and will not go to work. So that it is only in cases where there is danger of starvation that food is given to them. But weekly, and I may say oftener than weekly, reports are received from the various bands, and all these reports concur in stating that during the past winter the Indians have thrived well, and there has been very little destitution.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I see that the hon. gentleman is taking \$26,500 again for agricultural implements. Of course, the agricultural implements to which the Indians were entitled under treaty were given to them a long time ago, and these appropriations made to them from year to year are gratuities not required by treaty obligations.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The note I have from the department states that the different reserves in the North-West Territories are already well supplied with agricultural implements, tools and harness. The sum now asked is to provide against unavoidable wear and tear, and also the changed conditions of the Indians, who are now asking for implements and tools to enable them to perform labor which without them they would not undertake. I think the treaty obligation was only to furnish one set of implements.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That was all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Indians are very careless of the implements, although they have improved considerably since they were first taken charge of by the Dominion Government. But still it would be bad economy to refuse them implements when they really show to the agent what they want, because without them they would just wander about as vagrants and beggars.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No doubt that may be so, but of course we are making a new departure. After the treaty obligations are fulfilled, you propose to continue to supply them with agricultural implements. That may be a good policy, but has the hon. gentleman had any communication through the agents with the Indians, calling their attention to the fact that we are exceeding the treaty obligations, or will the Indians look on this as a matter of right that is to be continued for all time to come?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no. There is not the slightest necessity of giving notice to the Indians what their rights are; they know what they are just as well as my hon. friend does, and they know perfectly well that they have no legal or treaty claim to these implements.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to page 290 of the Auditor General's Report where there is a charge for 21 tool chests at \$58 each.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These tool chests are furnished under treaty. The pattern is settled, of a substantial tool chest in which to keep their little property, and their agricultural implements and tools. They are constructed by public competition.

Mr. MITCHELL. The First Minister will recollect that, for the last two or three Sessions, I have had the honor to bring under his notice the manner in which tenders for contracts have been let in the North West, and, while he did not assent to the suggestion I made at that time, he will recollect that he said he thought the suggestion a good one and that, in the immediate future, it should be adopted. I would ask on what system they make these contracts now, whether they are let *en bloc*, as they were a few years ago, or whether the manufacturers and traders of the country are given a chance to tender. My principal objection was to the time and the manner of delivery. I contended that the

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,

contracts should be asked for delivery at certain stated points, and not that the goods should be delivered on the different reserves, because that would preclude the manufacturers and dealers here from going into the contracts. I think so still. I thought that, by delivering those goods at certain points along the line of the railway, the public would get the advantage of a cheaper rate, and it would disseminate the contracts more generally among the manufacturers of the country. My hon. friend by my side (Mr. Perley, Assiniboia) says they do that. They may do that in regard to the contractors, but the contractors agree to deliver these goods all over these points, so that the American house which has had almost a monopoly of supplying the Mounted Police and Indians, have an advantage over our own manufacturers, and I thought there should be some opportunity given to our own manufacturers to tender for different parts of these supplies, to be delivered at certain points on the railway line, instead of letting the contract *en bloc*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no tender *en bloc*. Advertisements are issued specifying minutely the different articles required, and parties can tender for the whole or for portions of the articles contained in the advertisement, as they think they can supply them.

Mr. MITCHELL. What about the delivery?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The contract is still to deliver at the place of consumption.

Mr. MITCHELL. At the different Indian reserves?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, and not along the line of the railway. It would cost an enormous sum of money to the Government to be obliged to make a separate contract with parties to carry these supplies which would be strewed all along the line, to the different points where they would be required. Those who tender now make their own arrangements to send the different supplies from the railways to the points of consumption. At first the eastern contractors were rather unwilling to have that system adopted, but they have got into it now, and the contracts are eagerly sought after by contractors from Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa and other places. Ottawa and Montreal have several important contracts. I do not now speak specially of the Indian Department, but I know that for the Mounted Police as well as the Indian Department, there is generally a competition for these supplies, and they are all let by public competition.

Mr. MITCHELL. That does not meet the point as to the transfer. I suggested that, if three or four points along the line of railway were fixed upon, the actual delivery to these stations would be disseminated among our own people in the North-West, and our traders and merchants could tender for the supply of such articles of goods as they manufactured or dealt in. As to the system the First Minister says is in force at present, its result has been to put all this into the hands of large establishments such as I. G. Baker & Co.—a foreign company—and the Hudson Bay Company. These two companies have almost monopolised the furnishing of the great quantities of supplies for the North-West for ten years past. I think it is time that that should be changed, and that the general manufacturers, traders and merchants should have a chance to supply that country, and that our inhabitants in the North-West should have an opportunity of doing the freighting, without our paying toll to the middlemen. The Hudson Bay Company, or I. G. Baker & Co., undertake the delivery of the whole quantity to the Indian or police stations, and they sub-let that part to such persons as they like, while, if the contract were for delivery at certain points on the railway, it would be much cheaper and would disseminate the advantage among our manufacturers and our workmen without the aid of middlemen.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see that there is an amount under the head of "destitute Indians" of \$756 for 760 pairs of trousers. That is not quite a dollar a pair. I should like to ask if the cloth is bought, and if the Indians are so far advanced in industrial work that they make their own clothing. Otherwise the trousers must surely have cost more than that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I do not think they make their own trousers. It is done by contract.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is strange that the making and the goods are separated in that way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is correct. By some error the cloth was advertised for only, and a contract was made for that. Then there was a separate contract for the manufacture of the trousers.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I was in hopes that, perhaps, to some extent, they had been able to accomplish—of course you could not expect them to do as much as the more advanced Indians in my own constituency—so much in the industrial school that the females were able to do a great deal of this work and had made these trousers themselves. Still, I did not know that we had attained to so great an efficiency as that in these industrial schools. Are they simply for purposes of education?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend must remember that those schools have only recently been established. The women's school at Qu'Appelle was only established last year, and I think the others have only been established about three years. There are two others to be established during the coming year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We are progressing in that direction?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope the Premier will accept a suggestion which I make in good part. I think, if he will take the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Perley) into the Cabinet, that hon. gentleman could tell him more about it than he knows himself. He tells me that the female Indians—what do you call them, Mr. Perley, squaws?—make a good deal of their own dresses, and mitts, and socks, and so on.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I do not think the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is quite as ignorant of the character of the females in the Indian tribes as he pretends to be.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Indian woman—female as I think my hon. friend said—ought to do something of the kind, because I observe under the head of annuity that there seems to be an enormous and rather unaccountable disproportion. For instance, in one community, there are 48 men and 112 women; in another 25 men and 150 women; in another 150 men and 348 women; in another 147 men and 260 women. Are all these Indians provided with duplicate ribs? It appears to me there is something curious in this preponderance of women, because this preponderance does not exist so among the boys and girls. These in most cases appear to be tolerably equal, but in almost all cases, on page 238, there is a very great disproportion between the men and the women. As there are no wars now among these tribes, it would be interesting to know why these disproportions exist.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My attention was never called to that before, and I am not aware what is the cause.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I notice last year the agricultural implements cost \$26,000, seed \$5,000, farm instructors \$3,000, maintenance \$16,000; and as far as I can judge from hastily looking over the crop harvested, if we had

purchased outright the result of the labors of those farm instructors, we would have acquired for the use of the Indians the same amount as is produced. If those instructors are doing their duty there ought to be more than that. There appears to be an expenditure of the maximum amount of money with the minimum result. The hon. the First Minister ought to see how far these farm instructors are successfully performing their duties, for if the country is as capable of producing crops as it is represented to be, the results ought to be, after so many years trial, something more than the report shows.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I may say that on the reserves along the line of railway from Regina to Manitoba and also on the Touchwood Hill reserves, about 100 miles from the railway, the Indians are becoming very efficient in the art of agriculture. There is only one agent as a rule on each reserve. He goes out in the field in the morning, with a pair of horses supplied by the Government, and starts the plough. Then when the furrow is made, the Indians come along with their oxen and plough the land. The instructor teaches them how to sow the seed and plough and hoe and do all kinds of work, and soon the reserves will be able to maintain themselves. The first prize steers at Broadville were owned by an Indian chief, and the vegetables of all kinds there exhibited by the Indians astonished everybody. It was really wonderful that these wild men who, a few years ago, roamed about with scalp knives in their hands, could produce such result. A few days before I left home, I saw an Indian Chief who had his 20 bags of flour which he had raised himself and his team of oxen. Last year I visited Touchwood Hills, and there saw a cellar containing 3,000 bushels of potatoes, which the instructor had received from the Indians for seed this year. At all the reserves the instructors keep a certain portion from the produce of the Indian farmers for seed, and the balance the Indians store away for their own use. The women knit socks, and comforters, and different articles of that kind, which they have learned how to make from the instructors' wives. Each of those agents has a wife, a very nice lady, who takes pride in instructing the Indian women how to do knitting, and these Indian women become very expert at the work. I must say that it has been a source of great pleasure to me to see how efficient these poor people are becoming in providing a living for themselves, and this is altogether due to the careful management of these agents.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are these Sioux Indians or Crees?

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). They are Crees. I read the report of a statement made by Dumont that the Indians on the reserves were starving and had to be supported by the half-breeds. But I can say that as regards my district, on the Piapot's, the File Hills, the Assiniboia and other reserves, that statement is entirely incorrect. Those agents are gentlemen of high moral character and good standing. I know personally most of them, and I know that the statement of Dumont is entirely unfounded. I thought it was my duty, knowing the facts of the case, to bear this testimony to the progress the Indians are making.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We are all glad to know that. Few things would give me greater pleasure than to know that the Indians of the North-West were to any degree becoming self-sustaining. I notice in the Auditor General's Report for 1886-87 that the total number of Indians in the Manitoba Superintendency and the North-West Superintendency, who receive annuities, is put down at barely 22,000. Now, if that statement is correct, as I presume it is, it follows that for the maintenance of these 22,000 Indians we expend \$76,000, or at the rate of \$40 per head, which is equivalent to \$200 per family. This

includes all expenses, and, of course, does not go directly, all of it, into the hands of the Indians, but it is an extremely heavy expenditure, and I am at a loss to understand how it comes to be so heavy, unless something has been omitted by the Auditor General; \$200 a family, as an average result, is a tremendous heavy expenditure. I was under the impression myself that the number of Indians whom we had to support more or less was considerably larger.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is, I am quite sure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I put the question to the First Minister in order that, if there be a larger number than are here set down, it should be explained.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will take a note of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know, because I cannot help believing that to have to expend \$200 per family for the Indians of the North-West, is a great deal more than this country should be called upon to do.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That includes the expenditure of the instructors and surveyors, and I think there are more Indians than that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are a large number of non-treaty Indians.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do we do nothing for them at all, when they are destitute?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are the Sioux Indians, who were refugees from the United States after the massacre of 1860. They are in destitution, and have no legal reserve except what is accorded them by the Government. There are plenty of non-treaty Indians as well. A good many Indians that were counted in the band, had some white blood in them, and they claimed to be whites in order to get the scrip. I dare say that, in some degree, will account for the difference between the number of the men and the women.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may observe that I was by no means charging the whole sum. The actual sum expended in 1886-87 was \$1,072,000. Now, according to the department, they have spent about \$880,000, so that I kept largely within the sum actually expended.

Mr. McMULLEN. I endorse the views expressed by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I think in some cases excessive prices are paid. I notice that seed barley last year cost \$1.50 per bushel; seed oats cost a little over \$1 per bushel; and there was a quantity of oats bought for feeding purposes that only cost 40 cents. Why should there be such a difference?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The freight.

Mr. McMULLEN. The freight should be the same on oats for feed as on those for seed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Some of the grain may have to be carried 500 or 600 miles, and some of it only 20 miles. I would say to the hon. member for South Oxford that I find in the last report of the Department of Indian Affairs, that under the treaties there are 23,811 Indians; in the Peace River district, 2,038; in the Athabaska district, 8,000; in the Mackenzie River district, 7,000; in eastern Rupert's Land, 4,016.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand it, you do not do anything for the Peace River or Mackenzie River districts?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Except when they are outside the treaty, except when information comes that they are actually starving, we cannot allow them to die.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The figures of the Auditor General correspond sufficiently with the figures I have

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

here. They show a little over \$21,000. Now, in the Peace River district I hardly recollect any other sums having been spent for some years; if there were, I think they were very small. None was spent in the Mackenzie River nor in the Rupert's Land district.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was a small amount for twine for nets, and things of that kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Practically speaking this heavy item of expenditure that we annually vote for Manitoba and the North-West, goes to some 22,000 or 23,000 people.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And in 1886-87 it reached as I pointed out, to over a million.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The First Minister, in giving the population of the Indians within the seven treaties, included the Indians in the Province of Ontario over the height of land westward, so that if you begin at the western boundary of Ontario and take the Indians of the North-West Territories and Manitoba, you will have a much smaller population.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is, I take it, from the head of lake Superior westward.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course it looks like a large amount to give, but I always think, in reference to the Indians in the North-West, that the Government should not be unduly pressed in a matter of that kind. It is a very difficult thing, indeed, to manage, and only when I have thought that there have been cases of absolute neglect on the part of the officials, did I call the attention of the Government to it—I think it is our duty to do that at all times. With reference to this amount, there is this bright side: that while it seems large per head, we have heard from the hon. member for Assiniboina that a large amount goes for farm instructors, wages, and other things, that swell this total amount; but by means of this expenditure we have reason to hope that the Indians are becoming more self-sustaining, and the expenditure will in a short time begin to decrease. Although I was prepared to show that there is a waste—I do not feel able to do it at the present time—I should not like unduly to press the Government. Of course some of the prices look very high, but when we remember what the Minister has said, that they may be altered very much on account of freight, we cannot pronounce too hasty a judgment. I was pleased to see when I was up in the North-West last fall, that the Indians seemed to be making progress, as this gentleman has said, and every Canadian must rejoice; if we can solve the Indian problem—making them good citizens and self-supporting citizens—we will have accomplished something I think that has never been done by any other nation.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I would say with regard to the Indians being self supporting that the people of Battleford have already sent down a petition to the right hon. gentleman complaining that the Indians are raising so much grain and farm produce that they are taking away the market from the white settlers. They represent that the Indians have been helped on so much that they are now in such a good position that they are able to produce grain at a cheap rate, and are able to take away the market from the white settlers. I think this shows that the officials employed by the Government are deserving the highest praise for having taught the Indians so well that they are able to compete with the white settlers.

North-West Mounted Police.....\$748,426

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Clothing \$70,000—what is the precise number just now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 45 officers, 6 medical officers, 3 veterinary surgeons, and 1,000 non-commissioned officers and men, making 1,054.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would call the attention of the First Minister and also of the Minister of Justice to this fact: the expense of sustenance for the North-West Mounted Police is, according to the Minister's statement, a good deal less than \$90 a head. The expense of maintaining convicts in the Manitoba penitentiary is a little over \$120 per head. I can understand no possible ground on which the rations allowed to a mounted policeman should cost less by 30 per cent. or more than the rations to a convict in the Manitoba penitentiary. The First Minister will remember that we took exception, and I think with reason, to the expenditure on the penitentiary, and if am correct in that point the disproportion is great, because in every point of view the subsistence account for a mounted policeman on active service ought to be considerably in excess of that which is necessary to maintain a convict in the Manitoba penitentiary. I desire to enquire of the First Minister if there is any chance of reducing the North-West mounted police force largely?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. The force has an immense amount of work to do, and with the increase of whites the labor is increasing. The number of raids across the frontier is increasing immensely, and there is a regular system of patrol along the whole country. There is a great difference between the force the Canadian Government has on the frontier and that of the American Government for the same purpose. The Americans had two or three years ago 3,000 men on the frontier.

Mr. MITCHELL. Has the hon. gentleman ever experimented as to the employment of Sioux Indians in connection with the force.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have a number of them employed as scouts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the policy of the Government with regard to arming volunteer corps in the Calgary region and elsewhere? At the time of the outbreak there were two or three corps raised among the cow boys of the ranches. Have the Government established any volunteer force there?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think there is any volunteer force at Calgary. There is a volunteer force at Winnipeg, and also I think at Prince Albert.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desired to ascertain more particularly what the policy of the Government might be in this respect, because to a certain extent the maintenance of these 1,000 men depends on the question whether you have a sufficient number of reasonably good volunteer corps which might be summoned in case of emergency. At least it may come down to that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Active militia corps would be very useful in case of an actual outbreak, but for the every-day work, controlling the Indians, in fact overawing the Indians, seizing stolen goods, especially cattle and horses, repressing smuggling and destroying intoxicants, these 1,000 men are the only force available. A militia force could only be called upon in case of actual outbreak.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If every Indian in the North-West were put in the field, even if every man in the several treaties turned out, they would not number more than 4,000 or 5,000, and they would be very poorly armed I understand.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have a good many Winchester rifles among them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand their weapons are getting worn out, and as the buffalo are disappearing and there is little game, they have very few arms of any value now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe that is correct.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Therefore, so far as the Indians are concerned, the number of the force is very large, although in a country of such vast extent a large number of men is required.

Mr. MACDOWALL. The people of the North-West would not like to see the mounted police force reduced at all, because it has done very good work in the country. It has always been a small body of men and not an excessive body. The management of the force is very economical, and it will form the nucleus of any force raised there at any time for self defence.

Canada Gazette \$5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason of this increased expenditure?

Mr. BOWELL. The Queen's printer explains that \$1,250 increase is due to the additional size of the *Gazette* caused by the larger quantity of advertising, and consequent increase of income.

Miscellaneous Printing..... \$20,000

Mr. BOWELL. The next item, \$5,000 increase, is on account of more printing having been required. The \$15,000 formerly, did not cover the total amount of the printing, but the increase in reality is only about \$2,000, or scarcely that for \$2,000 is included in this sum of \$20,000, which was formerly taken separately for the printing of parliamentary bills.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the income of the *Canada Gazette*, because I observe that in 1887 the total expense of the *Canada Gazette* was only \$4,283, and it seems a large increase to incur in a single year.

Mr. BOWELL. The Queen's printer says that the revenue this year is between \$5,000 and \$6,000.

Expenses of Government in the N.W.T. \$142,889

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that there is an increase of \$40,000 this year for the expenses of the Government in the North-West Territories. Does this additional \$40,000 cover the *Regina Leader* and the cost of maintaining it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman want this additional \$40,000 for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are increasing the industrial schools, building bridges, and assisting in the material development of the country in every way. As the settlers go in there the demands are increased.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Cannot the hon. gentleman give some sort of estimate as to the mode to which he proposes to appropriate those \$40,000 additional?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The money has hitherto been sent to the Lieutenant Governor, and he appropriates it under instructions from headquarters. The larger proportion of it is for laying out roads and so on, and the Governor has always submitted that to his Council, and taken their opinion as to the best means of appropriating the money.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much does the hon. gentleman expect will go to such purposes as education? That is the item I specially want to know about.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The amount expended on schools last year was \$12,507. The appropriation asked for this year in consequence of the increased number of schools is \$63,229.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice on page 235 of the report on Indian Affairs, that there is a large sum of money for distributing pamphlets in the North-West. Is this included in the item?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know what it is for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It says there for the publication of pamphlets.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are those the pamphlets which contain the very lively attack on Mr. M. C. Cameron?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Those are the pamphlets that were a defence against a very lively attack by Mr. M. C. Cameron.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If that be so, the hon. gentleman will see that if those pamphlets were issued under his instructions, he went on the principle that the best way to defend is to attack. If he has forgotten, we on this side have not forgotten that those "Facts About the North-West" contained a very sharp attack on Mr. M. C. Cameron. It is somewhat difficult to draw the line, and I do not know that I should object to a statement of "facts" being issued by a department, but they should be confined to a statement of facts when they are published at the public expense, and not converted into an attack on a political opponent. If an attack on a political opponent is to be made, this Parliament is the place to make it. The right hon. gentleman did say something in his place, although, for one reason or another, he and Mr. M. C. Cameron were not together on the floor. This pamphlet that my hon. friend refers to was published at the public expense, and unless I have entirely forgotten the tenor of it—and I do not think I have—it certainly was highly polemical as regards Mr. M. C. Cameron. Did not the hon. gentleman accuse him of something like forgery? I think he did.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, not forgery.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He accused him of a deliberate and wilful perversion of the truth in every possible way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think a distinction must be drawn with pamphlets that are published in that way. It could be made quite as damaging, and perhaps more so, if the sharp attack I referred to could be confined to statements of facts. It is an indiscretion on the part of the officers connected with the publication of the pamphlet to proceed to attack a noted politician like Mr. M. C. Cameron. Should the wheel of fortune have revolved the other way, and should Mr. M. C. Cameron as might have been the case become Minister of the Interior, it might have been a very awkward position indeed for those officers to have found themselves in. It might have warranted considerable changes in the personnel of the department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the officers of the department are in any way responsible for that paper. As regards the facts all I have to say is that if the hon. gentleman himself would calmly sit down, and forget for a moment that he was a politician, and take the attack made by Mr. Cameron, and take the answer in that pamphlet, I think he would in all candor be obliged to admit that every word in the pamphlet was justified.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid I would hardly be able to go that length by any manner of means. What might perhaps occur would have been that in some cases Mr. Cameron had been misinformed, as it is quite possible where a man went over such an immense amount

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

of ground as he went over; but I think in a very large proportion of cases it will be found that there were very good grounds for the criticisms that that gentleman made. But that is not precisely the point. The point is this: it is not fair or judicious that the public money should be used to pay for publications which contain violent attacks on gentlemen on this side of the House, and that is what was done in this case.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think we should allow this vote to pass without making an impression on the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite that the public money should not be taken for a purpose of this kind. If the statements made by Mr. Cameron were not in accordance with the facts, and the department found it necessary to defend themselves, I do not think there could be any objection to that. But in this case there was a pamphlet got up for political purposes, and references were made to Mr. Cameron that were exceedingly unfair; and I do not think it is right that an item of this kind should be smuggled into this vote for Indian affairs, or that we should be asked to consent quietly to it. I do not think it is fair that the public money should be used to strike at a man who was a member of this House and who performed his duty with great ability, and to abuse him when he is not here to defend himself.

Expenditure in connection with the Canada Temperance Act \$10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does this come to be so large? I notice that in 1887 the total expenditure was apparently only \$3,900.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There have been a great many elections, some to bring the Act into force and some to repeal it, and the expenses of both have to be paid out of the general revenue.

To compensate members of the North-West mounted police for injuries received in the discharge of duty \$2,000

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would call the attention of the Prime Minister to the case of Private J. W. Boyd, of the mounted police force, who was injured, not exactly while on duty, but while he was attending to one of the horses under the order of a superior officer. The horse struck him on the leg, and he was disabled. He was brought down to Ottawa, and placed in the hospital here, and was for some time under the charges of Sir James Grant. He was very severely injured, and applied for compensation, but I believe it was said that he was not entitled to it, as it was claimed he did not receive the injury while on duty.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to send me the particulars, I will have enquiries made.

Salary of Mr. Fabre and contingencies of his office \$3,500

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to draw the attention of the committee to the amount which this man has drawn. He appears to be a rather expensive individual. I see by the Auditor-General's report that last year he picked out of the pockets of the people of this country altogether \$6,538.56 for salary and extras. I think we should try to do without him when he costs so much.

Mr. CASEY. I think it really is scandalous that this absurd expenditure should be continued year after year. If anybody contended that Mr. Fabre was doing anything to secure emigrants from France, we should be glad to sustain him; but there has never been any pretence that he was doing anything to promote emigration in any way except by the publication of a paper called *Paris-Canada*, out of which he makes money as well as from his office. He is in Paris to have a good time and to make money for

himself, and I can call it nothing but scandalous that we should maintain him there. I think it is time the Government should prove their desire to have French immigration by changing the agent, or else stop this expenditure.

Mr. COCKBURN. I regret to hear the position of Mr. Fabre designated as scandalous. I had the pleasure of living in Paris for two or three years, and I had an opportunity of seeing the services rendered by Mr. Fabre to many gentlemen living there. House rent in Paris is twice as dear as it is here, and if you want to buy a pound of meat you have to pay 50 cents for it, so that the salary of \$3,500, a year there is not equal to \$1,500 a year here. He may have received \$6,000, but some of that amount is for other services. I believe that if the office is to be maintained the salary instead of being too large is too small.

Mr. CASEY. I am very glad to have an explanation at last of what Mr. Fabre really is for, seeing that the Minister does not explain. The hon. gentleman tells us that he is not there to look after emigrants, but only to make it pleasant for Canadians in Paris. I am glad that wealthy people in Paris are so well looked after by him.

Mr. COCKBURN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will remember that there are people in Canada who speak French, whose sympathies are with Paris, and who, when they go abroad, are glad to find a representative there. He has been the means of facilitating our intercourse with France, and, at the same time, of drawing the attention of the Government to the means of developing our trade with that country; and the salary attached to that office is a very small one indeed, and such a salary as few persons of superior talent would be inclined to accept to fill that office.

Mr. MITCHELL. Are his services required at all? That is the first consideration. I do not believe they are, and I have failed to see any advantage this country has ever got from the appointment of Mr. Fabre.

An hon. MEMBER. He looked after the member for Centre Toronto.

Mr. MITCHELL. If he paid attention to the hon. member for Centre Toronto, that was very graceful on his part, and there is no better man he could look after. But outside of that, I know of no service he performed. The sooner the Government ascertains whether he is of practical benefit to the country the better; and if he is not, the sooner his services are discontinued the better.

Mr. COOK. Other gentlemen have visited Paris besides the hon. member for Centre Toronto, and have received hospitality at the hands of Mr. Fabre. I had the pleasure of meeting him at his office, and I am sure he receives very kindly all Canadians who visit Paris. I know he was with me, and I attempted to utilise him in the direction in which his services are valuable, but he failed to get me the information I desired or the individual I wished to meet. However, I do not blame Mr. Fabre for that, for he did all he could. I was proposing to be instrumental in bringing out a second immigrant, and to do my country a great service by having two immigrants instead of one for this expenditure of \$7,000. But I must bear testimony to the way in which I was received by Mr. Fabre.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Fabre is a gentleman of very considerable ability and of great culture, and it is very important, in my opinion, to have a Canadian representative in a place so important as Paris, not merely in regard to France or Paris but in regard to the whole continent, for Paris is a great continental centre and is visited by strangers from all parts of the continent. It is therefore of great importance to have a gentleman of Mr. Fabre's ability, talents and culture representing Canada in Paris in order to give information there in regard

to Canada. His paper has been referred to. I may say that his paper is not a money-making concern at all. But it is almost exclusively devoted to furnishing information in regard to Canada, and information of a most valuable character is diffused in this respect through its columns. It has been utilised for that purpose, not only in France but in Switzerland and Belgium, and, in fact, to a large extent all over the continent. The expenditure is not a large one, and I think the country receives very good value for it. Mr. Fabre has, to my personal knowledge, so maintained his dignity as a representative of Canada, as to acquire very considerable influence with the leading statesmen in France; and I am quite sure that the influence he exercises there in making Canada known and respected is very valuable. I am sure that gentlemen who visit Paris and have an opportunity of seeing what he is doing, and the mode in which it is done, and the position he occupies there, will not think this is an extravagant expenditure by any means.

Mr. McMULLEN. Notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman has said with regard to Mr. Fabre's influence, the result of his labors in the past has been the bringing out of one immigrant to our shores.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At this moment 11 families with considerable means, are on their way to Canada, through the instrumentality of Mr. Fabre.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is what we might call the first fruits.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is a great thing to have a beginning.

Mr. MITCHELL. It has taken a long time and a good deal of money to get that beginning.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Fabre evidently thinks himself as important a representative of the country as the hon. the Minister of Finance himself. While in London assisting at the Colonial Exhibition, Mr. Fabre drew \$10 a day for living expenses, and I notice that the hon. the Minister also drew the same amount, so that Mr. Fabre thinks himself as important as the High Commissioner.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, he eats just as much.

Mr. McMULLEN. The High Commissioner was very moderate, drawing only \$10 while he was attending the exhibition.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He always is.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot understand why Mr. Fabre should draw that much. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that Mr. Fabre is on a par with himself?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He is, in many respects, superior.

Mr. McMULLEN. He has not drawn quite as large a salary, but, according to the Auditor General's report, he has managed to draw a pretty good round sum. I do not think the people of this country can afford to have an expensive aristocrat of that stamp drawing the money of the people. If we had an agent there to whom we paid a reasonable salary it might not be objectionable, but to have a man there who is sucking the life-blood of the people is an outrageous scandal. \$6,528 to keep a man in his position living in Paris on the fat of the land is decidedly objectionable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Is this not rather a small business to be discussing the salary given to Mr. Fabre? Why he is attacked I cannot say. The majority of the people of Canada are certainly the English speaking race. We have an immigration agent in London.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do not raise race questions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not want to be interrupted. We have agents in England, Ireland and Scotland. We have 1,250,000 people of French descent in Canada, and it is natural they should like to see one of their own race in France, trying to induce some of their compatriots to come out here. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the French Canadians desire to increase in numbers, and they are very successful in carrying out that desire, and they are naturally anxious to keep up connection with the country of their ancestors. Why should we object to one French Canadian going to Paris to use his best influence to bring out French immigrants? And although he has not been very successful in that respect, he has been successful in other and very important directions. He has been successful in inducing French capitalists to invest in Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL. Where?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We know that French capital is now eagerly seeking investment in Canada, and know that Mr. Fabre is prepared to give information to French capitalists with regard to such investment, and we know that by means of his paper he has created a great interest in Canada in France. That is very desirable, and as he is our only French Canadian agent, we might fairly allow him this sum.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The arguments advanced by the hon. Minister in defence of this appointment are, to my mind, very absurd. It was not half as strong as the argument offered by my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). He had something substantial to offer as a reason why we should have a commissioner in France. He said, it is a very nice thing because, when I went there, I went to his office, and he treated me very kindly. He did not say that he gave him a glass of wine, but no doubt he showed him every attention. Of course it is only right that the Dominion of Canada should have a gentleman there to entertain such an hon. member as that. We all ought to shut our mouths and say nothing when this gentleman bestows favors upon such a grand member of Parliament when he is in France. Of course he distinguished himself, and Mr. Fabre took him around Paris and other places, in order to show the people there what a fine specimen Canada could send there. No doubt he rendered in that way ample service for the amount he receives as salary. The First Minister says he does a useful work, and that it is only reasonable to expect that the French in this country would desire to have a Frenchman in Paris to represent this country there, so as to induce the people to come from France to this country. We are all desirous to have them come, but Mr. Fabre has been there for many years, and I suppose has performed in the past the same service which he is performing now, and what are the results? My hon. friend from Simcoe said he had brought out one individual to Canada for all the amount which we are giving him. The Minister of Finance says he has edited a paper and sends it broadcast, and that it is doing a useful service to Canada by the dissemination of useful information. Are we not printing pamphlets and paying enormous sums of money under the head of immigration to have these pamphlets sent all over Europe in order to induce people to come; and why is it necessary to pay this individual something over \$1,800 for the printing of this paper? I ask if one tangible evidence can be given of any benefit which has resulted to the Dominion of Canada by the publication of this paper in France, Belgium, Germany or any other part of the old country? The First Minister promised us a few years ago that we should have a detailed statement of the operation of this office. Where do we find any detailed statement of the results which have been produced? I say that this is for no other purpose than to give this man a lucrative office by which he can reside there in

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

ease and comfort. He received a salary from the Quebec Government. He was sent there by them, and, after he got to France, I suppose he found it so comfortable, convenient and attractive to him that he desired to stay, and this Government have decided to keep him there. The statement of the First Minister that he has induced French capitalists to seek investments in Canada is merely an assertion without anything to substantiate it. If the hon. gentleman had been honest in his assertion—and he is not generally honest in his assertions—he would have said that it was owing to the exertions of Mr. Mercier, the Premier of the Province of Quebec, that French capitalists have been induced to come to Canada. It is not Mr. Fabre who has induced them to come. He has no time to do that. His time is taken up in looking after individuals from Canada like the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). He has no time to spend on other matters, and the First Minister knew full well that, in the statement he was making, he was trying to mislead the House, and he knows that this man in the past and at present is doing no service and that this vote is only a bonus given to him to enable him to remain in that country. I am surprised that the right hon. gentleman longer attempts to defend such an item, or that the Minister of Finance should say that the paper which is printed there is of any benefit to Canada. We know it is not, and, until the Minister is more honest with the House and brings in a report giving a detailed statement of what Mr. Fabre is doing there, the House would be justified in refusing any longer to pass such an item as this.

Mr. MITCHELL. When the right hon. gentleman attempts to raise a race cry in order to justify a very doubtful item, he pursues a course which is not worthy of him. There is no one who desires more than I do to have Frenchmen come to Canada and settle here. If it is desirable to have a man in Paris to induce Frenchmen and French capital to come here, let us send some man who will induce them to come, but do not let us keep a man there who has been there for about ten years, I suppose, and I do not think has controlled ten immigrants. As to French capital, I should like to know where it is. The late Mr. Senecal and the Secretary of State had something to do with inducing one of those financial institutions to come into this country. They came and spent a lot of money, and then they practically stopped their operations. Since then, I know of no French capital which has come here. The other day some discussion arose about French capital coming into this country, and the complaint was that they were treated so badly by the Dominion Cabinet that they declined to come. I am not going to take up the time at this hour and at this stage of the Session in discussing this matter, but I think the Government would do well to enquire during the current year as to what Mr. Fabre has done, and to be prepared at the next meeting of Parliament to state what services he has rendered. If they cannot do that, it will be well to consider whether they should not drop that item in future.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire it to be distinctly understood that I raise no objection, nor does any hon. gentleman on this side of the House raise any objection whatever to reasonable exertions being used to induce French immigrants or French capital to be brought to this country. There is a great deal to be said for that. But I have never seen a report from Mr. Fabre. I do not think any such report has ever been laid on the Table of the House. I do not remember any such report being printed in the Immigration Report presented by the Minister of Agriculture; and certainly, if we are to pay money from year to year for this purpose, we ought to have a report submitted by Mr. Fabre to show what he has done, or what he supposes himself to have done. That point, I

think, the Ministers ought to insist upon. It has been raised before, and has never been attended to.

Mr. COUTURE. (Translation.) I must thank the Government for having appointed the Hon. Mr. Fabre Canadian agent in France. It is certainly but an act of justice towards the French-Canadians and the minority in this House. I am happy to see the Hon. Mr. Fabre representing the French Canadian race in France. He lives in the midst of a nation which is acknowledged as one of the greatest in the world. His work is assuredly slow, but it is sure. We already have amongst us some Frenchmen who came here through Mr. Fabre, and I see in the newspapers that a number of French families, having large means, are leaving France to come and settle in Canada. I hope the money spent for the promotion of French immigration into Canada will be beneficial to us. I thank the Government for what they have done so far, and I urge them to persevere in that patriotic course towards France and Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have heard that this gentleman has not invested his money on the other side. I understand that he is a stockholder in the Texas Ranching Company. I do not know whether that is true, perhaps the Minister of Finance will be able to tell us.

To meet payments to extra clerks for services rendered in preparation of returns ordered by Parliament \$5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hardly think this item is necessary, in view of the number of sessional clerks we have, and of the fact which, if I remember aright, was stated to us by Mr. Speaker, that he was able to detach certain of these sessional clerks of ours, to act practically as secretaries for members on both sides of the House—although I never received any. If our sessional clerks have nothing else to do, they might be made available to prepare returns. We have got a considerable number of employes here who, as I understood, are not fully employed. It would be a very fitting thing that their extra time should be taken up for just such services, unless there be a rule that a man who is in the service of the Parliament of Canada, must not do any work that is not immediately connected with Parliament. Only 99 returns were moved for, and unless they were of an extraordinary character, they cannot require the employment of a whole host of extra clerks.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is merely an estimate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But this kind of estimate is very apt to be used.

Commercial Agencies..... \$10,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is for the purpose of sending agents to foreign countries to promote trade. At this moment a gentleman has been sent to Brazil and the Argentine republic for the purpose of ascertaining how far we may be able to develop trade there. Last year a gentleman was sent to Cuba, Port Rico and the British West Indies. Previously an agent was sent to Japan. It is simply a provision that when occasion requires the Government may send out agents for the purpose of extending our trade.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. gentleman would do well to see that the Canadian subjects in Cuba are placed in the same position as Americans. A British subject cannot leave that Island without permission.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would be very glad if my hon. friend would let me have as much detailed information as he can on that point, because I think we will be able to deal with it in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. MITCHELL. This sending expeditionary missionaries to foreign countries for the purpose of promoting trade, so

far as my experience goes for the last 20 years, resulted in nothing. I recollect in 1865-66 the old Government of Canada sent an expedition, composed of a great many distinguished statesmen of that day—the Hon. Thomas Ryan, the Hon. Wm. McDougall and a number of others—down to the British West Indies, to Brazil, Cuba and to other southern countries for the purpose of promoting trade. They made a report, and that is the last of it. There have been expeditions going periodically ever since. We had an expedition to Australia, and an expedition to Jamaica. They may do something perhaps in Jamaica, but as to this expedition the hon. gentleman has referred to, I do not think it will amount to much. I think it will result very much in the same way as a good many others of these commercial missionary expeditions which have been sent out from year to year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not suppose the hon. gentleman can refer to a single one of these commercial ventures which were set on foot during the last 20 years that has been a success. I do not think he can point to a single addition made to our trade with any foreign country in consequence of any commercial agent that has been sent out. The hon. gentleman knows that our lumbermen are engaged in trading with some South American countries; that some manufacturers of sewing machines have entered into trade with many countries in Europe, and with the South Americans; and matters of this sort are generally more satisfactorily conducted by those who have a special interest in opening up trade with those countries. The agents he has sent out in the past are men who have no special knowledge of the wants of the countries, of the chances there are for developing trade in any particular branch of business in this country or with any branch of business in any foreign country. Certainly the experience the hon. gentleman has had during the past 20 years ought to show him that he should leave these matters to our manufacturers, and our merchants, and our lumbermen, and to those who have a special interest in opening up trade with those countries, instead of the Government undertaking it. In every instance where the Government have undertaken it, they have proved flies on the wheel, they have failed to accomplish any purpose. The men who are engaged in trade, who have a special interest in securing the foreign market, are those who will best succeed in finding another market. They know with whom to deal. The hon. gentleman sends out his agent; he meets certain members of the Government, he does not meet the consumers, he does not meet with those who have an interest in trading with us; he merely meets with the officials and public men of the country, and has a very good time of it, and returns, and that is the end of it. If the hon. gentleman wants to find for a needy politician a position in which he can find an excuse for handing him over a few thousands, with which to spend a pleasant summer in a sort of holiday expedition, I can understand this vote. It is perfectly intelligible from that point of view, it is not intelligible from any other.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken in supposing that the Government desire to find employment for needy politicians, or that any portion of this vote is being used for any such purpose. Mr. Wood, who went to Australia, and who cost the country a very small sum indeed, was an intelligent man, and while he travelled through various parts of Australia, the press of that country was filled with statements calculated to bring Canada forward and to show the population of the various Australian Provinces, the advantage they would derive from closer trade relations with Canada; and I believe at this moment that if the whole of that \$10,000 had been expended in that one service, it would have been amply repaid by the increased trade that has been growing up over since between Canada and the different Provinces of Australia. I quite

agree with the hon. gentleman that after all the best means of promoting trade is to get parties who have a direct personal interest in the extension of their trade to take hold of it. The exhibition attracted a great deal of attention, and now an exhibition is being held in Melbourne, and a large amount of space has been taken up and given to Canadian manufacturers and exhibitors. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) will agree with me that in selecting Mr. Jones, of the city of St. John, who is now visiting the Argentine republic and Brazil for the purpose of extending our export trade, we were not providing for a needy politician or a dependent on the Government. He was appointed at the unanimous request of the Chamber of Commerce of St. John, a body representing all parties, which body indicated him as a very desirable person for the work, and which appealed to the Government to investigate those markets, and laid before us evidence which they had collected in regard to the trade. They had sent out an experimental cargo, and were satisfied that if the Government would follow that up and send out an agent to place himself in communication with the Governments and various commercial bodies there, a great deal could be done. We believed the statements to be well founded, and we selected a person acceptable to all. I do not think this is a waste of money. I believe nothing is more important to Canada at this moment than to endeavor to extend our trade with remote countries in every possible way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With near countries, not with remote countries.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Near, or remote. I want to extend our trade as far as possible, and to as great an extent as possible with every country.

Mr. MITCHELL. Since the hon. gentleman referred to me personally I can only say this, that as regards Mr. Jones, whom I know very well, he is personally a most respectable man. He is a brewer in St. John and a brother-in-law of one of the members for the county of St. John, and is a most respectable and worthy man. As to Mr. Jones doing one iota of good in developing this trade between this country and the countries to which he has gone, I believe it will end in a complete and total failure. It is something like the mission of Sir A. T. Galt to Spain, when he was accompanied by an extensive staff, with the brother-in-law of the worthy Premier as secretary of the staff. They spent a great deal of money, and what did it result in? It will be found to have resulted in scarcely any benefit whatever to this country. Then there is Mr. Wyld's expenses to Jamaica. What will that mission result in? Nothing. Mr. Wyld is a smart, clever man, who had been in business in Halifax, Nova Scotia,—a man with a good deal of acumen I admit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And in business in the West India trade.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes. But an extension of the business of the country is not to be made by missionaries but by the mercantile class. They talk about trade with the Argentine republic and about one vessel being sent from St. John as an experiment. Why, I read in the papers the number of regular steamers running between the Argentine republic and Europe, particularly England, and I think the number was ten or twelve steamers. I have no doubt that country is a good field.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is very rapidly developing now.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, so much so that some of our people are going down there to build railways. But is the extension of trade to be promoted by sending Mr. Jones there?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope so, that is the object.
Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the High Commissioner that is to be would go there himself, with his plausible tongue and power of convincing people and of making the worst appear the better cause, as he often does to the misfortune of this country, and the befogging of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, he might accomplish some good; but the Government will never effect any good by these commercial missionaries whom they are sending out. What should be done is what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) indicated. Business certainly should be promoted between these new countries and also between the old countries, and the utmost freedom of trade should be afforded. My hon. friend the Finance Minister had better commence at home with our neighbors across the line. The hon. gentleman frankly accepted the suggestion I made in regard to the statutory obligation the other day, which, unfortunately for this country, he was compelled—I suppose by the pressure of his colleagues and other circumstances which I need not mention—to withdraw, and he left us in a worse position than before. Before they endeavor to extend trade with remote countries let the Government take down the barriers between Canada and the United States. I will not say that these missions are undertaken for the purpose of finding employment for broken-down statesmen and politicians, because in some cases it is not so; but, perhaps, a desire to advance the private interests of an individual has had as much to do with it as anything.

Mr. McNEILL. I will instance one case in which a very important trade was developed through other agencies than mercantile men in the first instance. I refer to the trade in fresh meat between Canada and the mother country. This cattle trade, as every one who knows the circumstances of the country is aware, was developed entirely through the agency of the gentleman employed as our immigration agent in Liverpool.

Mr. MITCHELL. Pshaw!

Mr. McNEILL. He was the person who brought Canadian meat to the notice of the people of England, and it was directly through his action that that great trade was built up which is now of such great importance to the people of this country. That is a fact which, perhaps, the hon. gentleman does not know, but if he will make enquiry he will find it to be absolutely correct.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think I know as much about the live cattle trade between Canada and England as does the hon. gentleman. I tell him that no single man in Liverpool promoted that trade and has been the means of developing that immense trade—he is mistaken. The trade has been developed by our cattle men in Montreal, Toronto and all through western Ontario. Their action has developed the trade and not the service of one man in Liverpool—and I do not know to whom the hon. gentleman refers. There is no man in Liverpool to whom we are indebted for having developed this trade. Some one individual may have seen the advantages that would arise, but our people saw the advantages and acted upon them. When the English market offered a profitable market for our cattle our own merchants and experienced cattle men promoted the trade, and they have since built it up.

Mr. McNEILL. Our own merchants and enterprising men must always carry out the trade. We were speaking of persons opening up channels of trade and directing public attention to them. We are not supposing that one individual can conduct trade between Canada and the West Indies or Canada and the mother country.

Organising Printing Bureau \$1,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot understand for what purpose \$1,000—\$2,500 for 1887-88, and \$1,500 for 1888-89—is required for organising a printing bureau.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That amount was required to pay the Queen's printer and superintendent for printing, travelling expenses connected with purchasing printing plant, also superintendent's salary and salary of assistant, also contingencies of the new department.

Plant required for Government Printing Office, &c...\$165,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman I hope will be able to submit some statement as to how it is proposed to expend the large amount asked for printing plant, &c.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of the \$218,500 voted last year, \$58,500 will be expended before the 1st of July, with lapse of revote of \$75,000, \$61,000 are required for plant for printing the voters list, which has already been purchased. That makes with the revote of the amount required for the purpose, \$133,000. The \$82,000 is an additional amount required according to the estimate of the superintendent of printing, making a total of \$165,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This has nothing to do with the buildings?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Could the hon. gentleman give us it in detail?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very sorry that I have not the details here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman cannot give us that now, I would like he would lay on the Table before concurrence, a moderately detailed statement showing what that is wanted for.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I will do that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I see that the hon. gentleman proposes to provide for a Government bindery. It is to be hoped that the binding of the public documents will be done better than has been done for years past, for I think that the very worst binding in Christendom has been done in Canada. I have not seen any books which we have received in exchange, the binding of which is done as badly as it is here, for the binding here will hardly hold the volumes together. There is another item I wish to make an observation about. The hon. gentleman says that part of this appropriation is for the plant for printing a voters' list. I was in the hopes that the Government would abandon that project. I was in hopes that the last two or three years experience would convince them, as it has convinced the people of this country, that this system should not be persisted in. The hon. gentleman when he proposed the Bill said he wanted uniformity, but the hon. gentleman has since abandoned that principle of uniformity, and one of the hon. gentleman's colleagues has said he was in favor of manhood suffrage; a principle that many of the Provinces have adopted. Why should the country be put to the expense of printing this voters' list and incurring this large expense, when those lists are published by the various municipalities without the expense of the appointment of officers and everything of that sort? Surely when the hon. gentleman has undertaken to perfect and develop this scheme, he should allow this expenditure to stand over until this House has had an opportunity of considering and reconsidering that whole question.

Hot Springs, Banff, roads, &c..... \$25,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What amount has been expended up to date for the reserve at Banff Springs?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not able to say what amount has been expended. I can give you the particulars for which this vote is to be applied. The greater part of this amount will be expended on the completion of the road to the Devil's Lake, one of the most attractive spots in the Rocky Mountain park.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is the country travelling that road?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it is only the Opposition that are going on that road.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend wishes to get from the proper party more information about that road?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will have to build two houses there and the cost will be limited to \$3,000 each. The existing roads will of course require to be kept in repair, and the distribution of the water of the hot springs extended, as the construction of the hotels in Banff render necessary. The work done in the park last year is mentioned in detail in the annual report of the Department of the Interior. Although the Estimates shows an increase over the Estimates for the previous year, there is in reality a great decrease in the sum that will be at the disposal of the department, as there was a balance of \$30,829 at the credit of the department from the previous year's vote on the 30th of June last.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have seen so many reasons for differing from the conclusions which the hon. gentleman has arrived at, and I feel so little confidence in the hon. gentleman's judgment that when he tells us that the road to the Devil's Lake is a most attractive road, I am inclined to distrust him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You will see it yourself.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Although it may be one which the hon. gentleman is required to take, I am not any the more inclined to travel on that road because the hon. gentleman says it is a pleasant one. Let me say this: he proposed last year and he proposes this year, to spend a large amount upon a park, where not one in 50,000 of the population can ever go. He proposes to spend a large sum for the advantage and the comfort of the wealthy, and if the country was settled between this and the Rocky Mountains there might be some reason for the appropriation which the hon. gentleman is asking for. But the hon. gentleman knows that the whole North-West yet remains to be settled. It is to-day as it was ten years ago, a lone land. The population there is comparatively a mere cipher, and with the whole country unsettled, with the want of the necessary means to open up that country to the extent that is desirable, with the demands upon the public Treasury for works that are actually necessary in various portions of the Dominion, the hon. gentleman proposes to continue the expenditure upon the road to the Devil's Lake, a road upon which he expended a large sum last year, and which he is endeavoring to make attractive, to those who have the means of visiting that section of the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before we leave this item I would like to have the hon. Premier, who visited the Banff Springs last year, tell us what the place is like. I committed myself in supporting the Government about that Governor General's warrant when it was passed, and I had great satisfaction in doing so. I have always approved of the Government taking over that park, and I think I was the first that had ever written to the hon. gentleman in relation to that matter. I had been in the North-West and found that it was getting into the hands of private individuals, and when the discovery was first made I took the liberty to write to the hon. gentleman and was glad to see that he had taken it into the hands of the Government. I hope this money will be expended for the benefit of the masses that visit that very attractive place for personal comforts and the curing of diseases. I have heard very full accounts of what has been done there. I have been told by gentlemen who have visited it frequently that it is the best arranged and laid out park they have ever seen, and that the gentle-

man in charge of it has done his duty in the most efficient and scientific manner. While I do not know much of this road to the Devil's Lake—it is more for the advantage of the rich than the poor, and it is the rich who are most likely to go there—I think that the money laid out for the development of the curative springs there ought not to meet with an objection in this House while the expenditure is kept within a reasonable amount. Whether it is so kept or not, the accounts given by the persons who have visited it frequently are of the most satisfactory character.

Mr. TROW. I approve of any reasonable expenditure for beautifying that park. I do not know of any more attractive place on the continent of America. I have been at the Yellowstone park, and it is not merely \$25,000 a year which the United States Government are expending upon it, but hundreds of thousands annually. It is easy to say that the poor have not access to that place. I was there five weeks last summer, and I can assure you that of the people there ten to one were poor people who had been sent there by their friends, not merely from the Province of Ontario, but from other Provinces, including one or two from Nova Scotia; and there were people there from many parts of the United States; and it is attracting more people yearly. The superintendent of the park is a thorough, practical surveyor. He has constructed one avenue nine miles in length. I have been at the Devil's Lake, where there is magnificent fishing, and where boats can be obtained from private individuals. The whole park, which is some twenty-four miles in length by twelve in width, embraces most magnificent scenery, and I hope the place will be made attractive, because the beneficial effect of the waters has been proved. You will find as many crutches there as will almost fill your dwelling, which have been left by persons recovered, and who left their crutches behind them as monuments of the curative properties of those great springs.

Collection of Orders in Council, &c..... \$9,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is doing this work?

Mr. THOMPSON. This is for the printing of the collection of Orders in Council which have the force of law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is Mr. R. C. Weldon, who was employed in that work? Is that the present member?

Mr. THOMPSON. He was employed before he became a candidate for a seat in this House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did the hon. gentleman do in his case as was done in another case to which I called attention some time ago—bring him up here?

Mr. THOMPSON. No, the electors of Albert sent him here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that the hon. gentleman, in his zeal for economy, brought another gentleman from the Maritime Provinces, and allowed him, besides \$12 for his services, \$4 or \$5 a day for expenses of residence while at Ottawa. That gentleman was brought from Antigonish. I would like to know if the same was done in the case of Mr. Weldon, or if he did his work at home.

Mr. THOMPSON. There were no expenses of that kind connected with Mr. Weldon. The work he did was done at Halifax. The case of the other gentleman was like the cases of those who prepared the statutes, and all of whom were paid the expenses of living.

Salaries and expenses connected with Excise... \$351,627 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a rather curious provision here, to increase the salary of A. F. McPherson, accountant, Toronto division, from \$1,200 to \$1,400, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil

Mr. MITCHELL.

Service Act. Why does the hon. gentleman want to make a precedent, which is a dangerous precedent, to say the least of it?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Unless the sum is voted it could not be paid to him under the Civil Service Act. He is an accountant and book-keeper in the distillery office of Gooderham & Worts, in Toronto, one of the most important places in the Dominion. He is a special class officer, and would be entitled to receive \$1,400 under the Civil Service Act, on a special survey, but his services are so valuable where he is that the inspector does not consent to his going on a special survey.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many distilleries are under the Act at present?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Two at Toronto, one at Prescott, one at Windsor, one at Perth, a new one started at Hamilton; one at Halifax, and one at Belleville. That is all I can remember.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman asks for a considerable increase?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The first increase is in the salary of the officer I have just mentioned. The increases are: new appointments, \$1,080; promotions, \$1,940; increases under the Civil Service Act, \$2,625; increases under regulations, \$4,767; and increases during examinations, \$1,010; making a total increase of \$21,152, which is reduced again on the other hand by superannuations to the extent of \$3,900; by deaths, to the extent of \$5,900; by deductions and dismissals, \$1,650; by transfers to contingencies, \$750.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that in 1886-87, a considerable sum, nearly \$2,500, appears under the head of extra allowance to officers in Manitoba, to compensate for the increased cost of living. Does that still continue?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The intention is to stop it entirely.

Weights and Measures and Gas..... \$87,970

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Who is the assistant inspector for the London district in the place of Mr. Boggs, and why was Mr. Boggs removed?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Boggs was removed because of age and infirmity. Mr. Coughlin, who comes from North Middlesex, has been appointed for that district, which includes several counties, and another inspector has been appointed for Brantford who has a portion of that district also.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). As far as the assistant inspector is concerned, I think the statement made by the Minister that Mr. Boggs' infirmities rendered him unfit to perform the duties of the office, is hardly correct. I know him personally, and he is as competent, physically and mentally, now as he was when he received the appointment. Whether he is competent for the position or not, the Government certainly knew that at the time they made the appointment. Of course, he is a man of considerable age, but he was appointed to that position and discharged the duties, I suppose, as efficiently as he was capable of performing them. Very likely he had to pass an examination before assuming the duties.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; it was before the Civil Service Act came into force.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Then he must have been appointed solely for political reasons. There was another inspector there before the present Government repealed the Weights and Measures Act. He was a very competent man, but he was dropped and Mr. Boggs was appointed in his place. Now, it appears that he was incompetent and unfit for his office, and that he did not pass any examination. But he

was quite as competent to perform his duties at the latter period of his incumbency as he was at the first. I have been told that there was some other reason for this poor man's removal from that position, and that it was not incompetency. Whether that is so or not, it is not for me to say. All I say is that Mr. Boggs was always a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, that he received his appointment on account of services which he had rendered to hon. gentlemen opposite, that he was a devoted supporter of theirs, and was found, in season and out of season, opposing every Reform candidate who presented himself for election in the riding, and I suppose it was for that reason that he was appointed. But very likely he and the inspector did not quite agree. Very likely the inspector wished to have some friend of his own appointed to the position, and so Mr. Boggs, though needing the position, and being needy, and having received the appointment, and having left another business for that, was removed and some one else was appointed. I think this was a hardship to him and is unjust to his family.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the revenue derived from this ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have not the figures here. The revenue does not meet the expenditure, but a very large improvement has taken place in the last four or five years. The deficit in 1873 was, I think, over \$70,000. Two years ago it was reduced to \$40,000, which is a material improvement, and it is not more unfavorable now, though the service has been extended.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the deficit last year ? That seems to be an enormous deficit of \$10,000 on an expenditure of \$37,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is between \$30,000 and \$40,000.

Culling Timber..... \$54,900

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will trouble the hon. gentleman to return to the item of culling of timber. I either misunderstood him in what he stated, or he was under a misapprehension. I understood him to state that the deficit on that item was only \$19,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I understood the hon. gentleman to ask me what the present receipts were.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought there was some misunderstanding. That is a matter which requires a little explanation. I notice that we received for culling in 1831 some \$45,000, and spent in that year apparently about \$51,000, and \$56,000 in 1882. So that six or seven years ago our expenditure and receipts for culling were apparently very nearly equal, or at any rate the deficit was not more than from \$6,000 to \$8,000 or \$9,000. Now the total receipts, the hon. gentleman states, were about \$19,000, so that really we have only received about one-third of the amount I refer to. Now, these cullers undoubtedly ought to be paid by fees, and it appears to me that it is a very unjust charge on the people of this country that they should be asked to pay \$59,000 in 1887-88 and \$55,000 this year, as it is to be, when they receive only \$19,000 or \$20,000 for cullers' fees. I think we ought to deal very summarily with this matter. It appears to me to be a gross abuse that the people of Canada should be compelled to pay \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year for the benefit of these cullers in Quebec, for that is what it amounts to. I do not understand how it happens that, whereas we used to receive \$10,000 and \$15,000, and our expenses were \$51,000, \$56,000, \$54,000, and then \$50,000, we are now to be asked to pay \$55,000 when we only get \$20,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am not surprised at the complaint made by the hon. gentleman as to the condition of things in connection with that office. I think I may say that it is the intention of the Government, before next Session, to

provide some such change as will relieve the Dominion of that charge entirely by some measure which will place it in the hands of the local authorities, as it is in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. There the lumbermen pay for their own culling, but this in Quebec is something which we inherited from Confederation. A number of those cullers were retired from their position, and the fees were taken by the Government. The fees are falling off, and something will have to be done, and something will be done before next Session.

Mr. MITCHELL. The fact is that the business has fallen off. Instead of Quebec having the export trade now for the shipment of square timber, the trade has become simply the shipment of deals. From year to year the export shipment of square timber has fallen off; as the forests become depleted, the mill owners and lumbermen are going more and more into the cutting of logs, and in place of shipping square timber, as was done when this institution was first established, they are shipping deals. My hon. friend knows that is the reason, and it is his duty, as Minister of the Crown, to submit a scheme whereby this cost would be minimised in some way. We have no right whatever to pay out of the revenues of the Dominion, with a large deficit every year, for the purpose of measuring timber that is shipped from the ports of Quebec or Montreal. I trust my hon. friend will carry out his proposition, and if he is not in that office when we meet next year—it is said he is not going to be, that he is going to get a more permanent one—I hope the one who will succeed him will do so.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I said it was the intention of the Government to do that.

Adulteration of Food..... \$25,000

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is an increase, but I do not think the House will object to it. The total amount is very small for a service that extends over the whole Dominion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I dare say it may be. Does the hon. gentleman get any fees that compensate for the expense ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; the expense is mainly one in the public interest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know what examination do these analysts pass, or in what way are they selected ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The examination now is very strict. It is made by a board of examiners of which the chief analyst, a professor in Montreal, of very high standing is one, there is another from Toronto, and the professor in the Ottawa College is a third. A candidate applying for the position of analyst or assistant analyst has to undergo a very stringent examination by these gentlemen.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Who is the analyst for the city of London now ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is no one appointed yet, because no one has passed the examination.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Is Mr. Saunders still filling the position he held in 1886-87 ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, he has severed his connection with our department, and we have appointed another one. That shows how strict the examination is, because if a candidate had presented himself and had passed the examination, he would have been appointed for that position.

Mr. WILSON. When did Mr. Saunders retire from the position ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. When he was appointed to the experimental farm—I think some time last year.

Collection of Slide and Boom Dues \$21,700

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to enquire of the Minister whether any arrangement has been come to or is in contemplation, with the Governments of Quebec and Ontario, as to these slide and boom dues. I have understood that they proposed to take the entire management of these matters into their own hands.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This refers more particularly, I think, to the Crown Timber Office, although it has a bearing upon this also. There was a Crown Timber Office here and in Quebec. One-third of the expenses are paid by the Dominion, one-third by the Quebec Government and one-third by the Ontario Government. I have not heard that there is any intention on the part of the Provincial Governments to interrupt the present arrangement.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does this item cover the rentals of the mill sites, and privileges, and water power at the Chaudière Falls?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Has the hon. gentleman done anything to rectify the long-standing difficulty that has existed there? Has he collected any rent?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We collected a considerable amount this last year. The hon. gentleman will remember that I stated before the Committee of Public Accounts that I would take steps, with the consent of the Government, to place the matter in the hands of the Minister of Justice, with the view of bringing about a speedy settlement on this question, and I have done so.

Intercolonial Railway \$2,900,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is an increase of \$300,000 over the estimate of last year. The details of that increase are: locomotive powers—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see the details; and perhaps it will save the hon. gentleman some trouble not to bother about details, but just explain to us generally why he needs the increase.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is owing to increased business.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The more business we do on that road the more money we lose. In addition to \$2,600,000 for 1887-88, the hon. gentleman asks in the Supplementary Estimates for \$477,000. What is the hon. gentleman's forecast as to the future?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very glad to be able to tell the hon. gentleman that although the expenses were exceptionally heavy on account of the severity of last winter and the unparalleled difficulty with snow, the department hope to nearly balance the account. Although the Government asks for \$300,000 more, the estimate of the department is that the account will nearly if not quite balance during the coming year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is to say, you will have \$300,000 more surplus?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Instead of having a large deficit for this year, for the year to come the accounts are expected to practically balance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Let us hope so. What is the hon. gentleman's forecast as to the probable effect on traffic of the Intercolonial Railway when the new lines are in full operation? When the short line to St. John is completed across the State of Maine, we must expect of necessity that there will be a large diversion of traffic to that route. I understand the short line will be opened by the 1st of July. It will tap the Intercolonial Railway at Rivière du Loup.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will bring a good deal of traffic on a portion of the line as well as take some off it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This matter is a good deal *in nubibus*, but the department has formed some idea as to what will be the probable effect of these new lines of communication with the seaboard.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No doubt it is a very important point, and it has received the consideration of the department as far as possible. It is quite impossible to make anything like an estimate; but, in general terms, I may say that while through traffic will, to a considerable extent, naturally go by the short line to St. John, N. B., the continued development of the country and expansion of the business along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, which is very great indeed, and the great reduction in the expense of operating the line resulting from the traffic that will be taken off it, we hope that the result will not be much more unfavorable than it has been in the past.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman promised to bring me a memorandum of the cost of transporting the stone brought from Miramichi to this new building.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have a memorandum.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Every person must see it is very beautiful stone, and it is much more pleasant when strangers come to Ottawa and enquire where the stone came from to be able to say it came from New Brunswick, rather than to be obliged to say, as is the case in regard to these buildings, that we had to get it from the United States. It is very gratifying to be able to show that we have in Canada the finest freestone perhaps in the world, and that it can be made available for the construction of our public buildings.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The cost of transporting the stone from New Brunswick to the Canada Atlantic Railway Station, here was a little less than 12 cents per cubic foot, there being 14 cubic feet to the ton. The distance is about 850 miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be a rate of \$1.68 cents a ton for a distance of 850 miles or one-fifth of a cent per ton per mile. Does the Minister consider that he could carry stone that distance at that rate and pay the expense of transport?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a very low rate certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not see why my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) should be so inquisitive about this. This work is done for the purpose of constructing a public building, and I think he should not be so inquisitive about the cost, as to whether the railway could afford to do this at the rate or not. This is developing a great interest in the expanding of the National Policy of this country. It had the effect of opening up one of the finest quarries in the world, and there is material enough there for every public building, and every private one too, between Port Arthur and Cape Breton. He has no occasion to be so inquisitive about those details, because here we have a public railway and particularly this stone comes from Miramichi.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a good deal in what my hon. friend says, but at the same time I want to know really who paid for that stone? Did the contractor?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, the contractor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was it arranged with the contractor that he should get that stone at that rate?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose the contractor made the bargain with the railways.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course the contractor making that bargain made it with the Government, as they are the owners of the railway; but the hon. gentleman has not answered my question whether it was physically possible, to convey this stone so as to pay the expenses at that rate?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hear that it was.

Mr. SHANLY. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) should remember that this is return freight. Railways would rather take return freight at low rates than have their cars come back empty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought we had coal coming back?

Mr. SHANLY. I suppose they send coal too.

Mr. MITCHELL. We do not send coal on flat cars. The cars are peculiarly constructed for coal.

Mr. SHANLY. It is a low rate I admit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does my hon. friend from South Grenville (Mr. Shanly) think as a commercial transaction that this can be done?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think we would make much money out of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Could it be done without a loss?

Mr. SHANLY. Yes, it could, provided there were empty cars coming back. It is better to take the stone than empty cars. On no other conditions could it possibly pay.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should think not. I would like to know at what rate per ton, per mile, is coal carried on the Intercolonial?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Three-tenths of a cent per ton, per mile.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is about fifty per cent. more than the rate charged for this stone. Does that pay?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not lucrative.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I understand that the original contract was that the stone should come from Albert County, and that the contractor was allowed instead to bring it from Miramichi.

Mr. MITCHELL. I had something to do with that, and I know about it. I met the contractor one day, and I asked him why did he not go to Miramichi for the stone. I told him there was splendid stone there and that it was perhaps the best to be found in the world. Stone of a similar character is to be found at Albert County and also somewhere about Metis. I believe that the contract was closed (and I am speaking under correction) the contractor made an exposure of the quarry down at Metis and also at Albert.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The election was over then?

Mr. MITCHELL. Do not impute motives if you please. He made an exposure of the ground and found that the stone there would not be sufficient in quantity. It was purely a business matter for the contractor. After I told him about Miramichi he got a specimen of the stone there and submitted it to the Minister of Public Works, who in turn submitted it to his officer, who believed it was the best stone that could be found, and as it was abundant in quantity they decided to accept it. I know the contractor told me that he made his own bargain with the Grand Trunk in order to carry his stone from Quebec here, but what bargain he made with the Intercolonial, I do not know, but I

presume he made the bargain to carry it through. Now that matter about the stone has been well ventilated, and while we are on the Intercolonial Railway, I will, with the permission of the committee, refer to a circumstance that was referred to the other night with regard to the sale of the Intercolonial. I stated on that occasion that the Government of the day had been in negotiation with a French company for the purpose of selling the Intercolonial Railway. I stated among other things that I was informed that in addition to the negotiations for the sale in this country they had a meeting at London at which three Ministers were present, the Minister of Customs, the Finance Minister and the Secretary of State, and that they met on that occasion those French capitalists with a view of discussing, as I understood, the sale of the railway. I have since learned that the discussion was confined at that particular meeting to the establishment of iron works as part of the scheme in connection with the railway, and I feel bound to make that explanation. At the same time I say this, and I think I will be able to sustain what I say, that the sale of the Intercolonial Railway was part of the system which was connected with the establishment of iron works in Nova Scotia. Although the particular discussion in relation to the Intercolonial Railway did not occur at that meeting in London, it had previously been discussed by the Minister of Railways and by the Secretary of State, and for ought I know by the Finance Minister—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no, never.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, I say at all events, the Minister of Railways, for I can prove that, and I believe by the Secretary of State too, although I am not prepared to say I can so clearly prove that. What I pretended to say is that the statement made by me the other night, although literally not correct, was practically correct, because the sale of the railway was part of the iron scheme, and I hold in my hand a book to prove it. I had this document in my possession before I made the statement, but it happened to be in Montreal and I was not able to produce it. I hold in my hand a proposition made by Mr. Kamper representing this French syndicate for the purchase of the Intercolonial, for the construction of railways through Cape Breton, and the establishment of iron works in Nova Scotia, in Pictou or elsewhere, in such suitable places as was desirable. Mr. Kamper makes three propositions. He makes the first to Count Ducros:

"1. A proposition for the construction of three lines from Moncton to Oxford and from Sydney to Louisburg not being considered of immediate necessity, the syndicate wish, nevertheless, to indicate that they are willing to undertake their construction so soon as the Government decides upon it, and will duly consider at the proper time all questions having reference to these lines."

And then in a letter submitted to the syndicate through Mr. de Montgolfier, general manager of the St. Ciment Company:

"That the ordinary annual production would be 40 000 tons, but should business increase the work would be enlarged and made to furnish a much larger output, and that all the machinery, tools and plant generally used in rail factories and the fitting up of the same be admitted free of duty. Also that the rails needed for the construction of the different lines of the eastern division by the St. Ciment Company be also admitted free of duty, should the Syndicate be granted the contract. That the duty of \$17 per ton be levied during ten years from 1887, on rails and other railway supplies of foreign manufacture."

Then we come to proposal No. 3, which is the gravamen, sustaining the statement I made:

"Proposal No. 3—The Great Eastern Railway of Canada, with the Intercolonial as a main line. The syndicate would respectfully request from the Government the following:"

Then he goes on to state the different propositions: The operating of the Intercolonial with its projected branches and the Eastern Extension to one of the extreme ports of the Atlantic; the construction and operating of a line to

form a continuation of the New Brunswick line in the direction of Quebec, and the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. To whom is all this addressed?

Mr. MITCHELL. To John Henry Pope, Minister of Railways for the Dominion of Canada, and to the Government of Canada. He says:

"The three above-mentioned awards will constitute a system of railways destined to promote considerably the colonisation of the south-eastern portion of Canada, and develop to their full extent the industrial resources of Nova Scotia. It is estimated that to complete the plans and estimates of the projected lines and put the Intercolonial upon a rational and economical basis, a delay of a year would be necessary, counting from the day the agreement is signed."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is there any reply from Mr. Pope? I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman. It is quite evident that this has been sent to the Minister of Railways; but parties may project things and send them in, but is there any reply or discussion of the thing?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will read a letter signed by Mr. Kamper and sent to a friend of mine.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Was there anything sent from the Minister?

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not know. I am not in the secrets of the Administration. I am making this statement in justice to myself, and I am doing it in order that the public and the Government may know that a scheme was on foot to sell the Intercolonial Railway, which forms part of the charter of this country, and in order to warn the Government not to dare to sell that road. In the meantime, I am merely confining myself to statements which are necessary to prove the correctness of the statement I made the other day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That the proposition was made. Will my hon. friend allow me to say that I have asked the chief engineer—to whom if Mr. Pope proposed to entertain this proposal at all he would have referred it for a report as the first step—whether it was ever referred to him, and he says it never was, and he made no report upon it.

Mr. MITCHELL. You had better wait until I get to the end:

"Mr. Kamper, now at present in Canada, will deliver you this letter and enter into negotiations with the view of bringing matters to a successful issue."

This is signed by the president of the syndicate, Count Ducros. There were three schemes—the construction of the Cape Breton extension, the establishments of iron works, and the sale of the Intercolonial, to be called the Great Eastern Railway of Canada. Then we come to how he proposes to do all this. He says, with regard to the rail works:

"As stated in the annexed proposal for an annual production of 40,000 tons, the cost of these works is estimated at \$1,500,000.

"The capital is ready, and the capitalists show a certain impatience at their funds remaining unproductive at a time when money can find ready investment.

"Allow me, Sir, to summarise the conditions of the proposals concerning these works:

"The output of 40,000 tons must be taken as a minimum production.

"As it is in the interest of the manufacturers to meet all demands, once the works are opened, they will, if needed, increase their capacity for production.

"It is evident that the railway companies will object to the increase in the price of the rails; they will submit to this increase only with difficulty, and may combine together in order to bring about the closing of the works; experience leads us to believe that such will be the case. For this most important reason we ask from the Government the guarantee of a minimum demand for a stated term of years. Thus the Government can easily do by giving rails instead of money when distributing subsidies to companies asking help. The Government can also require that in the future rails be furnished by Canadian manufacturers."

Mr. SHANLY. What did they propose to give for the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. MITCHELL. They state to me that Mr. Pope told them he proposed to entertain the sale of the road on the basis of \$15,000,000, but these people wanted it for nothing. Here is the report from the staff of engineers the French company sent out to Canada. Mr. Lebrun, under whose direction the commission worked, says:

"You wish me to furnish you with the conclusions of the report of my mission in Canada; I hasten to do so, awaiting the moment when I shall be prepared to give you the report itself."

Then he goes on to give a report of the management and running condition of the Intercolonial Railway, which I do not propose to read. He says:

"The Intercolonial Railway, in a traffic point of view, is divided into sections of very unequal value, the most profitable being the one located between St. John, Moncton, Halifax; the most valueless is the one designated under the name of the Eastern Extension, located between New Glasgow and Port Mulgrave."

Then he gives a statement of the earnings of the road, showing what was lost in the years 1885 and 1886, and says:

"If we compare these figures with those of other Canadian or American lines doing an equal amount of business, one is struck with the high rate of expenditure.

"The principal cause of this trouble is to be found in the unprecedented lowness of tariffs which the Government grants to traders in the Eastern Provinces. Even admitting a very large tonnage, the rates are not calculated to cover the working expenses.

"Economy could probably be introduced, in locomotive power, by utilising to a better advantage the loading of trains, and by reducing their number, which under the pressure exercised over the management by the people have been too largely increased upon certain sections.

"Lastly, a company reducing the expenses as much as possible, and capable of commanding more work from its staff, could reduce considerably the working expenses.

"But the fact is not to be concealed that it is due to the insufficiency of the tariff if the budget of expenses is so crippled; in the hands of a company which cannot afford to work at a loss, it will be necessary to raise the tariffs."

Then he says:

"However, by the calculations which will be found in the report, based upon comparisons either with neighboring companies, or commercial information, I think that we could arrive at a receipt of \$2,000,000, and reduce the expenditure to a figure of \$1,800,000, leaving a net gain of \$200,000."

In place of the deficiency which he describes.

Mr. SHANLY. Who was to get the \$200,000?

Mr. MITCHELL. The company, if they got the rail-road for nothing. You see, there is a very elaborate plan got up, which they were going to lay before the people of France to induce them to come in and buy our road. I suppose they intended to bond it, and whether the stockholders would get anything or not, they would make a great deal of money out of it. Now, since the discussion the other day, a friend of mine who happened to be in New York, sent Mr. Kamper a copy of the *Herald* containing a report of that discussion, and I have received this letter, which Mr. Kamper sent to my friend. It is dated at New York on Tuesday last, and is as follows:—

"Many thanks for the *Herald* you sent me. I have read Mr. Mitchell's telegram, but I cannot send the documents. They are in Europe, where a memo. of all the things which happened to us by the Federal Government, especially by Mr. J. H. Pope and Sir Charles Tupper, will be made and submitted to the foreign office at Berlin."

So you see we are in danger of war—

"But I am glad to tell you that in the meeting in London——"

That is the meeting that I had a good deal of trouble in squeezing out of the hon. the Secretary of State the other day——

"the Intercolonial Railway purchase was not mentioned at that meeting. It was only spoken about the iron establishment in Nova Scotia, and a certain agreement was made, which has never been fulfilled by the Government. In regard to the purchase by the Intercolonial Railway I can assure you that Mr. Pope has made to us, in the month of June, 1886, a proposition to buy this road from Montreal to Moncton, saying that the lines from Moncton to St. John and Halifax would then be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Hon. Judge Church was present at that interview, and he possesses the original of the letter which Mr. Pope wrote to him the next day on that matter. The initiative in this Intercolonial Railway question came from the Minister of

Railways. but I had the opportunity to speak about the same question to the other Ministers, and not one told me that this road could not be sold. On the contrary, every one gave us the best encouragement, and therefore we have sent several missions of engineers over to study the road, and our engineers had received the best official reception in Ottawa, Moncton and everywhere. We have made, after the Government sent us to Paris, all the costly profiles, plans, maps, &c., from the Cape Breton line, a careful investigation about the construction price, and we have offered the 16th October, 1885, in the name of the Comptoir d'escompte in Paris, to build the whole road from Oxford to New Glasgow, the Pictou branches, and the Cape Breton road, altogether 250 miles, for a subsidy of less than \$2,000,000, and to build the western division short line for the subsidy voted, but we received the answer that our price was excessive; but now the Government spends more than \$2,500,000 for the Cape Breton line alone, and the western division has made an issue of \$7,000,000 with five per cent. interest guaranteed for twenty years by the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am not well to write you fully, but if it can be of any use, and if Mr. Mitchell wants it, I will send him a French report about all which happened to us. We have lost three years' time, we have expended more than \$50,000 for nothing, because we have believed in the truth of the Canadian Ministers. Excuse these badly written lines, I am not at all well.

" Believe me, Sir, yours very truly,
" J. KAMPER "

Now, there is the letter I received, which I think fully bears out the statement I made that the Government were in negotiation for the sale of the intercolonial Railway. I may state that in Montreal, some four weeks ago, I had occasion to visit a business office, and I was shown letters from Paris from some of those very capitalists complaining in the most bitter language of the want of faith shown to them by the Canadian Government. Of course, with that I have nothing to do. I simply mentioned this; and I am sorry, and more than that I may say that I saw the letter of the hon. the Secretary of State, written by himself, to an individual excusing the Government for having so treated Mr. Kamper, and I was surprised the other day at the warmth shown by the hon. the Secretary of State, and regret he is not here to hear this explanation. This is the first opportunity I had of bringing the matter up, and I take advantage of it for the purpose of vindicating myself and warning the Government that if they dare attempt to sell that road, a road which forms part of the contract under which we came into Confederation, they would commit a breach of faith which would justify the Province of New Brunswick, and I am not sure that Province would not be glad of the opportunity, of going out of Confederation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want simply to refer to one point. Mr. Kamper says a bargain was made with him in London. That statement is not true. I never saw Mr. Kamper in London, except in the presence of my colleagues, the Minister of Customs, the Secretary of State, and the Deputy Minister of Finance. In the interview with Mr. Kamper and with a number of his associates, gentlemen of very high financial standing as iron masters, who made proposals with reference to the manufacture of steel rails, I told these gentlemen in the presence of my colleagues - and that is the only interview I had with them - that I did not believe the Government would accept their proposals, but that I would lay them before the Government. I told them I considered the proposals most extravagant, and had no idea the Government would entertain them, but that if they would formulate them in writing I would lay them before my colleagues. That promise was redeemed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What the hon. gentleman now speaks of had reference simply to the proposition for establishing iron works?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so. I had no communication with those gentlemen concerning the subject, and they never mentioned the subject of the purchase or sale of the Intercolonial Railway at any meeting, and I had no negotiations with them on the subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the other Ministers probably have heard something of the proposition which

the hon. member for Northumberland states was made by the Secretary of State, tending or looking to the sale of the Intercolonial Railway to this syndicate. Or does the hon. member or do his colleagues say they are entirely ignorant of this proposition to sell the Intercolonial Railway? I think we have the right to know, because if the Minister of State communicates with influential capitalists touching the sale of a road like the Intercolonial Railway it must be presumed that he does so with the concurrence, at any rate, of the leader of the Government. It would be impossible that a Minister could do that without first having conferred with the Premier. Now, the Premier will observe that my hon. friend for Northumberland states he saw a letter from the Secretary of State offering to sell that road.

Mr. MITCHELL. Excusing the Government for not being able to do what was proposed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not offering to sell, but excusing the Government for not being able to carry out the sale.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have not been to Montreal since the discussion, or I would have endeavored to see if I could not get the letter.

Mr. BOWELL. I only desire to say that, after meeting those gentlemen in London, I met them in Paris in company with the Secretary of State, and no question was discussed by those gentlemen and ourselves except the establishment of iron or steel works in Nova Scotia, and they were told distinctly that their propositions were altogether too extravagant to be entertained. I never heard any question, to my recollection, concerning the purchase or sale of the Intercolonial Railway, so far as those interviews are concerned.

Mr. MITCHELL. During the administration of the Province of Quebec by the Secretary of State, we know what happened with the railway there, and I was a little afraid something of the same kind might happen to the Intercolonial Railway. That is why I take this opportunity of publicly making these statements, because I contend that New Brunswick came into Confederation upon the express stipulation - and the hon. gentleman knows that we refused to go into Confederation unless that was put in the bond - that the Intercolonial Railway would be built as a Government road. We would not take their word, we wanted it put in the charter. The Government objected, but we insisted it should be put in the charter and it is there, and they have no right to sell or give over that road in any way. I may state another fact in reference to this correspondence that was exhibited to me in Montreal, that those French bankers had written to a party in Montreal with whom they were in correspondence, complaining bitterly that the Government had gone back on their contract and agreement, and asking if faith could be had in these men.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I saw Mr. Kamper and some other gentlemen who were with him with regard to the establishment of a steel rail factory. I am sure that no such offer to give over the Intercolonial Railway was ever made by the Government or any of them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Or by any member?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As far as I know,

Windsor Branch Railway \$27,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it necessary to keep those various railways all separate?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is necessary so far as this is concerned. The Windsor Branch Railway is leased, and, therefore, it is necessary to keep it separate. It is not part of the Intercolonial Railway system.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Eastern Extension Railway is surely a part of the Intercolonial Railway system.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is to all intents and purposes, and ultimately an Act will have to be passed to make it so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the Windsor Railway pay its expenses?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, and more.

Canals—repairs and working expenses \$:65,720

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About how does this compare with our tolls at present?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It pretty nearly balances.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A little I suppose on the wrong side?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this the whole, or are there side votes to be added?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think this is all, except what is in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have under the head of railways and canals, chargeable to income, an amount of about \$256,000. That should be added, I suppose, to this to give us a fair idea of the cost of the canal system.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then practically the \$256,000 would represent a loss. If I understand, the income is about equal to this \$465,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman give the details?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have the details of everything except the income, which they have not furnished me with.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know really what is the annual loss on the canals. At present you have to look at so many different places in the Estimates that it is difficult to discover it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the statement on Monday.

Mr. BARRON. If it is not inconveniencing the Minister, could he tell me if a lockmaster has been appointed at Fenelon Falls?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman now, but if it is very important I will get the information for him.

Sault Ste. Marie Canal \$97,650

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am anxious to put myself right with the committee on this subject. As I stated, in the absence of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, I could only speak from recollection as to the cost of that canal, a vote having been taken of \$1,000,000 a year ago and the previous estimate being \$750,000, I stated that it was intended to extend the work very considerably, and, therefore, it was necessary to increase the estimate, and I assumed that the amount of nearly a \$1,000,000 in the estimate, as I found no information in regard to it in the papers furnished to me, would be sufficient. I find that was entirely erroneous. The approximate estimate to complete that work and obtain a depth of 16 feet at the lowest water, is \$2,800,000, and the hon. member for Glengarry

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

(Mr. Purcell) was not so far wrong in his statement, though his information does not agree with that of the department in reference to the cost of the approaches. If a depth of 20 feet at the lowest water is to be obtained, Mr. Page's approximate estimate of the cost is \$3,800,000. It is not proposed certainly to have that. The very outside depth would be 16 feet, which is 2 feet deeper than the Welland Canal and would require a vessel coming through with that draught of water to lighter at Port Colborne in order to pass through the Welland. I mentioned to Mr. Page, after the discussion we had the other night, the statements which were made, and said I would like to have a memorandum on the subject. He says:

"A person called on me this evening and mentioned that you wished to see me about the Sault Ste. Marie Canal matter. I regret being at present unable to give you anything like full or satisfactory information on the subject. In fact I only received this morning a copy of the Minute of the Privy Council intimating the depth the canal is intended to be made—16 feet at low water. It may, however, be stated that the Island of St. Mary is about 4,600 feet across, it at some places is very little over the upper water surface, at 800 feet out from the shore at the lower end the water is of the full depth required, and at from 1,300 to 1,500 feet out from the island at the upper end the channel way is of the full depth required; but about 3,000 feet above, a few places will require to be deepened a few feet. The material to be removed is principally boulders, stone, gravel, and what is called Potsdam sandstone rock."

I think that is about all the statement contains. The fact of my having been absent, and taking the estimates up with the information under my hands, and not having had any connection with the department, led me into the erroneous statement, and I assumed the \$1,000,000 would complete the work. The estimate for the 16 feet is \$2,800,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a very serious matter. I hope the Government will pause before they proceed with an expenditure which is at least \$3,000,000, and may very well come to \$4,000,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$3,800,000 is for 20 feet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But an estimated expenditure of \$3,000,000 in a work of this character, as we all know, runs great risks of being exceeded. Now, I trust the Government, under these circumstances, will pause before they proceed. It is well known that the Americans are constructing a double lock there of enormous dimensions. It does appear to me that with the construction of a railway on the north shore giving us access at all seasons of winter and summer, to the North-West, it is really a sentimental thing for us to go and spend three millions of money, unless there is extremely grave cause for it. I do not think that it would be contended by the Minister himself that, for commercial purposes, there is any need for a canal on our side, when the Americans have already an immense canal which they are now doubling.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We propose to take the vote, and to have a careful survey made of the ground, and then the Government will be in a better position to consider the whole question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the Government do not propose to go on, I understand. This is now nearly the 1st of June.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. According to the way in which these things move, it does not strike me that it would be practicable to have a large expenditure made before the House meets again. But I think it is very desirable to have a complete location of the canal and the most careful estimate that can be made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to that, but I do hope that the Government will not commit themselves, until the House has an opportunity of considering the question again, to an expenditure of three millions. I

understand the Minister to state that nothing further will be done until a full survey has been made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, nothing else.

Committee rose and reported progress.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say that it is the desire of His Excellency the Governor General to prorogue the House on Tuesday. In order to be able to do so; I think we must work very hard, and I am going to move that when the House adjourns, it shall stand adjourned until 10 o'clock on Monday morning. It will take all Monday, and I dare say a portion of Tuesday, in order to enable the Governor General to prorogue on Tuesday. I would say that the programme is this: that we will meet here say on Tuesday at two o'clock, or the House will adjourn rather, at two o'clock, and proceed to the Senate Chamber, where the Senate will also have adjourned. There the Address, in English and French, will be presented by the two Speakers to His Excellency, who will, of course, answer in both languages. We shall then return here and await the summons at 3 o'clock to prorogue the House. With the permission of the House, I move that when this House adjourns it will stand adjourned until 10 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me it will be impossible for us to get through in one day. I think the adjournment should not take place till Wednesday, because there are something like 250 items to go through, and how can we get through them unless we jump the whole thing?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the House will be very anxious to allow Parliament to be prorogued as the last official act of His Excellency the Governor General, who will be obliged to leave on Wednesday. In order to carry that out we must have him prorogue on Tuesday. Therefore, I hope that the hon. members will agree to work as hard as they can on Monday and the morning of Tuesday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will raise no objection to the meeting at 10 o'clock on Monday. I think that is a very reasonable proposition; although I may just remark that a session from ten to six, eight hours consecutive, will be rather too much. We must have a half hour's adjournment at one o'clock.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. From one to half-past one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That will do. But I may say this: I am very desirous, and so are all my hon. friends, of facilitating as much as we can the arrangement the hon. gentleman has proposed, and it may be that, beginning at ten—practically having three days for it will amount to that—it may be that we can get through; but in view of the very considerable amount of work that has to be done, I would not like to pledge myself ahead that we could get through because there are, I think, 200 separate items in the Supplementary Estimates, and then there is concurrence to be taken on the whole Estimates.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not see how it is to be done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have gone very great lengths of late years in this matter of concurrence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have discussed questions very fully going through.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We will try what can be done, but it is running the thing tremendously fine.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I doubt extremely in any case whether it would be possible—you might present

the Address, if you pleased, to His Excellency at two o'clock—but I doubt extremely whether it would be possible to have prorogation before night.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be the best that could possibly be done, and I see difficulties even in the way of that.

Mr. MITCHELL. We will leave the question of whether prorogation will be in the afternoon or in the evening, until Monday, until we see how we get on. There is every disposition to facilitate the arrangement, but I do not see how we are going to rush through such an enormous amount of business in so short a time.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It seems to me concurrence should be taken on Monday on many of the items. This leaving concurrence until the last day when many members are away, is to be regretted, as the Minister knows that members often ask the Government to let matters stand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think anything has stood for concurrence this time.

Mr. GIGAULT. Do the Government intend to proceed with the resolution respecting the salaries of certain judges?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it is not the intention of the Government.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and, at midnight, the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 21st May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Ten o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE—ELECTRIC LIGHT.

Mr. EDGAR asked, What is the nature of the contract between the Government and *Gazette* Printing Company, of Montreal, as to the lighting of the Montreal post office by electricity, in respect of the time for which the contract has to run, the amount of lights or power supplied, and the price paid for the service?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A contract was made with the *Gazette* Printing Company on 23rd October, 1885, for five years, to supply electric current to the Montreal post Office for 150 sixteen-candle power lamps, on Edison incandescent system, for an annual rental of \$2,750. In March, 1886, it was found necessary to extend the number of lamps by 87, at a further annual rental of \$637.96 making a total number of lamps now 237, and the annual rental \$3,387.96.

BRIDGE AT QUEBEC.

Mr. LAURIER (for Mr. LANGELIER, Quebec Centre) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to recommend to this House some measure to aid in the construction of a bridge opposite or near to the city of Quebec, or to be empowered to construct the said bridge themselves?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention of the Government at the present Session,

THE TOBIQUE VALLEY RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant a subsidy hereinafter mentioned, towards the construction of the following railway, that is to say:—

To the Tobique Valley Railway Company, or any other railway company, for fourteen miles of railway from Perth Centre Station towards Plaister Rock Island, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 49 Victoria, Chapter 10, for a railway from Perth Centre Station, on the New Brunswick Railway, to a point near Plaister Rock Island, and in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 50 and 51 Victoria, Chapter 24, to the Tobique Valley Railway Company, a subsidy of \$89,000.

He said: That amount has been already voted to the Tobique Railway Company, but they have done nothing, and I believe are not likely to proceed with the work. The object of this resolution is, in case the Tobique company fails to take up the subsidy voted to them, to empower the Government to make the same arrangement with another company who may be able to carry on the work.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it the same amount?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is there any other company in existence?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think a charter was granted to another company during the present Session.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it the same distance as the one last year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, the same distance and the same route.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to ask what is the entire length of this railway? How many miles from the Perth station from which it is proposed to run this road?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that it is simply a re-vote of the same amount and for the same purpose precisely as was voted last year, and the conditions are exactly the same as the provisions last year. If the company do not proceed with the work within a certain time this resolution merely gives us power to make a change to some other company.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is the line not shorter than last year?

Mr. THOMPSON. The resolution is exactly in the same words as that of last year and the distance is the same.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The only change is inserting the words "or any other company."

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the Order for third reading of Bill (No. 140) to authorise the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned be discharged and again referred to Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BROWN. I desire, Sir, to make a few remarks in connection with this railway question. I have no doubt the House, generally, is aware that great disappointment has existed, and does exist, in a great part of Ontario, at the withholding of subsidies from several lines of railways, the promoters of which, last year and the previous year, were very much emboldened by the strong hopes held out to them to go on and incur expense in surveying, obtaining rights of way, and so on. The railway which I am more particularly interested in is one which I think claims a good deal of consideration at the hands of the Government, and I hope they may see their way to grant that assistance which we so much require. The South Ontario Pacific Railway,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

which is projected to run through the important cities of Brantford, Hamilton and St. Catharines, to connect those cities with our national system, traverses a tract of country which has been a great contributor to the wealth of the country, and which, in consequence, has been a large factor in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Today those important cities and the country adjacent to them are deprived of direct access to the Canadian Pacific Railway; and as those cities are large manufacturing centres, we have no means of conveying the products of our manufacturing centres to any portion of the country or to the far North-West, or the Pacific coast by a direct system of connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The cities of Hamilton and Brantford have hitherto contributed very large sums of money towards the construction of railways. I may claim for my own city of Hamilton that it has not only led the van in encouraging all railway enterprises, but it has been a stout and cheerful supporter of any policy directed to the development of the country by railways. The wise and judicious policy of the Government in the past in subsidising railways for the development of the resources of the country has met with the support of the people, and will continue to meet with the support of the people; and no better investment could be made by the country than to assist railways intended to connect the large centres of trade with our great system of railway communication. I hope that the Government will soon be in a position to revive their wise policy of giving assistance to all proper schemes of railway; and I hope the Government will see their way speedily to recognise the importance of connecting with the Canadian Pacific Railway system perhaps the richest and most important portion of the Province of Ontario, containing the large manufacturing city of Hamilton, perhaps the first manufacturing city and the second in size in the Province. I desire to place these views of mine on record, and I hope the Government will see their way at as early a date as possible to recognise the importance of that line, which cannot be overlooked.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I see that by this resolution the Finance Minister asks us to agree to a subsidy of \$6,000 per mile.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I do not. I simply ask to put into this resolution the words, "or any other company." I am asking for nothing. I am simply asking to amend the existing Act.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That would be very unsatisfactory. It would leave the Government *carte blanche* to go and arrange with any other company, and to use their influence—I will not say a corrupt influence, but it might, perhaps, be very convenient to them—for the building of this railway; and in asking this House to appropriate a sum of money, I think they should indicate what company is to get it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume the hon. gentleman was not in the House when I explained that the company to whom this appropriation was made, have made no progress, and, the Government are informed, are not likely to do anything. Another company has been chartered this Session for the same work, and it is proposed that if the original company do not pursue the work within the prescribed time, the Government may transfer the subsidy to the other company.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has not explained why the House is called on to vote \$6,000 a mile, double the sum voted to any other part of the Dominion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not explain that because I am not asking the House to vote a shilling. I am not changing a letter in the Act, except in case the company to whom the subsidy was voted fail to carry out the work.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When was the Act passed ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Last Session.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). These votes are brought down at the last moment, and do not receive the attention they should.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say to my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Brown) that it is unfortunate he was not in the House when I explained how it was that the Government were obliged to turn a deaf ear to the demands of the large and important deputation which came from that section of country to ask for aid to the railway to which he has referred; but as we proposed this year to call a halt, and not to grant any new subsidies, with the exception of the two to which reference has already been made, we were obliged to ask my hon. friend and the section of country he represents to leave that demand in abeyance for a future day, when I hope the Government may be in a better position to go on with those works than we are at present.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Last year I find that the railway votes were passed in committee on the 23rd of June. I had left for home at that time, and I think also most of the members from New Brunswick. The resolutions were only brought in on the 20th, the subsidies passed on the 23rd, and the House prorogued the next day. I see there is no reference to this grant in the Debates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, we cannot afford to lose the day on this question, and if hon. gentlemen opposite are not willing that it should pass by common consent after my explanation of the circumstances, I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. Carried.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood that the hon. gentleman withdrew.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said I would withdraw if hon. gentlemen were not satisfied with the explanation which has been given.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Withdraw.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Withdraw, then.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. COUTURE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the House will observe that in the Estimates which are now before us there is an item of \$96,000 for the Lake St. John Railway. I must say that this subsidy was promised in 1886 to Mgr. Dominique Racine and that the same promise has been made by several of the hon. present Ministers. In 1887 that subsidy has been voted in fulfilment of a promise made in 1886, but it was granted to a company holding a local charter, but without even a subscribed capital; in order to be granted that charter, one of the shareholders was compelled to subscribe \$80,000, but I must say he was not worth 80,000 cents. The company was but an impediment to the building of the railway. Later on finding themselves under the responsibility of building the road they wished to sell their rights to the now existing company who held a charter for the main line. They at first asked for \$20,000; from \$20,000 they went down to \$10,000, and finally they accepted \$6,000. I must say that a transaction of that kind is far from being honorable, and that the result was to delay the building of that railway branch which was so greatly needed in the country. During the present Session the Government, after numerous requests from myself and from the electors of the county, authorised the transfer to the existing company of the subsidy granted to the other company. I am glad of it, and I must congratulate the Government for their action.

Those \$96,000 have been spent by the present company and sixty-five miles of that branch which are greatly needed, are still to be built. I notice that subsidies are granted to many railway companies, amongst which there are some whose lines are already opened to traffic. I protest against that policy, and I believe we ought rather to favor railways like the one for which I am now interested. During the present Session I have asked for a subsidy of \$239,465 to enable us to complete this railway, which will open to colonisation one of the finest sections of the country. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that Lake St. John Valley is not known enough by the hon. Ministers and the members of this House. At the beginning of the Session I received and forwarded to the Government several petitions from the county which I have the honor to represent; no less than eighteen petitions signed by more than eighteen hundred electors, amongst whom are the curates, mayors and councillors of those different parishes, all feeling confident that we would be granted what we asked for and were fully entitled to. Another petition signed by a good number of the hon. members from both sides of this House, congratulating me for my exertions in favor of a railway which will be so useful to that section of the country. Another petition with the same object was signed by the hon. members of the Senate, and I have myself addressed letters to all the hon. Ministers claiming justice for that section of the country. All have answered me, saying: that I could expect to obtain what I asked for. I have even addressed myself to the Privy Council and I was led to understand that something would be granted to that Lake St. John Railway. But, at the last hour, I find by an answer to a question put by me in this House, that nothing has been granted for that enterprise. I must say that it is painful for us, because those hard working and intelligent people who are endeavoring to progress as rapidly as possible, are thus checked for at least two or three years. I believe it is my duty to urge that the Government will reconsider their decision, and I hope that some hon. Minister will rise in this House and say that a subsidy has been granted to enable us to complete the railway at the next session, if not during the present Session. Mr. Speaker, I think it will be interesting to give a few figures as to the products of the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay and as to its resources. The following details are taken from the census of 1881. We have to-day in working order, in the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, not to mention large farms, 41 saw mills with 1,069 employes. The value of the raw material amounts to \$280,108; that of the manufactured products to \$657,341. The capital invested in all the various industries in the county, industries which are expected to progress rapidly, amounts to \$364,606. The number of employees is 1,393; the salaries paid annually amount to \$188,992. We have besides that other industries which are not included in the list I have just given. Now, I will give you some data as to the real property. There are in the county 4,498 proprietors, owning 464,329 acres of land; the number of houses is 4,514; barns and stables, 5,390; resident proprietors, 3,190; farmers, 399. The cultivated area is 76,470 acres; pasture, 55,366; gardens and orchards, 895 acres; improved lands, 132,731 acres. Mr. Speaker, we all know that the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay is almost a province by itself. The fact is easily shown by the following figures: 59,745,821 acres of land are in culture. The products of 15,189 acres of land, in 1881, were as follows:—

Wheat	155,589 bushels
Barley	47,825 "
Oats	211,216 "
Rye	13,221 "
Peas	73,555 "
Buckwheat	20,965 "

Corn.....	392 bushels.
Potatoes.....	287,238 "
Turnips.....	42,147 "
Other roots.....	3,398 "
Hayseed and clover.....	252 "
Hay.....	16,347 tons.
Linseed.....	1,761 pounds
Tobacco.....	67,437 "
Horses.....	1,812
Colts and fillies.....	838
Labouring oxen.....	2,225
Milk cows.....	9,398
Other cattle.....	8,288
Sheep.....	26,433
Hogs.....	8,390

Such were the products of the county in 1881, but I must remark that since that time they have almost doubled, and if we had a railway to carry them to market our farmers would strive to improve their lands, and their products would be twice as large as they now are. There is another important industry in the county, Mr. Speaker, and that is the home industry, the home work. I see by the last census that 131,190 yards of family cloth and flannel have been manufactured, and 46,387 yards of family linen; 82,382 pounds of wool and 20,834 of flax have been employed in manufacturing these articles. Mr. Speaker, I might mention another very prosperous industry which is a great boon to the county and the country at large; it is the dairy. In 1881, there were no butter or cheese factories in the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay. In 1898 we have 25 cheese factories and 4 butter factories under the Danish centrifugal system. The sales of butter and cheese in 1888 amounted to \$23,500. I hope that in the next ten or twelve years this industry will be more than doubled by the large natural pastures we possess and the care with which this industry is carried on. There is another industry about which a good deal was said in this House by several members from the various Provinces and which is carried on successfully in the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, and that is the fishing industry. I see by the census of 1881, that the fishing trade of the country was annually handled by 75 vessels and 334 men, 1,324 barges manned by 1,987 men, 1,565 cod-laying men, and 45,512 fathoms of nets. The following are the fishing products:—

145,080	ewt. of codfish.
5,304	" dabs and whiting.
4,011	barrels of herring.
322	" of mackerel.
89	" of sardines.
229	" of halibut.
1,055	" of salmon.
174	" of trout.
39	" of whitefish.
20,270	" of other fish.
47	" of oysters.
122,402	gallons of oils of all kinds.

In view of these figures, Mr. Speaker, I think the Government were wrong in not granting more aid to this extensive country. The Government are wrong in not granting us something to develop the resources of this great country. Last year, we had nothing from the Government, no grants for railways or for public works. This year our allowance is very small and we have nothing at all for our railways. At the beginning of the present Session I took upon myself to forward to the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin) a statement of the estimates and specifications of the works which I believe are absolutely needed in the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay. The statement reads as follows:—

" OTTAWA, 24th February, 1888.

" To Sir Hector Langevin:

" Sir,—I submit to you the estimates which I believe necessary for the counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay:
M. COUTURE,

Hydrographic survey and marine map of Lake St. John.....	\$5,000
Deepening of the Grande Décharge of Lake St. John.....	2,000
For the lengthening of St. Ann's wharf.....	4,000
Paving Chicoutimi wharf.....	1,000
Paving St. Alphonse wharf.....	1,500
Repairing the wharf at St. John's Cove.....	2,000
Wharf at Tadoussac.....	19,000
Clearing Rivière des Bergeronnes.....	800
Dredging near Chicoutimi wharf.....	2,000
Wharf, lighthouse and buoys on Lake St. John.....	20,000
Total.....	\$57,300

Well, Mr. Speaker, of this amount I was greatly astonished to see, by the Estimates, that we had only the sum of \$4,600, distributed as follows:—

Wharf at Tadoussac.....	\$1,000
Chicoutimi, St. Alphonse, St. John's Cove and Ste. Anne du Saguenay.....	2,000
Grande Décharge of Lake St. John.....	1,600
Total.....	\$4,600

I am really sorry to state that since two years the Government have granted but the sum of \$4,600 for public works in two counties having an extent of nearly 900 miles and a population of 40,000 souls, an intelligent and industrious population striving to progress. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I can say that if the Government had expended in the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay in public works and improvements the five-eighths of what was spent in other parts of the country, the population of the county would have been from 60,000 to 75,000 souls, instead of 40,000 as it actually stands. As I stated a moment ago, the soil is fertile and the county is extensive. We have in the United States thousands of French Canadians who wish to come back with us. What are they waiting for before coming? They are waiting until the country is opened, until they have roads, public highways and railways. They say, reasonably, that it is useless to go to Lake St. John and cultivate the land only to provide for local consumption, because there are no means of communication to export agricultural products. Well, when railways will be built, we shall see hundreds of poor Canadian exiles returning from the United States. I know the Government have expended a great deal of money to encourage the return of these exiles, but, in my opinion, the only course we should adopt to induce them to return is to give them colonisation roads in order to develop this great and beautiful country. The county I have the honor to represent, Mr. Speaker, is as extensive as a Province, and when we shall have fully known its importance, and when we shall have given to it an aid according to its size and to its future, Canadians will return by thousands to live in it, because the French Canadian always likes to rally round the steeple of his native country. He likes to return to the hearth of his family and live amongst his fellow countrymen. I therefore say that the only course we can adopt to recall our Canadians, is to open the northern counties, and particularly the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, by building railways and giving them a new market for their products. I hope, Mr. Speaker, I shall have a promise, during the present Session, from one of the hon. Ministers who are in this House at the present moment, that at next Session, the Government will see fit to grant the necessary subsidy for completing the railway now in construction, for building wharves and helping us to develop that fine country. In order to show the energy and the enterprising spirit of our population, I might say that a private individual built at his own cost a steambot now plying on Lake St. John. Other parties, feeling confident that the Government would grant a subsidy to complete the railway, have built a splendid hotel at Roberval, on the shore of Lake St. John, in order to invite tourists to visit

us and at the same time to better acquaint them with the resources of the country. Well, what a deception it was for these persons. For want of a subsidy the railway from Chicoutimi to Lake St. John cannot possibly be completed, and one can see the loss which was caused to the parties who built that grand hotel I mentioned and to the party who built the steamer navigating on Lake St. John. It is almost ruinous for those engaged in these enterprises. Mr. Speaker, when we shall have a railway to Lake St. John, at Roberval, a steamboat on the lake and wharves to moor vessels, I say that in the northern part of Lake St. John there is land enough to establish from 20 to 25 parishes. Well, I am very sorry that the Government have not thought it necessary to undertake the public works I have mentioned, but I hope they will reconsider their decision, and, that, as they have granted us hardly anything this year they will feel bound to give us much more next year.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps the hon. the Minister of Finance will give me his attention for two or three minutes. Of course it is late in the Session, and I may be slightly out of order in putting this question, but it is as well to have an explanation now with regard to a certain item. I was out of the House when the Estimates on the Intercolonial Railway were passed, I notice on page 46 of the Estimates, item 70, the item of construction, \$7,000. In the *Hansard*, I find an explanation given of that vote which I do not understand, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain it. The hon. gentleman stated that that was on account of a claim for \$20,000 which had been made for a gravel pit near Newcastle. I know of no such gravel pit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for drawing my attention to this matter. He was good enough to show me a telegram which he had received from the county. The pit is near Bathurst, and the memorandum I had incorrectly described it as near Newcastle. The claim is for \$20,000 to be given to this person for his gravel pit. It is a most inordinate and extravagant claim, the Government are resisting it in every possible way, and there will not be a dollar of money paid more than is proved should be actually given. When the Government took possession of this property, they found there was a gravel pit there. It was Government property belonging to the Government of New Brunswick, and this party, ascertaining that there was gravel there, went to the Government of New Brunswick and got a grant of the property. He has been making, in the judgment of the Government, a most inordinate claim, which the Government are determined to resist in every possible way.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very glad to hear this explanation, and I would suggest that there is a legal and a proper way for the Government to obtain any portion of the lands or gravel pits needed for the Government work. It would be well for the Government to take the ordinary legal means.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is what we propose to do.

Mr. MITCHELL. The claim is put down at \$20,000; \$20 would be nearer the value.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 140) to authorise the granting of subsidies in aid of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved :

That the amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 113) to amend Chapter one hundred and seventy-eight of the Revised Statutes of Canada, "The Summary Convictions Act," be concurred in.

He said: I explained on Saturday that the amendment made in the Senate was designed to remedy a defect in the Summary Convictions Act with regard to costs. The Act contains a provision that costs shall be recovered on conviction and provides that the warrant shall require the counsel to collect the costs. It has been decided that inasmuch as no tariff of costs has been prescribed, the convictions which provide for the recovery of costs and the warrant containing the latter provision are invalid, and a number of prisoners have been released in consequence. The better arrangement will, of course, be to provide a tariff of costs. But in the meantime it will be well to adopt the amendment of the Senate and remedy the matter by providing that a tariff of magistrates' costs enforced in the provinces shall be used for the purpose of convictions under this Act. This is only a temporary provision, and I propose to make a tariff of costs next Session.

Amendment concurred in.

BILLS WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 124) to amend the "Copyright Act," chapter sixty-two of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Bill (No. 88) to abolish Forfeitures for Treason and Felony, and to otherwise amend the law relating thereto.

SUPPLY—BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAWSON. I desire to draw the attention of the House to a matter which I consider of some importance and I shall only detain the House for a few moments. Some time ago the hon. member for Bothwell placed a notice on the Order Paper which he has not gone on with. That notice contained some very strong statements which I believe—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid I must ask my hon. friend, really, as a personal favor, to forego raising a debate at this stage. The hon. gentleman may occupy five minutes, but an hour may be occupied in answering him. In that case we must give up all hope of getting through to-morrow. The hon. gentleman would take the responsibility of preventing our being able to carry out what both sides of the House desire, to prorogue to-morrow. If he raises a discussion he cannot prevent, though he becomes responsible for the whole day being lost. I hope my hon. friend will not persist.

Mr. DAWSON. I shall give in to the hon. gentleman's wishes. I only wanted to draw attention to the very incorrect statements in that notice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am prepared to defend them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hire a hall.

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

(In the Committee.)

Collection of Revenues—Customs..... \$854,430

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it will be convenient, as we go on, that the Minister of Customs should state briefly to us such reasons as exist for increases or diminutions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose he will not be pressed so strongly in reference to the diminutions as in reference to the increases.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, not so strongly. At the same time, when a change takes place in a vote *pro* or *con*, it is only proper that the reasons should be stated to the committee.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOWELL. The details are so plain in this estimate that I suppose my hon. friend simply desires to know why the increases or decreases have taken place?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are two principal increases in the item of \$270,625 for the Province of Ontario—those at Ottawa and at Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. BOWELL. The increase of \$1,500 for Ottawa arises out of the necessity to appoint two additional men on the staff on account of the increased work at the railway stations, and also an addition to the Appraisers' department, where the revenue has swollen from \$30,000 or \$40,000 to \$60,000 or \$70,000. In addition to that, four outports have been established. One at Arnprior, another at Perth, another at Carleton Place, and one at Renfrew, all of which are attached to the Ottawa Port and consequently swell the appropriation for that port. The Sault Ste. Marie increase of \$2,400 arises from four or five additional men who will have to be added to the staff in order to manifest and check goods and cars which are passing over the Sault Ste. Marie bridge. The hon. gentleman is aware that wherever connections of this kind are made, it is necessary to have men appointed to check all the goods which are transferred from one side to the other, which entail a large amount of additional work without any corresponding return in the way of revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have you now communication direct with Minneapolis?

Mr. BOWELL. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there also a direct communication from Duluth?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think that is completed. I know flour has been sent in large quantities *via* the Sault over the bridge and the Canadian Pacific Railway. In regard to the amount of \$223,345 for the Province of Quebec, the great increase arises in the port of Montreal, and is caused by the opening of new railway stations and the large additional work required at the wharves through the increase of tonnage and the increase of shipping. As the amount of shipping and trade increases so in proportion the extra staff has to be increased.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the hon. gentleman means that when the Canadian Pacific Railway station is in full working order, there will be a larger number of men required there.

Mr. BOWELL. There will be when the new station is opened. We already had to put on officers at the eastern portion, and also some to look after the traffic crossing the river. The increase is on the extra staff for the summer season. As soon as navigation opens, fifteen, and sometimes twenty men have to be placed on the staff and kept there during the summer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is also an increase at St. Johns?

Mr. BOWELL. The port of Lacolle has been reduced to an outport, and the whole expense of that is charged to the port of St. Johns, of which it is now an outport; but there is no charge for Lacolle.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under the expenditure for New Brunswick, \$38,220, am I to understand that Moncton and Hillsboro' neutralise each other?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. BOWELL. Hillsboro' has been made an outport and attached to Moncton. The expenditure at the port of St. John is increased by \$1,450. That is caused by the transference in a great measure of certain outports which have been attached to St. John and by slight increases of salary to some of the officers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In Nova Scotia, \$109,310, Halifax seems to be the chief party to the increase.

Mr. BOWELL. The increase at the port of Halifax arises from the fact that the winter trade is increasing very rapidly, and I found it necessary, in connection with the transference of goods arriving in the winter to the railway, to put on three or four additional men. Some of those will go off the staff in the spring. Halifax is different from any other port in the Dominion. The work increases in Halifax in winter, and decreases, to a certain extent, in summer; while in most other ports the increase is in the summer and the decrease in the winter. The hon. member for Halifax is, no doubt, aware of that.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The general percentage of cost in collecting the revenue is less in Halifax, being about four, as against six in Toronto, Quebec and Montreal. I am not urging that it should be increased at all; what the Minister of Customs says is quite correct.

Mr. BOWELL. Manitoba, \$30,850.—There is a decrease here, owing to a decrease in the work in Winnipeg, and it is also decreasing at Emerson. Consequently I have dispensed with some of the temporary men, and have transferred some of the permanent staff to other places.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You mean that the imports are less?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, and of course the work is less. The necessity for the large staff there formerly, arose from the fact that all the goods that were sent from here into the North-West had to pass through the United States, and consequently had to go in bonded cars, and every bonded car required looking after when it arrived, either at Emerson or at Winnipeg. Now most of the goods pass over the Canadian Pacific Railway, by way of Port Arthur, into that Province.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. British Columbia, \$41,020.—Here is relatively an exceedingly large increase, nearly 25 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. That arises from the establishment of a port at Vancouver, and as in Winnipeg at first, a larger staff was necessary, and may possibly be reduced when the volume of trade is really known. The hon. gentleman will see that in New Westminster there is a decrease of \$2,200. Some of the officers there have been transferred to Vancouver, and a new collector was appointed, and a number of new officers had to be employed. I may mention that it is absolutely necessary to pay men in Vancouver and British Columbia larger salaries than are paid in the east, on account of the greater expense of living. There is also an increase in Victoria that we found to be necessary, from the looseness with which the business was looked after. During a visit made to that country by one of my officers, many irregularities were discovered in the management, and he recommended the appointment of four new landing waiters in order that more attention and a better surveillance over the goods that arrived at that port might be had; and, after reading his report, I decided that this addition should be made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman finds the present expense of living in British Columbia is greater than in Manitoba?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, I think it is, although I believe it is gradually decreasing, as it has done in Manitoba.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To provide for the administration of the Chinese Immigration Act, including remunerations to customs officers, \$3,000.—Would the hon. gentleman explain that item; and I also want to know what the effect of recent legislation has been with respect to Chinese immigration. The question may assume a somewhat important character in connection with our relations with the United States, where, also, they have carried a somewhat stringent system of prevention of undue Chinese immigration.

Mr. BOWELL. The result of the legislation has been to decrease the immigration of these people into this country. Under the operation of the law during the present year, at the port of Victoria, 116 immigrants arrived, who paid \$50 each. There were 971 registrations, 728 tickets of leave, the total collections being \$7,013.50. At Emerson, three immigrants arrived, paying \$359; at Winnipeg, there were three registrations and six tickets of leave, \$7.50. At Port Arthur, one immigrant, and six registrations, \$53; and at Montreal, one registration, 50 cents, making a total collection of \$7,424.50. This sum, as the hon. gentleman is aware, is divided between the Dominion and British Columbia, and there was paid to British Columbia, under section 20 of the Chinese Act, \$2,525. There was an amount refunded to C. F. Moore of \$50 which had been collected from him, his wife being a Chinese woman, and it was thought afterwards advisable, by Order in Council under the Audit Act, to remit that sum to him. The expenditure in connection with the Act will be found on page 364, Auditor General's report. However, it leaves a surplus in the hands of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The number of immigrants is not very formidable, unless it be a mere vanguard. I think the hon. gentleman said there were 971 registrations. Does he mean by that that every Chinaman now in British Columbia has had to take out a ticket of license?

Mr. BOWELL. Not a ticket of license. Under the law every Chinese who was in the country at the time of the passing of the law, had to register his name in order to protect himself from the collection of the 50 cents immigrant tax. As they come in from the interior of British Columbia they register themselves, and that exempts them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, that can hardly mean there were only 971.

Mr. BOWELL. These are only the transactions of this year. Last year there was a large number registered besides.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I find that under the head of Customs Board there are several items here for special officers. Does that include their total salaries, or are they entitled to a certain portion of the seizures? I see on page 343 of the Auditor General's report, Waters, Grosse, McMichael, O'Keefe, and Bonness, who have received large sums. It says Bonness gets \$600 as preventive officer, and down below, \$290 more.

Mr. BOWELL. That may be for travelling expenses. These officers have a salary. Mr. Grosse, for example, has \$1,200 salary. If he is sent to any part of the country to look after smugglers or to investigate anything, he is entitled to travelling expenses. If he effects a seizure, then the expenses attending that trip are deducted from the amount of the seizure before the distribution is made, and he is entitled, under the law, to a proportion of the net proceeds of that seizure.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). But if he is sent to perform a public duty, I do not see why he is entitled to any portion of the seizure.

Mr. BOWELL. The law gives it to him.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Officers sent from the department visit certain places on information received by the department. When an officer is despatched on public business he is not entitled to any remuneration in addition to his salary, his expenses, of course, being paid. I fail to see any reason why the amount should not go into the revenue.

Mr. BOWELL. That opens the whole question as to whether moieties should be given to any officers who make seizures. They all receive their salaries. I do not think it is advisable to enter into any general discussion of that system, nor do I presume the hon. gentleman desires I should do so. If any officer makes a seizure, the law entitles him to a certain amount of the net proceeds. We learn sometimes that certain irregularities exist in a certain section of the country, and we at once despatch an officer to look after them.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very sorry the Minister of Customs has continued the system of allowing these detective officers to obtain a share of the seizures. It is a vicious system and has worked very injuriously to the country; but he has been enabled by the force and power of the majority in this House to continue the system.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not put it on the Statute-book.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Minister of Customs is not responsible; it is the law and it has for a long time been the law. It is a question for discussion as to whether the law should be modified or not, but my hon. friend has only carried out the law.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not see why the hon. gentleman should correct me; that is exactly what I stated. I regret that on the revision of the Customs Act it was not provided that for the future this system, which is so objectionable to the mercantile community, should be abolished. At that time I endeavored to get the Bill postponed until the merchants should have an opportunity of expressing their opinion. The hon. gentleman, however, pushed the Bill through the House at a very late hour in the evening, after the Bill had been only one or two days on the Table of the House.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. It was a very short time, at any rate; and whatever might be the case in the cities, merchants in the remote districts had no opportunity of studying the Bill. The hon. gentleman chose by the power of votes to retain that objectionable system, which is one against which the large majority of the people have set their faces. It is vicious in principle and should be abolished. The hon. gentleman has the power of votes to push the Bill through and continue this vicious principle, which enables a few subordinates to wait and watch their opportunity of making seizures, due often to the inadvertence or ignorance of those in the trade, who thus become entangled in the meshes of the sleuth-hounds of the department.

Mr. BOWELL. I will not attempt to defend the system now; but I am prepared to defend the system at a future time and prove by statistics that this is the only way in which the revenue can be protected. I have no objection to the strong words used by the hon. gentleman if he thinks they are appropriate.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think they are very appropriate.

Mr. BOWELL. I know this, that I can prove to any gentleman either in this House or out of it, who has had anything to do with customs affairs either in this country or any other country, that it is impossible to protect the revenue unless some such system is in operation. I wish to enter my disclaimer against the strong language used; I do not think the officers should be designated by language of that kind. The hon. gentleman has a right to attribute to them any motives he pleases; but I can say this to him and the House, that in no case—and I have investigated a great many—have I found that the charges which have been placed at their door by certain of the press and by certain merchants who have been severely punished for their irregularities—I will not use any stronger language—in their importations, have been sustained as against the officials.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to ask the Minister of Customs what decision was arrived at, and what penalties were imposed in the case of the Montreal Cotton Company, which I brought before the House last Session?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman just now.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister should be in a position to do so. I brought the matter up last year and the hon. gentleman postponed answering it, saying the question was premature. I suppose the case has been adjudicated upon, and I want to know the result.

Mr. BOWELL. It has been adjudicated upon.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But on different lines from penalties imposed on others under like circumstances.

Mr. BOWELL. No; but if such is the case I will let the hon. gentleman know and give him the reason.

Collection of Revenues—Public Works. \$190,025

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What arrangement has been made or is going to be carried out with respect to the slides and booms covered by this item. They are really connected with the forest lands of the Provinces of Quebec or Ontario, as the case may be. It would be advisable to get rid of them, and let both revenue and repairs go to the two Provinces chiefly concerned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is a question to be studied. I am not in a position to say yes or no at the present time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I mention it, because I have always held that this matter really belongs to the different Provinces. We obtain revenue from them, but not sufficient to pay for staff and repairs.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Some of these works are on the large rivers, such as the Ottawa, St. Maurice, and Saguenay, and we claim the power to place works on those rivers. It would be better, I think as these works are not a very heavy burden on the Dominion, that we should keep them. At all events, this is a question that has not been raised before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The total amount expended is \$70,000; what is the revenue?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The revenue is collected by the Inland Revenue Department; but I know that the works on the Ottawa river and tributaries give a large interest on the money invested there—12 or 15 per cent. On the St. Maurice and Saguenay the works do not return as high a rate of interest. Altogether, I think we have less than 6 per cent. on the investment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do the receipts pay the expenses of the staff?

Mr. BOWELL.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And 6 per cent. beside?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am speaking of the Ottawa. There we have 12 or 15 per cent., but on the St. Maurice and Saguenay it is not so. The exact amount I cannot say now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know, and I would like the hon. gentleman to consider it. There is another item here which I want to understand exactly what our position is in relation to. Here is the Esquimault Graving Dock, and so far as I understand that work is brand new.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, it is a work that was completed last year, or not quite.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see here an item of \$7,500 for the staff, and an item of \$5,225 under the head of repairs. Surely a work that was completed last year can hardly need repairs to the tune of \$5,000 already.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There must be always repairs to those works, and I require a certain amount for that. That work is under our control since we made arrangements with British Columbia, and it certainly will be a paying work. It is open during the 12 months of the year, while other works of the same kind are not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The staff connected with a graving dock must necessarily be very small, because there are only a few hands, and I cannot see how it would come to \$9,000. Most of the people about the dock are paid by those using it, but the expenses of the staff of engineers and of a few men to open the gates ought to be a very small item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman tell me if there is any entry at all for the receipts of that graving dock in our Public Accounts? Possibly no receipts may have been obtained up to the 30th of June, 1887.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It began after that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman compute the annual receipts at?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If I can judge by the graving dock at Lévis, which was only opened for a short season last year, and which brought \$14,000 or \$15,000 during that time, I am pretty sure that the graving dock at Esquimault will bring probably \$30,000 or \$40,000. This is only a guess and I do not like to be bound to it, because I cannot say definitely.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do the vessels of the British fleet which make use of it pay, or is it free to them in consideration of the subscription from the Imperial Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are admitted free there, but they pay certain costs that are incurred by the department.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman can hardly take the receipts of the Lévis graving dock for the last six months as a fair estimate, because he will remember they had a steamer in there for repairs all winter, and that is a circumstance which might not occur again.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At the graving dock in Quebec sometimes a vessel will be admitted there late in the season, and will remain all winter for repairs, coming out in the spring. In Esquimault it is quite a different thing, because there the dock is open all the year round.

Telegraph lines, North-West Territories \$20,000
 " " British Columbia 6,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to the telegraphs in North West Territories and British Columbia, can the hon. gentleman tell us, generally, what are the receipts?—as I can understand those must be worked at a loss, but we have now been working them for four or five years; and how are the receipts coming in? Are they paying their way?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are not. The telegraph lines in the North-West Territories are increasing, and the hon. gentleman will remember that during the war in 1885 they were damaged very much, and they had to be patched up. It was found difficult to obtain proper timber in that distant country, and we had to take in different kinds of timber which lasted only a very short period. We have now tried, in a portion of the line, to use iron posts as a trial, and I think, although they cost more, that they will last a great deal longer than the other, and that they will be a great saving in keeping them in repair. We have been obliged to renew all the poles between Battleford and Edmonton, and to change the route, as I explained last year. That is completed and we have a much better line. The poles are good and the line is not exposed as it was. When the line was put there years ago, the poles were put in a swamp in order to have the shortest route, but we found that the shortest route after all was not the most economic. We have extended the line northerly, and we can protect it better and have better ground and keep the lines in better order. We expect that that line will not pay so much until that country is thoroughly settled.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In this prairie country where you are not troubled with rock, would it not perhaps be worth considering, in view of the constant interruptions and the cost of getting timber, whether, in certain sections, at any rate, an underground telegraph service would not be better than a pole service, or is the difference in cost so great as to make it impossible?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it would be most expensive. I spoke to Mr. Gisborne, the chief superintendent of telegraph lines, and he thought the cost would be very heavy. In the long run it might be better, and we might try a short line to see how it would work. I am not in a position now to say what would be the difference in price.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not wish to detain the hon. gentleman now, but I think it would be worth taking it into consideration. Of course I can understand that you cannot—if there was rock there you could not cut through it except at great cost, but, as the hon. gentleman knows, there are 1,500 or 1,600 miles where the trenching would be extremely easy. There would be obvious convenience if the cost is not too great to have the wires under ground.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will consider it during recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In connection with all these lines, does the Government pay for their part of the work, or do they get it free?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government service is perfectly free.

Mr. DAVIES. With regard to the lines in British Columbia, do they not belong to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, now, under the arrangement I made since.

Telegraph Signal Service..... \$10,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman state what that is?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This vote has to pay the salary and the travelling expenses of the superintendent of the telegraph signal service, the cost of stationery in his office and other necessaries, and to meet extraordinary expenses in connection with the service. We must have a small margin in case of an emergency.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are you going to construct a line to Sable Island?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, that would require a special vote, and we could not see our way to asking for it this year.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understood the hon. Minister to promise me last year that he would ask a vote for a telegraph line from Newcastle to Tracadie. I thought perhaps he had included it in his vote.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid it was one of those votes which disappeared after my estimates went to the Privy Council. They came out with \$150,000 less than I asked. I put in my estimates everything that is asked from every portion of the Dominion, because I am bound to lay them before my colleagues, and the Privy Council decides what votes shall be put in the estimates.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then I will blame the Privy Council, and not you, for I know you carry out what you promise. But I cannot help feeling that we are neglected in the county of Northumberland, in not having that telegraph line put up. I hope my hon. friend will make a mental note of it for next year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. What is the distance?

Mr. MITCHELL. About 40 miles.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have taken a note of it.

Public Works—Agency, B. O..... \$5,300

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the details of this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The agent of the department was formerly the Hon. Mr. Trutch.

Mr. MITCHELL. You might have got a better one.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He was a very good and active agent and did his duty without a word of complaint being made against him, but we do not expect to have his services in future. I had to organise the department. The officers number four. There is the resident engineer, Mr. Gamble, an accountant, a clerk, and a messenger; and there are expenses for stationery, fuel, advertising, travelling and contingencies.

Post Office expenses..... \$2,987,620

Mr. MITCHELL. I put a question to the Minister the other day as to the course the Government were to pursue in regard to carrying the mails from Chatham to Fredericton along the Miramichi river. Fifty years ago they were carried in a one-horse chaise; to-day they are carried in the same way, although there is one railway the whole way and two part of the way. Perhaps I have been neglectful of my duty in not pressing the matter earlier; but when I drew it to the attention of the Minister the other day he stated that in two or three days he would determine on a policy. I hope he will communicate to the company that he intends to utilise the railway for the mail service along the route. The railway goes through almost all the villages and there is no reason why the antiquated system for carry-

ing the mails with a horse should not be abandoned and the railways utilised.

Mr. McLELAN. This matter was brought to my notice a year ago; and on enquiry, I was given the information that in the preceding winter the railway had been closed for a time. In three or four cases the mails in the summer were put on the railways which had been newly opened, and in the winter they had to be sent by the old horse conveyance. I was told that the railway did not continue running in the winter of 1886-87.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is not so.

Mr. McLELAN. That was the information given to me, and for that reason I thought we should not be hasty in transferring the mails from the horse and sleigh conveyance until the railway was established. That, I believe, is now established. Then comes the question of cost. I think the carrying of the mails by railway will increase the cost over the old conveyance by over \$3,000; but I have taken up the matter and will be able to make a proposition in a few days, I hope, to send the mails by rail.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to say this in vindication of the gentlemen who conduct the railway. It was closed for one week in the winter before last, as some other railways were, in consequence of snow storms. But for six weeks the mails had to be carried for a considerable distance on snowshoes. The mail service during the past winter has been performed in a most satisfactory manner, and the railway has not lost more time from snow, on the average, than a great many leading main lines throughout the country; and if there was an objection to it on that ground, the same objection applied to a great many other parts of Canada. Now, if the railway undertook to carry the mail, and if, unfortunately, for a day or two the railway should be snowed up, they are bound to carry the mail on snowshoes, if they cannot in any other way; and I trust my hon. friend will see that an arrangement is come to with the railway for the purpose of carrying the mails. The question of cost is not to be considered, provided the railway will carry it at the same rate as other railways do.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Part of the mails from Grand Falls to Edmundston are carried by coach, and they arrive at Edmundston twenty hours after the passengers by mail arrive. This is a great inconvenience to the people up the River St. John, and should be remedied.

Mr. McLELAN. The matter is under consideration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the Postmaster General the report of his officer at Kingston touching the defalcation of the deputy postmaster. The Minister's explanation some time ago was not at all satisfactory, and I supposed he would be prepared on the Estimates to give full explanation. If he has not the report and the first communication made on this subject with him, I would ask him to hold over this item until he can obtain these papers later in the day.

Mr. McLELAN. I have not the papers here. I had them and kept them until a few days ago, when a message was sent to me saying that the papers were required by the inspector.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will take concurrence on these as soon as we get through the main Estimates, and then the hon. gentleman can get the information he desires.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That will answer my purpose. What I want to get are the first communication made to the Minister and the report.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has there been a late ruling changing the rate of postage on seeds mailed to the United States? A correspondent writes to me that a late ruling of

Mr. MITCHELL.

the department required four times the amount of postage on packages of seed coming from Canada that was paid before.

Mr. McLELAN. That is wrong. Under our agreement with the United States, we charge precisely the same rate of postage upon all merchandise going from Canada to the United States as is charged from the United States to Canada. The Americans complained that previously Americans sent their seeds to Canada in bulk, and then had them mailed from Canada in packages to different points in the United States, thus saving postage, as our rates were cheaper than theirs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another matter to which I desire to call the attention of the hon. the Postmaster General. I have a communication from certain inhabitants of South Huron. The inhabitants of Bayfield, Varna and other points adjacent request me to bring to the notice of the Postmaster General the fact that there is now some intention, as they are advised, of changing the mail route in that section, so as to cause the mails to be distributed from the neighboring town of Clinton. I would call his attention to this, that a great deal of the communications of the people in that section must necessarily be with London and other points in that direction. If the point of distribution is changed to Clinton, I am informed that they will not be able to get an answer to their communications to London and other points in less than three days, whereas now they receive an answer in one day.

Mr. McLELAN. There have been numerous signed petitions for postal service on the line between Varna and Clinton, and the proposition was made to start from Bayfield, go by Varna, and then by way of Hobartstown to Clinton. Then representations were made, such as the hon. gentleman has now made, that communication was desired with London, and that Brucefield should be the point for that purpose. I have, therefore, suggested that the communication shall be made with Brucefield, the station to connect with London, as well as on this other route to Clinton. There is a large portion of that country from Bayfield to Varna that has had no postal communication.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I understand that you are not going to deprive the inhabitants of Varna and Bayfield of their present advantages?

Mr. McLELAN. No; there will be communication with Brucefield.

Mr. BERGIN. I should like to ask whether any arrangements have been made for a daily postal service along the route of the Short Line through the counties of Stormont, Dundas, Glengarry and Vaudreuil?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot say just now, but I think we are sending a daily bag to some points on that line.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I want to understand one point which is not clear to some of us on this side. Under the ruling of the Postmaster General, has one of our own seedsmen, when sending a package of his own seeds to the United States to pay the larger rate of postage, or does he come under the old rate?

Mr. McLELAN. He pays the larger rate?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). So the effect is that our own seedsmen have to pay the postage of four times the amount?

Mr. McLELAN. Our seedsmen sending their packages to the United States pay the larger rate, but when they distribute their seeds in Canada they pay the lower rate. That applies to all merchandise going to the United States in that way.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are they in a worse position than the seedsmen of the United States sending their seeds in here?

Mr. McLELAN. No, it is just the same.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Was this done by Order in Council?

Mr. McLELAN. No, it is an agreement between the Postmaster General of the United States and the Postmaster General here.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Then it does not come within the application of our ordinary statute?

Mr. McLELAN. It is under the authority of the Act of Parliament.

Dominion Lands chargeable to Income.....\$181,268 25

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see there is an increase of nearly \$3,000 under the head of Superintendent of Mines. Who is the Superintendent of Mines, and what are the causes of the increase?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Pearce is the Superintendent of Mines, and he and the Commissioner form the Land Board. His duties are largely increased by the increasing explorations for mineral purposes in the extreme west. His principal duties are on the east side of the Rocky Mountains, in the mineral region.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest one thing to the hon. the First Minister. I have made the suggestion, I think, pretty regularly every year for the last half dozen years, but it has received the usual fate of all suggestions coming from this side of the House. Nevertheless, I think it is not unworthy of consideration. The hon. gentleman knows right well that in other countries where there are great mineral deposits, the Crown, or the State, which is perhaps the more correct phrase, has done one of two things—it has either reserved absolutely under its own control a certain number of the more valuable mines, or it has reserved to itself, as has been done, I think, in Nova Scotia, a moderate royalty with the right of increase after a certain lapse of time. It is clear that there are mineral deposits of the most enormous value in the North-West, and I have long held the opinion that it is the duty of the State to reserve a certain proportion or percentage or a certain number of mines, whichever might be found most convenient, to be absolutely the property of the people, at a later day to be worked or rented for their benefit. I am inclined to think that in that region that might be done with great future benefit, not to ourselves perhaps, but to those that will come after us twenty or thirty years hence. I am not going to prolong the discussion, but the First Minister quite understands that such benefit might come from such reservations if they were judiciously made, and I think he has had sufficient time to consider the matter and to say whether he would entertain such a proposition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As to the question of royalties, the hon. gentleman will, perhaps, remember that that system was tried with respect to the mineral region in the North-West, but it was found to be utterly unsuccessful from the fact that in the United States they had no such system, but that they sold coal lands, for instance, at so much an acre, and, I think, the same with regard to the other minerals. The subject has engaged the attention of the Deputy Minister of the Interior for some time, and I think he will be prepared, during the present summer, to bring the whole question under the consideration of the Government. I know, generally, in conversation with the late Minister, what his ideas were, but I do not think he had formulated any plan for consideration. His sudden decease prevented that. But the whole subject, of course, is now pressing in a greater degree from the recent informa-

tion received of the wealth of our mineral resources in coal, and petroleum, as well as in the precious minerals. I think that great source of wealth should not be lightly thrown away. The coal land, I think, is sold at \$10 an acre. I believe it is the opinion of the scientists of the Geological Survey that, except in favored regions where coal is very accessible, the fact that coal underlies agricultural lands greatly increases the value of the farms. At all events, the selling price of soft coal area is \$10 an acre, and anthracite coal, \$20.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Finance Minister knows that in the United States it has been found that very mischievous results have arisen from many private parties getting control of the enormously valuable mineral lands, and that if the United States had got to do the thing over again, in the older States, at any rate, there is no doubt reservations would be made in the public interest. There are questions looming up of very great importance in connection with our land system, as the hon. gentleman knows. They have taken a strong hold on the public mind, and they may come, within a moderate space of time, to take more hold, and no doubt while we have got a perfectly new country to take care of, it would be the part of common prudence, to make such reservations as that, the State might be able to put an end to a coal combine for instance, and other things of that kind, and likewise, which is equally important, to obtain hereafter a solid revenue from those lands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I find that, by Order in Council, all the coal lands in the reserve west of the 4th meridian, are absolutely reserved. They are about Medicine Hat.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But had you not disposed of a good deal? I think Banff Springs are within that region west of the 4th meridian.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a reservation. The anthracite coal has been sold, up in the mountains, at \$20 an acre.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand you to say everything was reserved west of the 4th meridian.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Except what had been disposed of before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman consider this question as important for the future. I would just say that if our Geological Survey, for which we spend \$60,000 a year, is worth anything, it ought to be able to locate certain coal deposits and other things of that kind, which the State would do well to reserve, and which parties would be exceedingly glad to lease on royalty. That would be a practical piece of work done by the Survey, for which everybody would be thankful.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I see the hon. gentleman has dropped from the Estimates, the appropriation for the salary of Inspector of Colonisation Companies. Is that office abolished?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no vote asked for that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Was that Mr. Stephenson?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it the intention to dispense with that officer?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe his usefulness is gone, because the colonisation matters have been wound up.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is any other appointment to be given to him?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not that I am aware of.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Inspector of Ranches, salary, \$600—what on earth is this officer expected to do? You can hardly get a man to give his whole time for \$600 a year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The inspector of ranches is also collector of customs at Fort McLeod. His duties as collector are not very heavy, and he is employed as inspector of ranches as well.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What are his duties?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place, he has to see that the number of cattle or sheep, for a given area, is on the ranch; he has got to see that it is not overstocked nor overcropped; nor is it allowed to lie idle. The hon. gentleman knows that by the lease that is given to these ranchmen, there must be a cow for so many acres within a certain period after the lease is signed, and he has got to see that that provision is carried out, and that the ranches are not merely sold as a matter of speculation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Forestry Commissioner's salary, \$2,000—where does this officer perform his duties, and who is he?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Morgan is the forestry commissioner; he has prepared one or two valuable reports. He was paid last year out of contingencies, pending a special parliamentary provision. His salary amounts to \$2,000, and his travelling expenses to \$1,200.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where has he any functions to perform?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has to inspect the whole range of slopes in British Columbia, I take it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In British Columbia, we have no lands except railway lands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, but we have the whole of the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains. There is heavy timber there. One great object of this forestry commissioner is to lay out a tract of forest which will be protected, in order to protect the waters of the streams flowing from the Rocky Mountains eastward. The hon. gentleman knows that the great cause of the destruction of fertility is the clearing away of forests at the head of these streams. Both in Canada and the United States there is an earnest desire to protect the forests all along the eastern slope of the mountains.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). At the present time there is more necessity for protecting the public Treasury. The hon. gentleman proposes to protect the timber at heads of streams where there is not a settler within 100 miles, and not likely to be for many years to come. The protection must be very inefficient or very expensive, if protection were needed; but I fail to understand how it can be needed at the present time. Who is this Mr. Morgan? Is he Mr. Morgan of this city?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is he Mr. Morgan of Essex?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He was a party candidate aspiring to a seat in this House, and no doubt he has given the hon. gentleman a considerable amount of trouble in that constituency, and it is desirable to get him out of the way.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It must be a matter of regret that fires are running through the south-west range, but that timber, I understand, would be under the British Columbia Government. I do not think we have much timber on this side of the Rockies.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole of the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains is wooded almost to the top, except where snow lies. I cannot exaggerate the importance of protecting the timber from fire and other cause of waste. At present there is not a great rush of settlers on those slopes, but with the recent mineral discoveries there is sure to be a great rush of miners, who are especially careless and who will, I think, be the cause of forest fires. This is a modest attempt to obtain the services of one man to range over that country and endeavor to prevent timber being destroyed. He is also instructed to encourage the planting of forest trees in the western portion of the country, near the foot of the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In what way to encourage—what is he to do?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By teaching people how to plant—and the hon. gentleman knows there is a good deal of planting going on over the prairies. Mr. Morgan thoroughly understands this subject, as will be seen from his pamphlet.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is there any encouragement under our North-West laws to promote forest planting by our farming population, as is the case in the United States?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We had a clause in the Dominion Lands Act in that direction. It was, however, used by people to obtain homesteads on the condition that they plant forest trees, but the conditions were not fulfilled. In the United States it was found that this provision was fraudulently used as a means of obtaining land from the Government. They repealed it in the United States, and we, having had the same experience, repealed a similar provision here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have never had the privilege of seeing Mr. Morgan's pamphlet.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A summary was published in the general report of the Interior Department, and the report was also published separately.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Forestry has become almost a science as practiced in the old world. Where did Mr. Morgan obtain his information? Did he pick it up promiscuously, or did he go through any training, because although no doubt running as a candidate at a general election is liable to give a man a pretty good knowledge of human nature, it does not necessarily afford him a knowledge of forest planting.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe Mr. Morgan was an extensive farmer, and it was his hobby to study a system of planting. Many years ago he was employed, in consequence of his knowledge in that direction, to visit the United States and investigate the system of forestry pursued there. Having been educated in that way, he has since been employed as a forest ranger.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This being a new branch of Government work deserves very careful consideration, and the members are entitled to full information respecting it. No doubt Mr. Morgan's pamphlet was distributed among hon. gentlemen opposite. I observed the other day some of these hon. gentlemen sending away a book called "The History of Canada." I sent over to the department of Agriculture for some copies, but I failed to receive a reply, although hon. gentlemen opposite were sending them away by the cart load. I presume the forestry pamphlet has been appropriated in the same way. The idea of a forestry commissioner undertaking the planting of forests in the North-West is an enterprise of a very exceptional character, and it should be fully explained by the Government. The

item should be allowed to stand, and hon. members should have an opportunity of considering the whole subject before they were committed to the principle.

Mr. McMULLEN. Were it not for the fact that the Government and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are desirous of closing the business of the Session, I would consider it my duty to take pointed exception to this item. It must be distinctly understood for the future that the items will not be allowed to pass as they have been allowed to pass this Session, and for which the country will not thank the Opposition. I hope another Session, neither to meet the wishes of the Government nor the Governor General, will prevent items being fully criticised by the Opposition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood the Half-breed Commission was closed, and no further expenditure would be required?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The proceedings were nearly finished, and only one commissioner, Mr. Roger Goulet, has been retained. It will take him all summer to wind up these claims.

Mr. BAKER. Would it not be well to put the items for contingencies under this heading into one amount, as they practically belong to one department?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You cannot alter that.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Aikman is agent of the department, and he has a salary, and allowance for contingencies. The Crown timber agent has also an allowance for contingencies. Is not the Crown timber agent under the agent of the department? There can be only one representative of the department in the Province.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have not the power to change that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What Crown timber have we in British Columbia? Is it on the twenty-mile belt?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, on the twenty-mile belt. There will be 3,500,000 acres of land on each side of the Rocky Mountains, and within the Province of British Columbia, which the hon. gentleman will remember has been conveyed by British Columbia to the Government of Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The north-east corner of British Columbia?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, the Peace River country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to know if the Government have come to an understanding with the Legislature of British Columbia in relation to the extent of the holding of these lands? I understand that the Legislature of British Columbia contend that on the arrangement with the Government for building the Canadian Pacific Railway that only the fees on the lands were conveyed, but that British Columbia still has absolute proprietorship.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the contention of British Columbia, but it is controverted by the Federal Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not disposed of yet?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Extra Clerks at head office, Ottawa \$28,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In regard to those extra clerks I find that the hon. gentleman took \$30,000 last year and he asks for \$28,000 this year. I think that no one ought to be retained as extra clerk whose services are required as

permanent. They should be transferred to the permanent list if they are so required. It seems the height of absurdity to make an annual vote of \$30,000 for this purpose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are a number of extra clerks required from time to time, and it has not been thought well to place them on the permanent list because you cannot get rid of them. Under the present system you can get rid of them whenever you want to. Some are in the draftsman's room, and they are dispensed with when they are not wanted. It is much more economical to pay them for their services when you want them, than to put them on the permanent list.

To compensate D. C. Bliss for performing additional official duty during Mr. Benson's absence for three months on account of illness \$130

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We might as well raise a discussion on this item as on any other. Are the departments going to lay down the rule that when some additional duty happens to be thrown on any gentleman by the accidental absence or illness of one of the clerks, that they will pay another gentleman extra for his extra services incurred in this way? The case of Mr. Baxter is different from this, as there was no additional expense. No doubt Mr. Benson received his salary during his illness. Are you going to lay down the principle that whenever an accident of that kind occurs, that the other clerks, or one or more of them, are to be compensated? This is not the rule that prevails in any business establishment, unless some very remarkable protracted illness occurs.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right, but the law as it now stands makes this provision. The Government, after due consideration, have come to the same conclusion as the hon. gentleman, and it is provided by the Civil Service Amendment Act passed this Session that this practice shall be no longer maintained.

Payment to J. A. J. McKenna of arrears of salary as Minister's private secretary \$236 67

Mr. MITCHELL. What Minister's private secretary is he?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Minister of the Interior has a secretary, and the same Minister is also Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and he has a private secretary for that department as well.

Railways and canals—To pay H. A. Fissiault the difference between his salary as a first-class clerk and that of chief clerk from 1st July, 1884, to 30th June, 1888 \$1,100

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that it is a most objectionable practice to allow arrears to accumulate for a period of three or four years. There is simply no end to the claims that might be advanced by gentlemen whose merits are not sufficiently recognised. One of two things is clear, either that this application ought to have been made three or four years ago, or that it ought not to be made now. I think a very special explanation ought to be given why the Minister proposes to do such a thing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite concur in what the hon. gentleman says. But an Order in Council was passed proposing to make this payment, and the Auditor General objected because it was not specifically provided for by name in the Estimates, and it is to meet that objection that the item is submitted here.

Mr. TROW. It certainly must be an unwise system to date back. If this man was worthy of the increase during the four years, he ought to have had it all along, instead of remaining four years without it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This officer was promoted by Order in Council of the 3rd of September, 1885, to the rank of chief clerk. I may say, from personal knowledge and years of experience, that this gentleman is a highly deserving officer, who has discharged his duties with great ability. Being a professional man, having technical qualifications, I think he is fully deserving of the promotion; and this vote is simply to carry out the Order in Council, and to meet the objection of the Auditor General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But you had both 1886 and 1887 to rectify that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It has been neglected, that is all.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It is a very vicious practice to allow a thing of this kind to occur, and I think we ought to have a definite understanding that nothing of the kind should occur again. If this man was entitled to the salary he ought to have received it when the Order in Council passed; if he was not entitled to it, then he ought not to get it now. The thing appears perfectly absurd.

Payments on account of Post Office Department.....\$907 52

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that two different gentlemen are paid for performing Mr. Stewart's duty during his absence, and that he also receives an increase of salary. What was Mr. Stewart doing during his absence from Ottawa?

Mr. McLELAN. He went to London, Paris and Washington to examine the system of accounts there. I think he acquired very valuable information.

Mr. MITCHELL. Has he made any report on his observations?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, he reported to me on his return, and I am carrying out his suggestions. I propose to make very great changes after the 1st of July, and it will take some time to carry them out. Mr. Stewart is now placed at the head of all accounts of the department, and the changes which are to be made will reduce very largely the work of the department and also effect a saving.

Mr. MITCHELL. Was it in consequence of any report he made that the commission on the sale of postage stamps was reduced to 1 per cent.?

Mr. McLELAN. No, it was in following the practice of other countries, both England and the United States, and it has effected a saving of from \$20,000 to \$25,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When shall we have his report?

Mr. McLELAN. Such portions of it as are of a general character will be in next year's report. The transactions connected with both the savings banks branch and the money order branch are very large, amounting altogether to about \$35,000,000 a year. The positions occupied by Mr. Everett and Mr. Matheson are very important, and I think it but right that they should receive these increases for the work they did in Mr. Stewart's absence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand, you do not add anything, but simply pay the salary to whomsoever did Mr. Stewart's work during his absence.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes. I may say that Mr. Stewart's salary has been increased, as he has been promoted to the charge of all the accounts of the department.

Mr. MITCHELL. But he drew the whole of his salary while he was away, did he not?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is this item for, translating English into German?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. McLELAN. There are a great many German letters in the department, which reach it through the dead letter office and otherwise.

At one o'clock, the committee rose, and resumed at 1.30.

Library of Parliament—J. Lafontaine, extra messenger ... \$250

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not know anything about Mr. Lafontaine, and I do not rise to object to this vote, but we have here in connection with this House two old and obliging servants, Narcisse Turgeon and Mr. Hugg, the first of whom receives \$900 and the other \$480. I think we should give \$100 additional to Narcisse and make the other \$600. I would suggest that to the authorities, and I am sure that I may appeal to this House in regard to the faithful services and great efficiency of these two officers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we all agree with the hon. gentleman as to the value of the services of Mr. Turgeon, who is a very good officer, and I have no doubt the assistant is also. It is the intention of the Speaker to call the attention of the Committee on the Internal Economy of the House to the case of these two officers, with a view to forwarding their interest.

Mr. TROW. I believe Mr. Hugg has been in the service of the House for sixteen years, and he is certainly deserving of attention.

Colonial and Indian Exhibition \$16,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the object of this vote?

Mr. CARLING. A Governor General's warrant was issued a year ago, and an expenditure of \$50,000 was provided in the Estimates last year, but the vote lapsed; and we are asking for this \$16,000 to pay return freights, and other claims against the department.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is there ever going to be an end to the votes for this piece of folly?

Mr. CARLING. I think the money voted last Session will more than pay the expenses, but it lapsed on the 30th of September, and we are asking for this to meet return freights, and so on.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is this the end of it?

Mr. CARLING. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this a re-vote?

Mr. CARLING. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it should be so stated.

Gratuity to Mr. Charles Foy, late Immigration Agent at Belfast..... \$1,000

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like to have some explanation in regard to this.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Foy was an agent at Belfast. He held the position for a number of years. He was an excellent officer, and now that on account of his health he is unable to discharge the duties, and has been retired from the service, the Government feel justified in giving him a gratuity of \$1,000.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). What salary did he receive?

Mr. CARLING. \$1,000 a year, with travelling expenses.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Has his place as agent at Belfast been filled by anyone else?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, it was filled over a year ago by Mr. Merrick.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Who is this Mr. Merrick?

Mr. CARLING. He is a very highly respectable gentleman, who held a seat in the Local Legislature of Ontario.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I suppose that, as that seat was, as they called it, gerrymandered, and he lost his seat, the Government thought they should compensate him and so they are going to pay \$1,000 gratuity to Mr. Foy because Mr. Foy felt his health was so bad that he made way for Mr. Merrick, who lost his seat and was therefore sent to Belfast as immigration agent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As I am very familiar with the circumstances, I may state that Mr. Foy unfortunately lost his reason, and I think my hon. friend who has just spoken will agree with me that under such circumstances it was impossible to continue him in the position of immigration agent at Belfast. The gentleman who has taken his place is well known to many members of this House; he is a very able man and well qualified to discharge the duties. I do not think any of the circumstances the hon. gentleman has referred to are such as to deprive him of filling the position he is well qualified to fill. There is no doubt a great deal of advantage in connection with these local agencies in having gentlemen appointed who are acquainted with Canada and are able to give information to persons in reference to everything connected with the country. Mr. Merrick is well known to be a man of considerable ability, and I am certain, from what I have seen of the discharge of his duties, that he is discharging them efficiently.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I said nothing as to Mr. Merrick's unfitness for the position. I think he is a very competent and a very suitable man. What I complained of was that, unless we had a report to show that Mr. Foy was not fitted to continue in his office, the Government had no right to set him aside.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have explained that. In fact, Mr. Foy is in an asylum, and there is no question as to his state of health.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire briefly to call attention to a matter which I think is of very vast importance to the farming community of Canada—I refer to the vast possibilities we have in regard to the butter trade with the mother country. We all know how valuable is the trade which has recently sprung up in cheese with the mother country. Great and valuable as that trade is, there seems to be little doubt that there is an opening for a greater trade in butter, that is, if we can judge from the comparative amounts of cheese and butter imported into England. While there is some twenty or twenty-five million dollars worth of cheese imported, there is some fifty or fifty-five million dollars worth of butter imported into England. The Government of Ontario and this Government have both done great service, lately, to the farming interests, by directing attention to this matter—the Ontario Government by encouraging the establishment of creameries, and the Agricultural Department of this Government by circulating a pamphlet in reference to the manufacture of butter, which has proved a most valuable document, and which has been read, I believe, almost with avidity by the farmers who have received it. One of the great advantages which we may expect to derive from this pamphlet is that it will attract the attention of the farmers not only to a better system of manufacturing butter privately, but also to the fact that it is impossible to secure a great natural trade in butter unless it is manufactured in a wholesale way. No matter how skilful private individuals may be in manufacturing butter, they cannot all manufacture it of one color and of one quality. When it is placed in the market of different colors, it is rated very low. Now the value of Danish creamery butter in the English market to-day is from 33 to 36 cents

per pound, while the value of Canadian butter in the English market is 12 cents per pound; therefore you may see that as we manufacture in Ontario now some 32 million pounds of butter, the difference in price, if it were properly manufactured and placed upon the English market, would amount to the sum of six or seven million dollars to the Ontario farmers alone. I think it is scarcely possible to exaggerate the importance of this question. The reason that I wished particularly to call attention to the matter is this: That our specialists—

The CHAIRMAN. My attention has been called to the fact that the hon. gentleman's remarks are not relevant to the item.

Mr. McNEILL. If you rule they are not, I have nothing more to say; but I think it is a little unfortunate that this question should be stifled, which is of so much importance to the farmers.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think I understood the Minister of Agriculture to say that the salary of Mr. Merrick is to be \$1,000 a year.

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice in the accounts of last year that Mr. Foy had \$1,400 for travelling and other expenses. Will Mr. Merrick also have that?

Mr. CARLING. I suppose he will.

Mr. McMULLEN. That virtually makes \$2,400.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was not present a few minutes ago when these items for salaries for civil servants were carried. I wish to bring to the attention of the Government the case of Mr. Ternent, who is acting as librarian to the Supreme Court. Now, he is a very intelligent and very efficient officer, but he is paid simply as a messenger. The amount is altogether inadequate, considering the duty he performs. It seems to me the Government ought to recognise his position as librarian of the Supreme Court, and give a fair compensation for the services he performs. I think all who have attended that tribunal, are of the same opinion as I am, that he is not adequately compensated for the work he has to reform.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before my hon. friend returned to his place it was stated that the question of the remuneration of all the civil servants in this department would come before the Commission of Internal Economy immediately after the Session. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman as to the merits of Mr. Ternent. I have known him for a great many years. He is a worthy man, and a fit man for his place.

Mr. WELDON (St John). I can bear testimony to the very efficient manner in which Mr. Ternent has done his duty.

Private Montgomery Smith, No. 5 Co., 26th
Battalion, pension from 26th January,
1872, to 9th July, 1885, inclusive, 4,914
days, at 25 cents \$1,228 50

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is an extremely sad case. Sergeant Montgomery Smith served during the Fenian raid. In consequence of exposure he has become a complete wreck. He is paralysed and scarcely able to speak. He resides in Lucan, North Middlesex. I do not know a more deserving case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do you come to prize his sufferings at two different rates? For a portion of the time he gets 50 cents, and another portion of the time 30 cents.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, I presume his first attack was inflammatory rheumatism. They pay these people a certain sum of money for a certain time in the hope they

will recover; but this man got worse and worse instead of better.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to ask in reference to an item already passed, to give Mr. Pelletier, chief clerk, back pay. I wish to ask what is the particular qualification that entitles him to that position?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. A clerkship was vacant, and it was filled by Mr. Pelletier, who was well qualified.

Mr. LAURIER. In place of whom?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Morgan.

Mr. MITCHELL. Had Mr. Pelletier been in the department before he was promoted?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, Sir.

Mr. MITCHELL. He was taken from outside.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, Sir.

Mr. MITCHELL. And shouldered into this, the first office in the department, or nearly the first, at a large salary, without any civil service examination or anything of that kind, I suppose?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, Sir.

Mr. MITCHELL. No civil service examination?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, Sir.

Mr. MITCHELL. Now, I must say that I think that is a system that ought to be put an end to. The only particular recommendation that Mr. Pelletier has got for the position, as I am told, is that he is very useful during election times. Is he the same man who distinguished himself on the hustings in Ottawa county?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, Sir. Beauharnois.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is he the gentleman who, it was alleged in the *Herald*, nearly bit a man's finger off, or nose off?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Wrong again.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is another Pelletier?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes. There are many other Pelletiers. There are even Legislative Councillors in Quebec of that name; but he is not one.

Mr. MITCHELL. All I have to say about this case is this: If we are to have a Civil Service Act at all—which I do not believe in—which requires people to pass an examination, we ought to adhere to it. In this case it appears to me that we are violating the principles laid down in that Act. In any case where this has been done, there should be some reason given. The Civil Service Act is used by the Government to prevent a man entering the service when they wish to do so, or the reverse. The Government should consider the propriety of changing it so as to allow people to come in on their merits, not by favoritism as they do now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister should state when he has gone outside the service to find a chief clerk, what are the special grounds for the appointment of Pelletier. It is a practical censure on the officers of the department, that when a vacancy occurred the hon. gentleman was unable to find an officer who could fill it. The Minister, indeed, is bound to state to the House what special qualifications Pelletier had which he could not find in officers in his department. It injures the whole service to bring a man into the service in this way, because it deprives those who have served diligently of the ordinary incentive to good service, a reasonable promotion from time to time. I await the hon. gentleman's explanation.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Since 1882 I have kept the expenditure of the Department of Secretary of State at its narrowest
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

limit, and the expenditure has scarcely been increased since that time. There was no officer at the time in the department who could fulfil the duties of chief clerk, except the man who has been turned away from that office, Mr. Morgan.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is the matter with Mr. Morgan?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am not here to discuss that now. When the proper time comes I shall do it. It will be found between now and the next Session that when I appointed Mr. Pelletier chief clerk, a position which he deserves, there was no other officer in the department whom I could appoint. It will also be found that economy has been practiced in the department, because I hope to be able to dispense with a clerk, so that the expense will not be increased. I could not replace that officer by any one else in my department, and the only officer whom I could appoint has been promoted from the position of a second-class clerk to a first-class, that is Mr. Coulson.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is this the same gentleman who ran against the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron)?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, I said so a moment ago.

Mr. MITCHELL. That probably is some explanation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has not given the information which the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) asked. The hon. gentleman says this man is a very competent officer. That may be. There are hundreds of men who might be picked out outside, any one of whom would be an efficient and able officer; but the hon. gentleman has departed from the spirit and principle of the Civil Service Examination Act. The hon. gentleman admits that Mr. Pelletier did not pass the primary examination, and further he did not pass the promotion examination. The hon. gentleman admits that both these examinations have been passed over, and that this officer has been appointed in defiance of the Civil Service Act. The hon. gentleman is the last member on the Treasury benches who should have done this. He proposed the Civil Service Examination measure; he has told the House and the country it was a necessary measure, and after doing that and insisting on the House adopting the measure as one by which the Government could be governed and their authority limited, he has himself set the law at defiance and appointed a party without such person having passed any examination whatever.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If it is a sin to make an exception to the rule the sin has been committed, and I take the full responsibility of it. It is an exception to the rule, I admit; but as my department was the only one where there was not a legal adviser, I thought such a gentleman should be appointed. The Civil Service Act says that a barrister or a lawyer can be appointed without passing any examination either for qualification or promotion. I do not say I made this appointment under that clause; but as there was no legal adviser in the department, I thought I would take this opportunity of appointing a gentleman who could fill the office. As to the gentleman's general knowledge and literary qualifications, I can refer to my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Bergeron).

Mr. LAURIER. What has become of Mr. Morgan; is he still in the service?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He is still in the service.

Mr. LAURIER. What position does he occupy?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. First class clerk, a rank below that he formerly occupied.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then he has been degraded.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, he has gone down a grade.

Mr. MITCHELL. Has he replaced any one?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He has filled a vacancy that was formerly occupied by Mr. Pulford.

Mr. AMYOT. I want to hear from the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) as to what he knows of Mr. Pelletier.

Mr. BERGERON. I will tell the hon. gentleman anything he wants to know at some meeting on the hustings, because the Minister has said all that is necessary now.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may state to the hon. gentleman that I enquired of the Government if this Mr. Pelletier was the same gentleman who opposed the present distinguished member for Beauharnois, and I was informed that it was.

Mr. BERGERON. It is, and I may say to the hon. gentleman that I never asked for the appointment of that gentleman and never recommended him to that appointment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then I may add this, that I said that explains the milk in the cocoanut.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Secretary of State mentioned just now that Mr. Morgan had filled Mr. Pulford's place. Is that the same Mr. Pulford who is down for an amount for extra services.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why was Mr. Pulford's place vacated.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Does the hon. gentleman want me to make a full confession?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am as little disposed to select individuals for comment as any man can be, but we have a duty to perform, and we are obliged to ask the reasons why officers are removed from their posts, and why certain appropriations are inserted in the Estimates. I cannot pass this matter over; it has been made a matter of comment in the public press.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Two years ago Mr. Pulford was appointed a first-class clerk. Some irregularities in his conduct were brought to the notice of the head of the department. He was suspended from his appointment, but for the last two years his conduct in the department has been exemplary. His services in regard to the position to which he would have been promoted, and his services in the department generally, have been such that a large amount of money has been saved by the work he performed on the Franchise Act. He took it on himself, and as it were to make up for the deficiency in his conduct before. His services were not at all pertaining to his own office, and the certificate of the Auditor General recommends that he should be paid \$200. I would not have done it myself had not the Auditor General approved of it.

Mr. LAURIER. What is Mr. Pulford's position now?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He is a second-class clerk, but I hope with the reorganisation of the office he will be first-class clerk next year.

Mr. LAURIER. He was degraded, as I understand?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He was not degraded, but there was a vacancy which he was to be promoted to, and he was not promoted.

Mr. LAURIER. He was punished then.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, by not being appointed.

Mr. LAURIER. Now he is rewarded.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He is paid for the work he has done and for which probably another officer would have to be appointed. I might have employed a clerk, who would

cost, perhaps, \$1,000, and he would not have done it so well. Mr. Pulford has done it well and faithfully, and retrieved the faults he committed before.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The appointment of Mr. Pulford is perfectly intelligible. The hon. gentleman says he was guilty of misconduct and that the Government punished him. Mr. Pulford's former conduct shows that he is eminently qualified for the discharge of the duties connected with the Franchise Act, and so the Government finds it necessary to appoint a man, who was guilty of misconduct, to this very important office. It is not every one who will undertake to travel the crooked road which is sometimes marked out for him by gentlemen on the Treasury benches. This gentleman was fully qualified for that by his past conduct, and he was appointed to the important duties. The hon. gentleman, finding that Mr. Pulford is guilty of improper conduct and deserving of punishment, finds him eminently qualified for the duties in connection with the voters' lists.

Further amount required for the Franchise Act (Governor General's warrant), including expenses of bailiffs and clerks caused by the holding of preliminary revisions for 1886 at more than one place in the electoral division—the Act having authorised the holding of the revision at one place only..... \$20,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want some information with respect to what the Secretary of State proposes to do with regard to this? As I understand he proposes to do all the printing of all the innumerable voters' lists throughout the Dominion, in Ottawa. He proposes to substitute numerals for post office addresses by way of economising space and printing material. If the voters' lists are sent up here, I think great delay will occur, no matter how the printing bureau may be organised, and I think that the system of putting numerals for the regular address is not advisable, and that it will lead to immense confusion.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am glad to receive any suggestion in the way of facilitating the work which I have undertaken for the printing of these voters' lists. I think that the system I have adopted, under the suggestion and with the advice of persons who knew this matter perfectly well, will prove satisfactory before the next general election. I will take the hon. gentleman's suggestion into consideration, and between now and next Session I think I will satisfy him. As to the vote of \$20,000, it is only for half of the \$40,000 we asked to pay for cost of revision; we spent only half of it. As far as the \$3,000 is concerned, it is part of the \$18,000, \$15,000 of which will be voted for in the Supplementary Estimates. A calculation was made that it would cost at least \$40,000, but I have the superintendent's word that he will do it for less than \$23,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a question of public policy of great importance connected with those voters' lists. As matters now stand the voters' lists throughout Canada are all based on the assessment rolls of 1885, and from 1885 to the present time three years have elapsed. It is quite certain that a large percentage of the electorate of this Dominion who are entitled to vote are at this moment disfranchised, and cannot by any possibility record their votes. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to say that this is a trifle. Suppose such a contingency should arise—and constitutionally at least the Minister of Finance nor no other Minister can deny it may arise at any time—that it becomes necessary to appeal to the people. Peradventure, although there is not so much sign of it as I should wish, this House or the majority of it might lose confidence in the First Minister or his colleagues. It would be a crying scandal that an appeal should be made to the people to obtain their decision on an important public question, and that 20 per cent,

of the people who are entitled to vote should in consequence of the non-formation of those voters' lists be disfranchised. I desire to ask the Government two questions: first of all, are we to have a voters list for the Dominion of Canada within the space of 12 months, or is it the policy of the Government to continue delaying this matter? The next question I wish to ask is this: Should we not, as a mere matter of constitutional precaution, take measures that if by any chance an appeal to the people or a dissolution of Parliament should take place, that the Government should return to what they proposed to do, and if they cannot give us the voters' list of the Dominion electorate franchise, give us the last voters' lists in the various Provinces? It seems to me that, constitutionally speaking, we are in this position: If His Excellency should have to dissolve the House to-day, or at any time within the next twelve months, we would undoubtedly have to appeal to the people under circumstances by which one-fifth of the people would be disfranchised. That is unconstitutional in the highest degree, and no one knows it better than the First Minister. The voters' lists ought to be in such a position that if dissolution takes place the true voice of the people should be had, and the true voice of the people cannot be had under the voters' lists based on the assessment roll of 1885. There is a way to remedy that, and I desire to know if the Government do not choose to give us a revised voters' list within a short space of time, are they disposed to do the other thing and give us the last accredited provincial list?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place I do not think there is any chance of there being a dissolution consequent upon the present Session. The Government has already pledged itself to have a voters' list for the year 1889. Should the consequence of the next Session of Parliament, in the spring of 1889, be that there is to be a dissolution and an appeal to the people, I take it that the dissolution must be postponed until the settlement of the electoral list of 1889. The next general election will be held under the new voters' list framed under the Act passed this Session.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not understand what necessity there is for an appropriation at all. Certainly the hon. gentleman does not propose to take the voters' list already prepared, and print that as a basis for the new voters' list. That certainly would be extremely inconvenient. If the hon. gentleman desires further legislation, and that is what he suggests, it seems to me the appropriation should wait until the legislation is had. The hon. gentleman will take no action until Parliament determines what the policy in the future shall be. Then why take an appropriation for a voters' list when we must have a meeting of Parliament before any action is taken? And I venture to say that 25 per cent. of the present list will not be in the new list. It certainly seems to me that if the present policy is continued, a new voters' list would require to be prepared before any printing was done at all.

Mr. LAURIER. This item of \$26,300 is to complete the cost of the revision of 1886. Can the hon. gentleman tell me now what is the total cost of that revision?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. \$126,000. I have already said perhaps four or five times in the House what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is asking. It is true, the lists will not be ready before the month of January, 1889; and the correction of these lists, even if the corrections amount to 10 or 15 per cent., at least \$25,000 will be saved to the Government—and that is a very low estimate—from what would have been the cost if the lists were printed at the different newspaper offices throughout the Dominion. The lists will be distributed during the next winter, and some of the revisers, if they are willing to do it without pay, will probably correct them so as to facilitate the work in 1889;

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

and during next Session, I hope, if a vote of Parliament turns out the present Government and puts hon. gentlemen opposite in our places, we shall be prepared to have a revision made in probably a month or six weeks. This work is being done, not for the pleasure of satisfying the vanity of a Minister who has a new idea. I do it for the public and for my hon. friends opposite, if they are going to take our places next year.

Pensions payable on account of North-West outbreak, to mounted police, Prince Albert
Volunteers Police Scouts \$3,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see the hon. Minister of Militia here. Some explanations are required with respect to the distribution of pensions, which he probably would be best prepared to give.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Minister of Militia is called away in consequence of the illness of his sister, and is unable to be here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am very sorry for the cause. I raised the question as to the mode in which certain pensions had been distributed. A certain gunner, Ryan, and a sergeant, Valiquette, died. The former left a wife and daughter, who received, the widow \$68, and the daughter \$14 a year. Sergeant Valiquette left neither wife nor children, but he had certain collateral relatives, I think a father, two brothers and three sisters, presumably all grown up, who received in all \$307 a year. It appears to me that there is no justification for that mode of distributing pensions—that either in the one case too much has been paid, or in the other case too small a sum has been given. To give to the child of a deceased soldier \$14 a year, and to the father, brothers and sisters of another each \$51 a year, is a thing that I cannot concur in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret that my hon. colleague the Minister of Militia is not here to make a full explanation; but the question was up before, when I think he did make an explanation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No. He has sent down a memorandum mentioning that this was done in accordance with the order, which is practically no explanation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Was not this done by the commission?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume so. The commission reports to the Minister, and the Minister reports to the Council. I think the First Minister, the Minister of Finance and all hon. gentlemen will see that to pay \$300 to the collateral relatives of a deceased soldier, and to pay a much smaller sum to the wife and child of a deceased soldier is altogether out of proportion. It may be permitted, but it is apparently very unreasonable in its result.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Apparently very unreasonable.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I regret very much that the hon. the Minister of Militia is not here, because when this matter was brought up the other day, he promised to give us some papers in connection with it, to justify the conclusions at which the Government have arrived. He has handed in some papers which are not satisfactory. In the first place, in the order regarding militia regulations, these pensions, and this one in particular, would be under the head of "sisters." First, there are pensions to widows and then to sisters:

"The sister or sisters collectively of an officer or soldier killed in action or dying of wounds received in action, within twelve months after such wounds shall have been received, without leaving widow, legitimate child, or mother, and provided she or they be an orphan or orphans, without surviving brother, and mainly dependent for support upon the officer or soldier deceased, may, under special circumstances to be determined by the Minister of Militia and Defence, be granted an allowance equal to half the rate of widow's pensions."

Now, this case, to which the hon. gentleman has drawn the attention of the House, seems so exceptional in its character that it demands an explanation. The hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence was good enough to promise an explanation; and in fulfilment of that promise, he has handed us a memorandum without any signature to it. The explanation is that the pension was granted to the father and sisters and brothers, his collateral relations, who are not entitled under the militia regulations to it. The memorandum furnished by the hon. Minister reads:

"Gunner Ryan, who was killed while on service in the North-West Territories, in 1885, left a widow and a daughter. His pay was 50 cents per day or \$182.50 a year. A pension is given to his widow amounting to $\frac{2}{3}$ of his pay, \$68.44, and to his daughter $\frac{1}{3}$ or \$14.60." That would be all right.

"Sergeant Valiquette, of the 65th Battalion, was the main support of his family, composed of his aged parents, totally incapacitated, and two boys and three girls entirely unprovided for. The pensions were calculated as follows:—Valiquette's pay was 75 cents per diem or \$273.75 per annum. According to the rates fixed by Order in Council, the pension of mother and children, in such circumstances, is one-half of the widow's pension, viz.: \$51.33 in this case. Therefore, Valiquette's family are in receipt of six pensions of \$51.33 each, which is the lowest figure granted by general orders on such occasions."

The point is they were not entitled to anything at all. They do not come under the rules laid down by the law. There is no provision in the law for brothers and sisters and fathers. There is only provision when the sister has no brother to support her.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The children were helpless.

Mr. JONES. That is not even stated. There are two brothers and three sisters. There is no report but simply this memorandum.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did you not read in that, that the parents were entirely helpless, and that the children were incapable of supporting themselves.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The memorandum states that two boys and three girls were unprovided for. It does not say that they were unable to provide for themselves.

Mr. MILLS. The pension exceeds the pay.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The pay was \$273, and the family now are getting a pension of \$307. If they lost another member of their family, they would get a still larger pension. This is an utter violation of the law, whether out of political considerations or not remains to be seen; but there is nothing in this memorandum to show there were any particular circumstances in Valiquette's case to warrant granting this pension. The ages of the children are not even given. This is a gross violation of the statute.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I agree with one part of the hon. gentleman's statement, and that is that there is no use in our prolonging our sitting on this question. I am advised that Mr. Valiquette was the sole support of his family; that these helpless children were entirely dependent upon him. Gunner Ryan left some property, and his relations were not in the same dependent position. These two cases were enquired into by a board of officers who recommended the amounts.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Where is the report?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No doubt in the department, with the great mass of other reports.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not believe there is any report. I do not believe the Government can show one scrap of evidence in justification of their decision. The Minister of Militia and Defence promised to bring down all that he had, and all he has brought down is this bald statement, printed without any signature. Does anyone believe that if the Minister of Militia had any report to justify such an extraordinary departure from the militia regulations, he would have failed to bring it down?

Mr. O'BRIEN. A few days ago application was made on behalf of a person who had been in "C" company, and because the application did not exactly square with the strict technicality of the Act, the Minister refused to consider it. I will oppose any grant that in the slightest degree infringes the strict regulations, for if exceptions are not made in one case, they should not be made in others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This matter is more important than it appears on the face. Just consider the case. Here the daughter of a soldier, who dies in action, receives \$14 a year, and the sister of another soldier, who also died in action, or of disease contracted while on active service, receives \$51. Why should there be such a difference?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There was a difference in pay.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was a difference of 25 cents per day in the pay. One man received 50 cents and the other 75 cents per day. If you treated the sisters precisely as the daughters, it would allow a pension of \$21. My point is that these things show clearly and distinctly that very serious irregularities have occurred in adjusting the pensions. You may be justified—I wait before deciding positively—in giving this very large pension to the relatives of the deceased Sergeant Valiquette, though I think it would require very strong proofs to justify it; but how on earth can you justify paying \$14 to the daughter and \$21 to the sister? Allowing for the difference in the pay, if the three Miss Valiquettes had received \$21, that would have been only a fair proportion to the \$14 paid to the daughter of Gunner Ryan.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The widow had a pension of \$68.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course the widow is always entitled, under Her Majesty's regulations, which we follow, to a larger pension than a mother or a sister, even if the latter are wholly dependent. The pension to mother and children, according to circumstances, should be one-half the widow's pension; that is, according to the Imperial regulations, which we are supposed to follow. It is on that basis they seem to have granted it, but instead of granting the amount to them taken collectively, they have granted it to each of them individually. Whereas Sergeant Valiquette's pay amounted to \$273 all told, the Government have granted to his family pensions amounting to \$307. Unless Sergeant Valiquette was in receipt of a much better income than a non-commissioned officer ordinarily is, that is a very extraordinary pension to grant, and the reports ought to be laid on the Table showing under what circumstances and why the commission arrived at the conclusion to grant a pension of \$307 a year for the term of their natural lives to the collateral relatives of a man who was only receiving \$273. I do not think you will find in the annals of the British service any case in which the pensions assigned to the relatives of the deceased are greater than the pay of the deceased soldier. Certainly this is a very remarkable case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the circumstances mentioned by the hon. gentleman require some investigation, and I will undertake that the matter shall be fully investigated. The unavoidable absence of the Minister of Militia prevents the information being given which I have no doubt he would have been able to give. In the meantime, I do not suppose the hon. gentleman desires to cut down the allowance to the Valiquette family, but I think there is, at all events, very good ground for reviewing the pension granted in the case of Gunner Ryan. I must say it is rather an anomaly that the pension granted to the relatives of a

deceased soldier should exceed his pay when he was alive. I shall undertake to have that enquired into.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think there must be some mistake in this matter, because the rules and regulations under which these pensions are given make no provision for granting pensions to brothers in any event, but only to the widow, and to the sisters if they are unprovided for. I am sure, if the Government go into the matter, they will see that a mistake has been made.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is clear from the statements which have already been made that this is in violation of the law. It is utterly impossible that the collateral relatives of a deceased soldier can be entitled to a larger sum than his pay amounted to. But that is what has been done in this case. I find by the regulations that the provision is :

"The sister or sisters collectively of an officer or soldier killed in action or dying of wounds received in action within twelve months after such wounds shall have been received, without leaving widow, legitimate child, or mother, and provided she or they be an orphan or orphans, without surviving brother, and mainly dependent for support upon the officer or soldier deceased, may, under special circumstance, to be determined by the Minister of Militia and Defence, be granted an allowance equal to half the rate of widow's pension."

That is that the whole of the sisters taken collectively are to get this half rate and not each individually; but it seems that in this case each sister was allowed the half. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said these parties would be entitled to about \$21, if to anything; but that would be the amount to which they would be entitled collectively, and not each individually, and it is quite clear that there has been a violation of the law. In fact, the law has been altogether disregarded, and the Minister has acted altogether in regard to his own opinions of favoritism, it may be, instead of according to the provisions of the law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will fully enquire into it.

Militia—To provide for the retirement of two deputy adjutants general, gratuity of two years pay each, at rate of \$1,700 per annum..... \$6,800

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Who are these deputy adjutants general?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Colonel Jackson and Colonel Harwood. They retire after a number of years' service, and their places are not to be filled.

Barracks in British Columbia..... \$4,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course this will not be sufficient to build barracks. What is this sum for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think they are putting up wooden huts similar to those used by the Mounted Police in many places in the North-West, which will be sufficient for a good many years. I suppose this amount is what is to be expended this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this for the huts the hon. gentleman speaks of, or is it for the purchase of a site for future barracks? How many men is it expected to accommodate?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is for battery "C," in which I think there are 100 men.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can answer for it that you will not get 100 men suitably accommodated for that sum.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose that is so, but I know the Minister of Militia is proceeding in the most economical way.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How does this come under the Militia Department? The Board of Works ought to do this.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As a general rule, if they were important buildings, the Board of Works would attend to them, but these are to be put up *pro tem.*, as it were, in wood, and it is thought that the officer in command, who is a very clever man, Major Holmes, will be able to look after it without an officer of the Public Works Department being detailed for the service.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is a public works officer there now who is paid for this, so you will also be paying this one, and will have two officers. Where does the importance begin or end? At what amount is the importance of a public work to be estimated?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This sum will be expended for militia purposes. Perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will have the opportunity of putting up the buildings.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You cannot pay this out of the Department of Militia.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I asked very few questions this Session, and I think I ought to get some satisfaction when I do ask.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You may put it under the head of militia. It is a vote for militia purposes, but the expenditure of the money according to law ought to be made by the Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Militia will have to hand over this vote to the Minister of Public Works for the purpose of expending it. There will be no difficulty about that. I have no desire to refuse to answer any question put by my hon. friend.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). A year ago there was an Imperial officer, Colonel O'Brien, sent to British Columbia to report upon the defences there, and I presume to make suggestions for the protection of that part. Are the Government in possession of that report? If so, are they prepared to inform the House what they propose to do?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Colonel O'Brien was sent out by the Imperial Government to report on the best means of defending the harbor of Esquimalt, and the graving dock. I happened to be there at the time, and went over the ground with Colonel O'Brien—he and the Admiral, and myself—I not being of much assistance in the enquiry; but Colonel O'Brien pointed out the various positions that he thought would require defence. His opinion was that the work should be of the most economical nature under the new system of attack and defence, that it should be principally earth works, without any stone work or other expensive work at all. He thought these earth works, if sufficiently armed, would be a complete defence to the harbor of Esquimalt. The arrangement is, as the hon. gentleman knows, that Canada shall put up these earth works, and that the armament, which will be the most expensive portion of it, will be furnished by Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Has the Government obtained a copy of Colonel O'Brien's report?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think not, but I am not quite sure. There was to be a confidential report, as I understood. It may have been communicated to the Government here.

Intercolonial Railway, chargeable to Capital. \$365,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The increased accommodation at St. John consists of inspection, \$7.50; buildings, \$912.93; land damages, \$619.38; Wall street bridge, \$75; grading, \$354.86; materials, \$8.70. There are outstanding accounts for the same service, \$521.63.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In Moncton the platform should be covered over. People exchanging trains are exposed to storms.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume that will be done by this vote.

Mr JONES (Halifax). Pictou Town Branch, \$128,000—I notice in the report of the Minister of Railways, at page 18, he says "In the spring of 1885 the construction of the Pictou Town Branch was commenced. Its total length is 14 miles, composed partly of existing railways, and partly of new railways." In the same report he gives the expenditure as \$248,000 for the Pictou Town Branch. To-day we are asked to vote \$128,000 for that branch, and as there was \$34,000 in the original estimate, that would make \$410,000 for this 14 miles, or about \$40,000 a mile. It appears to me that is a very large amount to pay, and it requires some explanation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The total expenditure for the Pictou Town Branch for 1885-86 was \$12,000.65; 1886-87, \$248,123.48; to which will be added this amount for the year ending 31st January, 1887, of \$189,734, making a total expenditure up to 31st January, 1887, of \$449,872.47. Of that appropriation there is available \$101,148.89. The total for this year, therefore, will be \$128,000.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How much did you say was the revote?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$189,000, of which \$123,000 is contained in this estimate. The total expenditure was \$449,000. Of the appropriation available there was \$101,000, and \$88,000 were expended in connection with the appropriation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How much does that make it per mile?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not the statement of the mileage under my hand, but I will be able to give it to the hon. gentleman later on.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 18 he will see that the Minister gives the total length as 14 miles. Does not the hon. gentleman think that an enormous cost for 14 miles?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You must remember this railway runs into the town of Pictou, and along the wharves, and through the upper portion of the town.

Mr. LAURIER. I see an item of \$71,000 for the St. Charles Branch. Is that for land expropriated?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The items are as follows: Inspection, \$920; building, \$1,828; labor, \$1,692; land and damages, \$3,443; painting, \$245; steam pumps \$3,792; rails and fastenings, \$11,400; materials, \$92; snow sheds, \$12,500; snow fences, \$19,100; total expenditure to 1st January, 1888, \$55,042. Appropriation available \$10,145, leaving an expenditure in excess of appropriation of \$44,896. Estimated cost of miles in progress: pontoon, \$4,900; lands for Levis station, \$12,000; snow sheds, balance, \$9,203; total \$26,003, making a grand total of \$71,000 odd.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think there should be a change of name, and that it should for the future be known as the Sir Charles Branch.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the appropriation for the Pictou Branch was passed, was it not understood that the town of Pictou would give the right of way?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Unfortunately I was not here at the time the work was undertaken, and I am not able to say what occurred in that connection.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman not think that \$32,000 a mile is an excessively heavy

rate for the Pictou Branch? I think when the estimate was brought down a quarter of a million was stated to be the probable outlay. It is now stated that the cost will be about \$150,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will compare the expenditure of the Pictou Branch with that on the St. Charles Branch—and I think the property is about equally valuable—the result will be found to be very favorable to the Pictou Branch.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The expenditure on the St. Charles Branch was altogether outrageous.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the expenditure on the Pictou Branch is very heavy. The country for the 14 miles is not very heavy I believe.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is a very heavy bridge across a long sheet of water before you come into Pictou.

M. JONES (Halifax). Has the work been done by contract?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman give particulars in regard to snow-shedding, for which an item of \$39,000 appears?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are 1,200 feet of iron snow-shedding at St. Flavie. There are also stretches of wooden snow-shedding as follows: 2,640 feet, 8,976 feet, 425 feet—16,500 feet at different points along the line.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are these repairs, or are they new snow-sheds?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Those snow-sheds are, to a large extent, to replace snow-sheds built in 1878.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I call the attention of the committee to this fact, that the amount of \$39,000 is expended for snow-sheds to replace, to a large extent, snow-sheds built ten years ago. That is an extraordinary charge to place to capital account. I do not think it would be done in regard to any railway except a government railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The substitution of iron for wooden snow-shedding is a very important change.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is \$13,000 here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$13,000 is charged for the substitution by iron.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But there are a great many more thousand feet of wood this winter, and I think that item should go to income and not to capital.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid it would not make much difference.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That I regret is the trouble. In a sense it would not make much difference to a country, but we would know what the road is costing over and above its receipts. While you keep the capital account open, and that is what my hon. friend complains of, it is a matter of the extremest difficulty to see where we stand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The snow sheds were put up under the administration of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Mackenzie). They lasted for ten years, and they have practically all disappeared together. This sum is required to replace an expenditure made ten years ago, and it would be hard to charge that against the revenue of any particular year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know that.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why not do in the same way as you do with rolling stock. The hon. gentleman says that

if a car or an engine is bought it is charged to capital account, I think you should deal with the snow sheds as you do with the rolling stock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The ties have a life nearly as long as the snow sheds, and you do not charge them to capital account.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is quite true. There is no doubt that correctly speaking the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) are practically correct, but suppose any of the great bridges were to disappear from any cause we could not replace it out of revenue, and inasmuch as we have a large deficiency in the revenue account, it practically comes to the same thing. The general principle is right that it would more properly become a charge on the revenue.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What is the difference between the cost of iron and wooden snow sheds?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it is 4 to 1, but it is undoubtedly cheaper to have the iron.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Has the hon. gentleman any experience from other railroads as regards the iron sheds, because if it is merely to be covered with sheet iron I doubt if it will last any longer in our climate?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am inclined to think that an arrangement is being made in regard to which is the cheapest and best.

Indian Town Branch.....\$5,000

Mr. MITCHELL. With regard to this item I wish to ask the hon. gentleman to explain?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have explained that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope there is no ballast pit in that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, there is not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would ask if the appropriation last year for rolling stock has all been expended? I believe he is aware that the rolling stock is not sufficient for the road especially with regard to the coal traffic. I know that complaints have been made, and I hope he will not adhere to the gondola cars.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is an item in that vote that I want explained with regard to the Indian Town Branch. I presented several claims against the railway, and one especially from Mr. George Knight. As I see the general superintendent of railways, Mr. Schreiber, here, I hope the Minister will excuse me for asking an explanation on that point. The people of the Indian Town Branch, with some exceptions, gave the right of way for nothing. Mr. George Knight gave the right of way to the railway free. It was found when they constructed the railway that a spring on Mr. Knight's farm, where he was in the habit of watering his cattle in the winter, was taken from him. Mr. Knight had to drive his cattle in consequence of this to the river, and he lost one valuable cow, and is likely to lose in the course of years a great many more. I presented a claim from Mr. George Knight to the gentleman who has charge of the railways, and I have been unable to get any satisfactory explanation. I do not wish to protract or delay the business of the Session, but as Mr. Knight has lost a valuable adjunct to his farm, and as he gave the right of way to the railway free, I ask that the Government should settle this claim, instead of compelling Mr. Knight to go to the law courts for justice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no hesitation at all in saying to my hon. friend that I will ask the department to deal very fairly and liberally with this party under the circumstances he has mentioned, because I think he presents a

Mr. McMULLEN.

very strong claim. While on my feet I may say that I have ascertained from the chief engineer that the bridge on the Pictou Town Branch is over a mile long, and that the water in some places is of a very considerable depth, so that the hon. gentleman will see that it is a very expensive work.

St. Lawrence River and Canals..... \$16,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What caused this expenditure?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The balance of the appropriation for 1887-88 being only \$2,000 on the 31st December, 1887, the chief engineer states that a further sum of \$16,000 is required to cover the expenditure up to the 30th June next for deepening the channel of the Galops Rapids.

Murray Canal..... \$30,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That work is in progress?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

St. Anne's Canal—to pay gratuity of two months' salary to G. H. Henshaw, H. G. Stanton, and Antoine Ranger..... \$513 32

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under what circumstances, when work is closed, are we expected to pay two months' gratuity?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The circumstances are these: These gentleman had been a long time in the public service. Mr. Henshaw had been employed since 1873, and the other two since 1880; and having discharged their duties with great fidelity, the Government thought it was only right, when their services were suddenly dispensed with, that they should receive this small provision.

Rideau canal—construction of a bridge at Brass Point..... \$1,347 30

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this a new work?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it is to pay a final estimate; the appropriation was not sufficient.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Were we bound to make this?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; it is a canal bridge.

Canals—Miscellaneous..... \$24,516 46

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this vote of \$14,000 for the construction of a steam dredge and scows?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The appropriation available, from the 1st July, 1886, to the 30th September, 1887, is \$15,000. Expenditure, \$5,239; amount lapsed to the 1st October, 1887, \$9,760; expenditure from the 1st October, 1887, to 31st January, 1888, \$9,067.77; special warrants issued by Order in Council, the 31st December, 1887, \$7,500; over expenditure, \$1,567.77. Required to complete, \$6,500, also special warrants, \$7,500, making \$14,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does \$14,000 supply a new dredge and new scows?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the Government have possession of the Lake St. Peter dredges, why not take one of them?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The work there is still going on. On its completion, the plant becomes the property of the Government, and will be available for service in any part of the Dominion, or may be sold if not required.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the royal assent was given the Act passed last Session, the plant becomes the property of the Government at once.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There are more dredges there now than they can work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think not; but I will enquire into it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why pay these land damages in connection with these canals now?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It is for overflow of lands along the Rideau Canal. The high water damaged the lands, and some claims are under adjudication.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is for compensation for flooded lands. The compensation is \$1,077 and legal expenses.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This is like the springs on the Northumberland railway; it is perpetual.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). These lands must have been flooded every year for the past four years, and no doubt were bought at less than the ordinary value on that account.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No; the water has been kept up at a higher level the past few years than formerly, and bitter complaints have been made on that score. Deputations came down last year to urge the Government to dredge out the bed of the old River Cataragui. There is a greater surface of water there than formerly, the trees having been cut away around the drained lands, and consequently a much higher level has to be kept up in the spring to provide water for summer navigation.

Mr. MACKENZIE. To furnish water to the manufacturers in Gaaanoque.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No, they are not on that level.

Mr. CURRAN. Whilst on this item, I would ask the permission of the committee to bring up a matter which was before the House on Friday evening last concerning myself. On that evening an hon. gentleman undertook to read a couple of affidavits in connection with some canal laborers, in which, amongst other things, I was charged with having been the cause of the dismissal of these men. I will not read over the affidavits, because the whole thing has dwindled down from a tremendous agitation to the charge that I had not interfered to get these men back; but as the Government has been attacked, I desire to read the following two affidavits on the subject:—

"I, Etienne H. Parent, of the city of Montreal, Superintending Engineer of the Lachine Canal, do solemnly declare:

"That Michael Conway, of the city of Montreal, is superintendent of the Lachine Canal under my direction as engineer. Before the opening of the canal last spring, Mr. Conway consulted me about certain laborers who had been engaged on the canal during the previous season and explained the part they had taken in the election for a member of the House of Commons for Montreal Centre, a few months previously. I advised Mr. Conway to inform those who were seeking employment to get letters of recommendation from the sitting member, Mr. Curran, as I considered it in his patronage. I had no communication with Mr. Curran on this subject, nor with the Department of Railways and Canals, at Ottawa, nor with any member of the Government. I advised Mr. Conway, as above stated, because I considered it the proper course to pursue. The member for Montreal Centre, Mr. Curran, has no responsibility whatever for my action or that of the superintendent, Mr. Conway, in this connection, having never been spoken to by me on the subject in any way.

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the Act respecting Extra-Judicial Oaths.

"E. H. PARENT.

"Taken and made before me }
this 19th day of May, 1888. }

"WILLIAM WILSON,

"A Commissioner for taking affidavits for and in the Province of Quebec."

"I, Michael Conway, of the city of Montreal, Superintendent of the Lachine Canal, do solemnly declare:

"That I know James O'Rielly and Edward Tobin, formerly temporary employes on the Lachine Canal. I have taken communication of the solemn declaration signed by them and read in the House of Commons.

James O'Rielly says he is an Irish Catholic; that is true. He says he is married and has two children; that is true. His two children are both grown up men, and I believe good citizens and treat him well. 3rd. It is true he was employed on the canal during four seasons in the summer time. 4th. Although far from being a desirable man I did not find fault with him. 5th. He had no right to consider his position a permanent one, he was merely a temporary employe to be taken on in the spring of the year if I found he suited the work. 6th. Previous to the opening of the canal in the spring of the last year he distinctly admitted that he had been very abusive of Mr. Curran during the election, and that having said so much against him he would not go to get a letter of recommendation from him. 7th. The statement under this head made by O'Rielly is for the greater part untrue. I never said he was one of the best men, and had I said so it would not have been the fact as I knew he was a meddlesome man, causing trouble by having too much to say. I never told him about any communications with the authorities at Ottawa. No such communications ever took place. His statement that I said I had received instructions from Ottawa is false. The facts are these: O'Rielly never applied for work in the spring of last year. He never reported himself at all. I saw him some time before the first of May. I knew from general report and by his own admissions that he had been abusive towards Mr. Curran. I never had any communication either with Mr. Curran or the authorities at Ottawa about the subject, but I consulted, as was my duty, my superior officer, Mr. R. H. Parent, superintending engineer of the Lachine Canal, and was instructed by him to cause those who had been guilty of abusing the members to bring letters of recommendation from them before giving them employment. The instructions in our department are to the men to attend to their business and not interfere with politics. When polling day comes around the men are allowed to go and vote according to their convictions and are in no way interfered with. When I saw O'Rielly on the street, where he was working for the corporation of the city of Montreal, I simply told him that if he wished to come back to the canal when it opened on the first of May then next, that he would require to bring a letter of recommendation from Mr. Curran. His answer was that he had said too much against the man, and that he would not apply for any letter. When some time afterwards the canal was opened he never applied for work as I have already stated.

"With reference to the other men mentioned in O'Rielly's solemn declaration, I received letters of recommendation from Mr. Curran for Holden and Frawley. Egan I took on myself; he is a quiet, inoffensive man. These men have all been taken on again this spring. As regards Tobin, who made the other declaration, I have to say he was one of the worst men on the canal and he should have been dismissed long ago and would have been, had it not been for the urgent solicitation of his friends and on account of his family. In fact, at the request of Mr. Curran, I gave employment to one of his sons as telephone boy and as an assistant on one of the locks, where he remained for two years until, on my recommendation, he got a better situation. Owing to Tobin's drunkenness and insubordination, I had to change him three times and place him at different points. When I changed him the last time, I told him that would be his last chance on the works. When he came and applied for work last spring, I called him aside and said to him: Owing to the way in which you have misbehaved in the past and your insulting manner during the late election, I cannot employ you again unless you give proof of reformation. I said to him, the first thing you have to do is to go and take the pledge, that you will abstain from all intoxicating liquors, and the next is that you will go and get a letter of recommendation from Mr. Curran. He left immediately, cursing and swearing that he would do neither, and I have not seen him since. I would not have employed him in any case, even had he not acted as he did during the election, unless he took the pledge.

"I solemnly declare that Mr. Curran knew nothing of this matter until the newspapers took the question up, and when he came to Montreal, a few days afterwards, he sent for me and asked me for a full explanation of the above affair, which I gave him, as I now state it.

"Both O'Rielly and Tobin state in their declaration that 'neither Mr. Curran nor anyone else, as far as they are aware, has ever taken any steps to have them reinstated in their positions.'

"I declare that when I told Mr. Curran the circumstances, he said he would very much prefer that the men should be taken back without any letters from him, as he did not wish to have any trouble with canal laborers. I said that I could not maintain discipline on the canal if my orders were not carried out.

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the Act respecting extra-judicial oaths.

"M. CONWAY,

"Supt. Lachine Canal.

"Declared before me at the City of Ottawa, }
this twenty-first day of May, eighteen }
hundred and eighty-eight.

"WILLIAM WILSON,

"A Commissioner for taking affidavits for and in the Province of Quebec."

I have nothing to add to this matter. The House has heard quite enough about it; and if I had anything to say I would wait until the hon. member for North York was in his place. When I have anything to say against an hon. member, I say it before his face.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite unfair to the hon. member for North York that the hon. member for Montreal did not present those affidavits when the hon. gentleman was here. The hon. member for North York has interested himself in behalf of the three poor Irishmen who were dismissed from employment in Montreal. He did not endeavor to gather information, but it was sent to him to be presented to this House. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) tries to shield himself by presenting affidavits executed by employes of the Government in the city of Montreal. No doubt by his influence exercised over these employes he has secured these affidavits. Probably, if they were in an independent position, they would not have executed the affidavits, but, finding that they might be dismissed from the service by the influence of the hon. gentleman, he extracted those affidavits from these employes.

The **CHAIRMAN.** I think that is irregular.

Mr. McMULLEN. In order to back up the statement which he has made, I think this was an unfair course to take if he intended to refute the statement made by men who are not in the employment of the Government. The affidavits which were previously read were those of men who were discharged, and it is peculiar that their discharge should have taken place just after the hon. gentleman was elected. It is that circumstance that casts a very suspicious cloud over all this matter, and it is to shield himself from the odium under which he rests with the Catholic people of this country that he has exercised an influence so as to get affidavits from these men over whom he holds the threat that, if they do not do what he wants them to do—

The **CHAIRMAN.** Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why should you call the hon. gentleman to order?

The **CHAIRMAN.** The hon. gentleman has no right to say that the hon. member used threats and made use of undue influence to obtain these affidavits in the absence of any proof, and that in the face of the disclaimer of the hon. gentleman to the contrary.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, he has.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the Chairman is too premature in this matter.

Some hon. **MEMBERS.** Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I tell hon. gentlemen that they had better shut up, and keep quiet about their "order." I tell the Chairman of this committee that he has no right to call the hon. gentleman to order for what he was saying. Go on, Mr. McMullen.

Mr. McMULLEN. I say the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) had the opportunity to use this influence when this matter was within the purview of this House, but I say he had no right to exercise it now, and, in presenting these affidavits to the House, we must conclude that there was influence brought to bear upon these men to get these affidavits. I appeal to the Minister of Finance to prevent the reading of these affidavits and so possibly the continuation of the discussion and the detention of the House. We have all agreed to rush matters through as far as we possibly can, and I must say that I regret that we did so consent. At all events I think this should not now be brought at this late period before the House, especially when the hon. gentleman who brought it before the House originally has left for his home, but the member for Montreal feels that the cloud which has been cast upon him is so dark and gloomy that he cannot refuse to take this opportunity to endeavor to clear himself.

The **CHAIRMAN.** I did not call the hon. gentleman to order for saying that the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) had an opportunity to exercise that influence, but for having made the assertion, as I understood him, that he did use that influence and those threats, and that in the face of the declaration of the hon. member to the contrary.

Mr. MITCHELL. We are here at the close of a Session, and the regular Opposition, as well as the party I lead myself, have shown every disposition to promote the business of the House. I am sure no one can say anything to the contrary. I think our worthy Chairman would have shown more discretion and would have taken a course tending more to the progress of public business if he had not been so hypercritical in calling hon. gentlemen to order. We have a good deal of business to go through. We all desire to adjourn to-morrow, but, if we are to do that, we have to pursue a course, as I tell the Chairman, which will not only meet the views of the majority, but also the views of the minority.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I feel that there was some force in the statement of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that I should have interposed in this matter, as I did to-day in the case of my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson), when I appealed to him not to raise a question which would be a matter of controversy. Still, the circumstances of the present case were, I thought, very peculiar. It appears that, in the absence of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) read certain affidavits which became public by being placed in the *Herald*, reflecting very strongly on the hon. member for Montreal Centre. Now the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) asks why the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) did not produce these at that time. How could he? They are in answer to the affidavits of these former laborers on the Lachine Canal, and it was impossible for him to produce the answers to these statements until the parties who were to answer them had an opportunity of seeing them, consequently the hon. gentleman had no legitimate opportunity before this to put his answer on record. What has he done? I am quite sure that, if the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) knew these two gentlemen, Mr. Parent and Mr. Conway, as well as I know them—and I had an opportunity for years of knowing them, as they were in the service when I was Minister of Railways and Canals—he would know that either of them is quite incapable of making a statement that is not true, and therefore I felt, under the circumstances, that this was a peculiar case. If the hon. member had attempted to make a speech or to detain the House, except in order to give the answer which he had from the only men who had the knowledge requisite to give the information, I would have appealed to him not to raise any question likely to promote discussion; but, under the circumstances, I felt that he had the right to give his answer to the statements which had been made.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) states that he never speaks in the absence of the person he is attacking, but he has done it to-day, because he knows that the hon. gentleman who read those affidavits read them on the eve of his going away. I am willing to excuse the hon. gentleman for reading these affidavits, because this is the only opportunity he could have of replying, but I am sorry that the hon. gentleman who made the statement is not here to reply to him. Perhaps my hon. friend from Montreal did the same thing with these affidavits as he did in regard to the recantation which the *Herald* signed—perhaps he wrote them himself, and no doubt, if he did, he would do so very efficiently. As to the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, I may say in regard to the statement of Mr. Conway—and I know nothing about the other to whom he has referred—that I sent my manager down to see Mr. Conway, and he entirely verified the statement in the *Herald*. I am content to con-

fine it to the question whether he stated what was correct or not, because that is the ground on which he put it, but I believe that every word these men said was true, and that they were told that they could not get employment unless they applied to Mr. Curran. I believe that this statement was made to them, though whether it came from the Government or was made by Mr. Lesage as coming from the Government, I am not prepared to say. I believe the statement they made, and I wish my hon. friend from York (Mr. Mulock) was here to reply on this occasion.

Mr. CURRAN. Just one word in conclusion. In the first place the affidavits that were read the other night were dated the 9th May. I was in the House every day from the 9th until the 18th. On that evening I happened to be temporarily absent, and during my absence these other affidavits were read, and the hon. gentleman who read them immediately left the city, and I could have no other means of meeting the affidavits than the one I have adopted. Here are these affidavits now. If it is supposed that the superintendent of the Lachine Canal would make false statements, if it is supposed these men would make false statements, they are amenable to the law; it is open to the hon. gentleman to proceed against them. Now, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) says that I wrote the article in the *Herald* apologising to myself for having published statements of this kind, and he only looked it over. As regards these affidavits of course the writers are responsible for them; as regards the article in the *Herald*, I dictated it, I dictated the terms, I dictated an apology, and the hon. gentleman swallowed it, and if he is ashamed of it now and wants to withdraw it, let him do so, and let him make the charge again in his newspaper against me, and I will charge myself with making him dance in the courts for it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Now, we are coming to a live issue on this matter. I stated, on a former occasion, that he offered to settle the matter, provided I would give a reasonable acknowledgment. The hon. gentleman was willing to take a reasonable apology. He said he would not even charge the costs if it had not been that his partner was a very poor man, and he could not afford the funds, and practically to lose the expenses; and I said, all right, I will pay the expenses. I gave an explanation the other night why it was that I settled this matter. I can tell the hon. gentleman the reason to-day: It is that I had not much confidence in the hon. member for Montreal Centre, and I did not have much confidence in the crowd that was behind him—if it came to a trial—if he wants to know the real reason. The hon. gentleman says that if I wish to repeat the statement, he is willing to risk a trial. Sir, the law is of such a character in the Province of Quebec that the truth is not a defence to a statement of that kind. That was one of the reasons I stated the other night. The hon. gentleman is very valiant. Let him take care; I will watch him. I will give him an opportunity if I ever find him doing any more of his tricks with the canal laborers; I will give him an opportunity to bring the matter to a test and I will take care that I have something strong to rely upon. The hon. member for Montreal Centre is under the control of the Government, and I don't want anything of that kind to rely upon in an action for libel before the courts of Quebec. That is the secret, as I explained the other night; that is the secret why I consented to an apology, when my lawyer—a Conservative, it is true—advised me to do so. I said I am willing to make any reasonable apology; if I have got to eat crow I am not afraid of the pie. The proposition was made that Mr. Curran should write the letter, and he wrote it himself.

Mr. CURRAN. Certainly, and I made you swallow it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Made me swallow it! John J. Curran make Peter Mitchell swallow anything! His poverty made

me swallow it. He complained that his partner could not afford to lose the expenses.

Mr. CURRAN. That is not true.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is true. More than that, it was not out of consideration of swallowing the leek. I am always ready, when I find myself in a tight place, to get out of it the best way I can. I found myself there for two reasons: first, on account of the Quebec law preventing the truth being a defence to a statement in certain cases; next, because the character of the witnesses was such I could not rely upon them, when I knew that Mr. Curran was a friend of some leading influential officials on that canal, and of the manager of the canal who had control of those under him, and I knew mighty well what would be the fate of the *Herald* upon the matter. That is the reason I ate the leek, and I am not ashamed of it. You make me eat the leek! You are a trifle in the consideration; you didn't weigh; I do not value you at all, nor your masters behind you.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on, go on.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am in no hurry. The week is long, and I can stand here if hon. gentlemen desire to extend this business. I am in no hurry, not the slightest. My business will stand for a week any way; and if hon. gentlemen are going to allow their supporters behind them to assume a dictatorial tone, an arrogant tone, such as that hon. gentleman has no right to assume in this House, neither from his ability, nor his position, nor the confidence he enjoys in the community. He has no right to assume any such tone, certainly not towards Peter Mitchell and the *Herald*.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. What are hon. gentlemen laughing at? The hon. gentleman from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), what has he got to say about it? He is a coming Minister, I suppose, everybody says so. And the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) is enjoying himself. I don't say anything about you Peter (Mr. White).

Mr. HESSON. I am perfectly quiet, I have not even laughed at the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman sit down, please. That is right; do as I tell you. All I want to say is this: I believe the statement I made was true. If I did eat the leek it was a matter of form, not a matter of principle but to save my pocket; that is why I did it. And I did so because I could not rely upon the testimony that I had to depend upon; and I believe now that the *dicta* went forth from this Government telling the men on the canal that not one of them would be employed unless he got employment through Mr. Curran. I found the same thing in my own county when, at the last general election, they put on a hundred hands shovelling snow, and the overseers were told: You must not employ a man who has not got a vote, and you must not employ a man who does not bring a certificate from Mr. Adams that you are sound in your voting. That is the way they did it, and that is the way it was done on the Lachine Canal, notwithstanding what has been said about the matter. Why was the hon. gentleman absent the other night? Did he keep out of the way because he knew the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) was going to bring in these affidavits? He was in the city, he was in the House in the afternoon. He kept out of the way while the hon. member for York was here. I suppose he knew he was going home, and he thought after he got away he could get these affidavits and bring them in. Sir, the supporters sitting behind the hon. gentleman had just better be a little prudent if they want to get through to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to say one word with respect to my absent friend from North York (Mr. Mulock). I do not suppose the hon. member for Montreal

Centre entertains the idea that the hon. member for North York was afraid to bring them up in his presence, although some of his remarks might seem to bear that construction. Now, I happen to know, if the hon. gentleman does not, that my hon. friend from North York, owing to a misfortune in his family, was obliged to be absent during the greater part of the time preceding the 18th; and I saw myself the hon. member for Montreal Centre in the House on the morning of Friday, as I think my hon. friend for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) did.

Mr. CURRAN. In the afternoon, too.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So there was nobody to blame but the hon. member himself if he chose to be absent from the House when the matter was brought up by the hon. member for North York, who had to leave that night. My hon. friend from North York was certainly in his right in bringing up the matter when he did, nor can the hon. member for Montreal Centre impute to him any design of shunning an encounter.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The affidavits produced by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) show conclusively that a number of persons were dismissed from the canal because they chose to exercise their franchise according to their consciences. In looking over the affidavits that were produced to-day they seemed to be open to great suspicion. The *Hansard* of Friday contained the affidavits and it was issued late on Saturday. How could they have got the *Hansard* and known what the affidavits contained if they had not taken them and sent them that night? How did they get the affidavit sent in by the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) and have affidavits here from them to-day? It looks suspicious. In effect, we have two affidavits against one affidavit, because they voted in accordance with their consciences. I heard the member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) complain in the days of the Mackenzie Administration that the Catholics were only made sweepers in this country, and here are sweepers who, because they voted in accordance with their conscience, were dismissed on the first opportunity. This is a piece of petty malignity unworthy of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) will show more discretion and sense in the future, and not attack the *Herald* which has always treated him fairly.

Mr. HESSON. Let the hon. gentleman take back what he said in regard to the member for North Perth.

Mr. MITCHELL. I meant the member for South Perth; I apologise.

Intercolonial Railway—Capital..... \$305,000

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to the working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for the past year. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the report of the Railway Department he will find there has been an increase of expenditure for locomotive power of \$68,000; car expenses, \$73,729; maintenance of way and works, \$176,950; station expenses, \$18,314; general charges, \$378—making a total increase of \$337,395. That seems to be a very large amount. It is fair to admit that there has been some increase in the number of tons of freight carried over the road, but it must be well known to any one familiar with the working of the road that the working expenses are quite out of proportion to the amount of the traffic. If this is going to continue there is very little advantage in having increased traffic because it is attended by largely increased expenses. I notice by the report at page 19 the following: "The coal traffic between Nova Scotia and the Upper Provinces has increased as seen by the following comparative

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

statement:" and then there is a statement given, showing that, in 1870, the amount of coal carried was 10,000 tons as compared with 175,000 tons in 1886. That would be a gratifying feature of the working of the road I am prepared to admit, if it were not for the remark that the rate at which coal is carried is exceedingly low and the cars are hauled back empty a distance of 600 miles, so that this business causes increased expenses without furnishing an increase of revenue. Last year when I brought this matter under the notice of the Minister, he admitted that coal was carried over the Intercolonial Railway at an actual loss. There are other coal interests in Nova Scotia which are interested in this question, and I have often been spoken to by gentlemen interested who very justly complain of the favoritism shown by the Government in this matter. They say they are contributors to a certain extent for whatever loss is incurred by the carriage of the coal, and that such loss falls upon the public generally. They further say, that were it not for the action of the Government, they would be prepared to have large depots for coal along the line, in order to take advantage of the scarcity which usually arises during the cold season when navigation is closed; but they say it is useless to go to any expense of this kind, because the moment coal reaches a point above what is merely a paying rate, then the Government step in and show their disposition towards this favored company by carrying their products over the Intercolonial Railway at a losing rate to compete with us and prevent us from obtaining what, under other circumstances, we would obtain, a fair advance for our precaution and foresightedness in having stocks accumulated at Montreal and Quebec, or other large consuming points. I do not think the House would be prepared to sanction in any part of the country an expenditure of that kind. The increase of the working expenses has been altogether out of proportion to the increase of traffic, and if the increase in expenditure has to continue in the same ratio with the increase of traffic last year, the more traffic the road obtains the worse off we shall be, especially in regard to coal, which I suppose is the main factor. It is time we put a stop to this business. The Government for the benefit of a company in the hon. gentleman's own county should not make a discrimination in favor of that company. I have no feeling against the Spring Hill Company, and I desire to see them prosper and make money and develop their industry in every proper and legitimate way; but, as a representative in this House, I cannot permit to pass without protest these statements in the report of the Railway Department every year which show that the department with which the hon. gentleman has so much influence has carried the product of that company's mines to market at a loss to the Dominion. The hon. gentleman admits that three-quarters of a cent per ton per mile is the lowest rate at which coal can be carried in the United States to pay working expenses, and yet coal is carried from Spring Hill to Montreal at three-tenths of a cent per ton per mile. It is high time this business was stopped, because it causes great dissatisfaction, and justly so, and we hear complaints from other parties having similar interests in the Dominion. I should like the hon. gentleman to explain, if he can, the increase in the working expenses on the Intercolonial Railway. I regret that the Minister of Railways is not in his place, because he naturally would be more familiar with the working of the road, but the enormous increase of \$337,000 demands explanation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid it is impossible at this late period of the Session to enter into an elaborate statement of the traffic and working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway. The question of the general policy has been settled before, and we quite admit that it would be very desirable, if we could do so, to make the accounts

balance. But the hon. gentleman is somewhat unreasonable in complaining that the rolling stock is inadequate and that there are not sufficient coal cars, and also complain of the appropriation asked for the purpose of furnishing that rolling stock which is required. The hon. gentleman may be quite sure that the Government will not ask any appropriation for rolling stock for the Intercolonial Railway not demanded by increased business. I quite admit that the question raised is an important one, namely, whether business should be done that is not of a profitable nature. I have endeavored to point out the great importance of the inter-provincial trade, and that when we have a Government railway we have to adopt a system of rates that we cannot expect to obtain from a private company. The hon. gentleman complains that the coal is carried on the Intercolonial Railway from the Spring Hill mines more largely than from any other company. The reason of this large volume of traffic on the Intercolonial Railway, from the Spring Hill mines is because they are nearer to Montreal and the west than any of the other mines.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Naturally, yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, naturally, there would be a large volume of traffic from that cause. I imagine that in another year the volume of coal carried on the Intercolonial Railway will be greatly diminished, because of the construction of the Short Line Railway to Halifax and St. John, and the construction of the road from Spring Hill mines to the harbor of Pugwash which will give communication by water, as cheap as the transit over the Intercolonial Railway is now, and carried at a loss, as I admit it is, it will be carried much cheaper by waterway. I am afraid, however, it is too late to take up any longer time in the discussion of this question, which has been discussed over and over again on former occasions.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says I am apparently inconsistent, because while arguing for an increase of rolling stock to accommodate the coal companies I am now complaining that this stock is being used for the carriage of coal to Montreal. The complaint of the other companies is that the general traffic of the Pictou mines, and along the line elsewhere is being neglected, and the stock is being used to carry the product of the Spring Hill mines to Montreal and Quebec at a loss to the Government, whereas if it were placed at the disposal of the Pictou mines for traffic in Nova Scotia, it would be profitable. The complaint is that those cars which are required for the development of the Pictou mines are given to the Spring Hill mines to carry their coal to Montreal and elsewhere.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is a question of some importance to the Maritime Provinces, and I am rather inclined to take the view of the Minister of Finance in this matter and not to object because he carries coal from the Spring Hill mines at a loss. It cannot be carried at all if it is not carried at a loss, and if we are to make a practical union of this Confederation, having built an Intercolonial Railway at an expense of \$25,000,000 for the purpose of connecting the Maritime Provinces with the other portions of the Dominion, I am prepared to justify the Government in doing what is reasonable to develop the resources of that country. While this may be a loss to the country, it was the contract that was entered into at Confederation, and the Intercolonial Railway is the connecting link which binds the Maritime Provinces to old Canada and the western portion of the Dominion. The Government could no more sell that railway as they proposed to sell it, than they could fly, and pretend at the same time to hold the Maritime Provinces in the Confederation. The same principle that governs the carriage of the coal from Spring Hill, governs the carriage of the stone from Newcastle, and if we can develop any of those industries in the eastern portion of

the Dominion—a portion of the Dominion which has sacrificed so much in the interests of Confederation—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say they are justified in carrying the natural products of those Provinces under special circumstances.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, I am prepared to justify that. The complaints of the other coal companies are that they are not so favorably situated as to their geographical situation as the Spring Hill mines are. I have no interest in the Spring Hill mines, and I never had, but I believe it is in the interest of the whole country that those mines should be developed, even if we had to develop them at some sacrifice to the other portions of the Dominion. Under those circumstances I find no fault with the Government carrying the coal from Spring Hill; always assuming they carry it at the best rate they can get. It is just as well those cars should carry coal as come back empty, even though they carry it at a loss. Take the case of that magnificent stone quarry at Newcastle, a monument of which is erected out here in front of these parliament buildings. When I am forgotten and have passed away, that stone will be pointed to, as coming from the county that Peter Mitchell once represented. Let me say to the Minister of Public Works, who is paying no attention to me—let me again say to the Minister of Public Works, who, for the third time I repeat, is paying no attention to me whatever—

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Very well.

Mr. MITCHELL. Let me say that I admire the course pursued by the hon. gentleman. When he found the best stone that would commend itself to the artistic taste of the artistical people of this Dominion, he at once adopted the principle of getting that stone even though he carried it at a loss. It is desirable to have that stone there as a monument of what Canada can do, instead of going to Ohio for stone as we did for this building when we can get the finest stone at home.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. the Minister of Finance said he would give us information.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On a former occasion I gave the result of the increased traffic on the Intercolonial Railway, and I was asked what the earnings were. I have since obtained the information. In 1876-77 the earnings were \$1,154,445.33; in 1886-87, ten years afterwards, they were \$2,596,009.83, showing that the earnings have kept pace with the increased traffic. The loss in the operation of the road in 1876-77 was over half a million; the loss during the last year was under a quarter of a million.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, but the expenditure in 1876-77 embraced \$200,000 for new rails, as the hon. gentleman knows.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The fact must not be lost sight of that \$10,000,000 of additional capital have been sunk in the road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend from East York is not correct in saying that the expenditure in 1876-77 embraced the rails.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, I am quite correct.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). \$800,000, spread over three years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If you deduct that, you will still have a much smaller balance last year than in previous years.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But how much have you charged to capital during those years?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have followed my hon. friend's example as closely as I could, because I thought his example was highly commendable, that is, to charge all new rolling stock required for increased business to capital, and to charge to revenue that which was necessary to keep the rolling stock in repair. As the hon. gentleman's rolling stock was all new and ours was old, the burden has been much greater on the Government now than it was in the inception of the road, because a much greater outlay is required to keep it in repair. I did not bring this question up, but I thought it well to state that we have had a most gratifying increase in the traffic during the ten years, and in the revenue received from that traffic, and that we are able to balance the accounts more nearly, even in our worst year, than we were in the inception of the road. It is very natural that that should be the case, because every year additional industries spring up along the railway, and furnish increased business to it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is very gratifying, of course, to find that the increase has been gradual and natural; that was only to be expected from a new road. But I am under the impression that if the hon. gentleman had followed the same course as his predecessors, and had charged to working expenses what actually belonged to working expenses, we should have seen a very different result and a very much smaller amount standing charged against capital today. If I am spared to be in this House next year, I intend to move for a special committee to examine into the expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway, because notwithstanding all that has been said on this subject by the Government, I am under a very strong conviction—so strong that it will take a great deal to persuade me to the contrary—that large sums have been purposely and deliberately charged from year to year to capital account, which ought to have been charged to ordinary expenditure. I stated in the House at an early part of the Session that I was informed by one gentleman, an ardent friend and supporter of the Government living in Halifax, who is constantly complaining of the want of accommodation for the transport of coal, that he was aware of a certain number of coal cars having been burned up at Pictou or Stellarton, which could have been repaired at an expenditure of \$60 or \$70 each, because they would have had to be charged to working expenses, and that they were replaced by new cars costing \$200 each, which were charged to capital account; and I will give the name of my informant to the hon. Minister of Finance. Therefore, I say it is utterly impossible that the large amount which has been charged to capital account since the present Government came into power could be properly classed under that head. There is another matter to which I would refer, that is, the very general feeling of discontent at the chief engineer or manager of that road being at Ottawa. The impression generally prevailing is that the management should be at Moncton. When anyone has a transaction connected with the Intercolonial Railway a great deal of red tape and a great loss of time are necessary before any business can be transacted or any information received, as it frequently happens that when one man is away, his deputy has to await his return. I know that very important questions of business relating to the Intercolonial Railway have been hanging over week after week; and I am satisfied that it would be very much to the interest of the railway if the management were transferred to Moncton. The hon. gentleman referred to the opening of the Short Line Railway. I am glad to hear that it is going to be open; but I always thought it very extraordinary that the Government should have subsidised a railway to form a rival line to the Intercolonial. If that road is going to shorten the distance as much as he says, the annual loss on the Intercolonial will be very much larger than it has been

Mr. MACKENZIE.

hitherto, because the working expenses cannot, probably, be very largely decreased while the traffic will be very largely decreased. Had that Short Line Railway been built by private enterprise, we could not, of course, raise any question; but I always thought it was a mistaken policy on the part of the Government to build up a rival line to destroy the interest this country has in the Intercolonial Railway. I may be mistaken, but I fear very much that when that line is in operation a few months hence, the loss on the Intercolonial Railway will be double what it has been in the past.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to correct the misapprehension which I fell into when discussing the question of snow sheds. I assumed, from having no information at my hand, that they were to replace snow sheds which had been built ten years ago, but I find that I was mistaken. The snow sheds now required are new, in addition to what existed before, on the St. Charles Branch, and other portions of the line, where great difficulties were experienced for the want of additional snow sheds. I take this opportunity to explain this item, because all renewals certainly ought to fall on revenue, and I thought this had been treated exceptionally. The chief engineer informs me I was wrong, that the item for snow-shedding is for new and additional sheds, and that the keeping in repair of the old sheds is charged to revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to hear that because it will save us a vote on concurrence. I will take this opportunity to say a word with reference to the expenditure on this railway. The expenditure in the time of my hon. friend beside me arose largely from the alteration in grades or the replacement of iron rails by steel or both; at any rate, it was expenses which might reasonably have been placed to capital. But there are two other important questions. The present charge for interest on the Intercolonial Railway is fully \$400,000 greater than it was in my hon. friend's time. The absolute cost to the people is now \$2,250,000 as against \$1,800,000 then for interest; and the hon. gentleman knows that no possible test of comparison can be made between a perfectly new railway, as that was in great part, only just open to traffic, and one which has been in operation for years.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before this item is passed, I wish to say a word in reference to the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and I desire to do so because I see the chief engineer present, and wish him to take a note of what I say. You know, Sir, that the rebates on flour from Halifax and St. John are from 2½ cents to 10 cents a barrel, according to the amount imported. Well, there are many thousands of barrels imported by Prince Edward Island from Boston, and I would point out to the hon. the Minister that if the system of granting rebates was extended to the flour imported by Prince Edward Island, most of it would go over the Intercolonial Railway. We all desire to see the Intercolonial Railway made as paying an investment as possible, and if we can, by applying the system that is in vogue from Halifax and St. John to flour going to Prince Edward Island, the greater portion of that would go over the Intercolonial Railway. I know myself that in Boston this year, on the 1st May, there were at least 50,000 barrels of Canadian flour there for transportation to Prince Edward Island, and if a similar reduction were made to that made on flour from Halifax, it would all have gone over the Intercolonial Railway. I trust that the Government will take this matter up. If they can carry flour to Halifax for 55 cents a barrel, they ought to carry it to Pictou Landing at the same rate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say a word with regard to this matter, and I wish also to answer a question asked by the hon. member for South Oxford. I would draw his

attention to the condition of the canal account, which bears upon the point he was discussing. The hon. gentleman knows of the enormous capital expended by this country in connection with the canal system, and I draw his attention to the fact that the expense of maintaining the canal system exceeds the receipts this year by practically, \$192,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the receipts?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are \$556,646 from all sources, and the expenditure for expenses and repairs are \$548,567, nearly \$200,000 deficiency, which relatively is much greater than the average deficiency on the Intercolonial Railway; and yet we pay all the interest on the whole of this canal expenditure just the same as we pay the interest on the railway expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has underestimated the expenses. We voted \$508,000 for this year; we voted \$503,000 for the future years, and we have besides, under the head of railways and canals chargeable to income, about \$220,000 more, so that the loss is not merely \$200,000 but nearer \$400,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You will find the statement on page 23 of Public Accounts, and that is for the year 1886-87. The loss in that year is \$191,920 95.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would appear that, in all human probability, the loss for 1888-89 will be \$400,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid it will be largely increased.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What rate is charged by the Intercolonial Railway on stone from Newcastle?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. One-fifth of 1 cent per ton per mile, or about 12 cents per cubic foot.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman knows that great complaints have been made by the merchants of Halifax with regard to the accommodation given to the western millers, who are enabled to keep their flour at the public expense for a month. The Halifax merchants justly complain. If any person requires flour for shipment, say to Lunenburg or Liverpool, it can be shipped by the western millers owing to this accommodation, and the merchants in Halifax are prevented doing any business in flour at all. I think the hon. gentleman will remember there was a representation presented to the Government on that subject.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In answer to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), I will say that during the past recess a royal commission was appointed to take up the whole of this question in connection with the interstate commerce Bill in the United States. That commission was composed of very able men; and having investigated the whole of that question with great care, they embodied the result of their opinion in a report which has, to a large extent, been embodied in an Act which has passed Parliament the present Session, and which will deal with the question of rebate of which the hon. gentleman complains, by putting the various parties nearly upon an equal footing.

Esquimalt Graving Dock.....\$67,325 15

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why was the amount of \$17,383.15 for settlement of McNamee's claim not disposed of last Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Because the report of the Special Committee came in the last day or two before the end of the Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is described here as the Session of 1886. Is that a mistake for last Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is a mistake for last Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have forgotten who were the members of the Select Committee, but I do not like this business of referring claims of this kind to a Select Committee, because my experience is that that is a mere buffer for the Government to get rid of a disagreeable duty. Of course, the Government assume the responsibility, but I doubt whether any Select Committee should be allowed to deal with these matters in any case. If a claim is made, it should be dealt with by a judicial tribunal.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I was a member of the Special Committee, and I know that we investigated very thoroughly the claim that was made. The question was a difficulty between the Government of British Columbia and McNamee.

Mr. SHANLY. I was associated on that Committee with my hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Weldon) and I know that we did investigate the matter very thoroughly, though I do not express any opinion as to the wisdom of referring any of these matters to a Special Committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am bound to say that the Government could scarcely have elected two members in whom I would have more confidence than my two hon. friends from the two sides of the House. At the same time, that does not alter my opinion that it is a very dangerous practice to send any such claims to a Select Committee. I would infinitely prefer that they should go before judicial arbitrators.

Mr. PRIOR. I do not object to the vote being passed, but I do object strongly to this money being handed over to F. B. McNamee & Co., unless there is some stipulation made that he shall pay his creditors. He took the contract from the Provincial Government of British Columbia in the first place, and in June, 1882, the Provincial Government took the work out of his hands because it was not being done satisfactorily. Afterwards the Dominion Government took the work and paid the Provincial Government a large sum of money for the work done, and also for the plant and material of McNamee & Co., and then the Dominion Government gave a contract to Larkin & Connolly, and they carried on the work. McNamee then petitioned the Provincial Government for compensation for the deposit of \$10,000 which he had put up and the Provincial Government had forfeited, and also for the balance due on the contract work. The Provincial Government had a Select Committee appointed, and that committee admitted that the account should be paid, but reported that the Dominion Government should pay it. McNamee then petitioned the Dominion Government, and a Select Committee was appointed here, and that committee reported, that, although McNamee had not a legal claim, he had an equitable claim, and they thought the amount of \$15,000 with interest should be paid. During the time that McNamee & Co. were performing their work in British Columbia they ran up a large amount of debts, and, when the contract was taken away from them, they left the country without paying their creditors, who have never received a cent to this day. The Provincial Government paid a great many workmen out of the \$10,000 which was put up, because some of them were on the point of starvation, but there is now over \$4,000 owing to creditors there. I think the Government should get a guarantee from McNamee & Co., that they will settle in full with their creditors in British Columbia, and I object most strongly to this money being handed over to them unless that guarantee is obtained.

Mr. BAKER. If it were necessary to corroborate the statement of my colleague, I would have pleasure in doing

so, but I should like to ask the Government if the amount in the Estimates of \$17,383.5 includes the amount of \$15,000 with interest at 6 per cent. from the 8th November, 1884, which was the date of the letting of the contract to Larkin, Connolly & Co., and, further, if the Minister of Public Works will give an assurance that the creditors of McNamee & Co., in Victoria, will, before the money is paid, be protected. In order to secure that, I would move that the following words be added to the item:—

Said sum not to be paid over to F. B. McNamee, until satisfactory evidence has been furnished to the Department of Public Works that the creditors of the firm of McNamee & Co., in Victoria, and other British Columbia towns and cities have been paid.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was a despatch received from the First Minister of British Columbia, Mr. Smith, stating that the \$10,000 deposit which McNamee & Co. had made with the Government of British Columbia would be kept for the purpose of paying the creditors of McNamee & Co. in British Columbia. We are not aware that there is anything else in the amount to be covered by that \$10,000. Therefore, this is not for the purpose of paying for work done, but it is to pay for the plant which was handed over by the British Columbia Government to the Government of the Dominion, and, therefore, I do not think this amendment should be adopted. If these parties have judgments that have not been paid, let them do as all other creditors do, let them execute their judgments; but I do not think they should ask us to pay the debts of a contractor to whom we are giving the price of the plant that was taken from him by the British Columbia Government and handed over to us.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The Minister of Public Works states that the plant had been taken by the Provincial Government without any authority, and that Government handed it over to the Dominion Government. Mr. McNamee could not file a petition of right against the Government, and he felt that the plant having been taken from him the amount should be paid. He notified the provincial authorities of the proceedings of the committee, and of the Dominion Government, and I think the matter was fairly investigated, and it would be very unfair now to say to Mr. McNamee that this condition should be attached, for it appears that in consequence of what was clearly and wrongfully the act of the provincial authorities of British Columbia, Mr. McNamee was practically ruined.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why should British Columbians come here and ask to be placed upon a better footing than other people?

Mr. BAKER. They do not.

Mr. MITCHELL. If a gentleman happens to enter into an engagement and gets into debt, and happens to have a claim against the Government, are the creditors coming to this Parliament and asking this Government to pay all his debts?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think we have a precedent for this action in this House. A vote was passed a few years ago, respecting the Short Line. The Government took a portion of that money to pay the laborers on that line; therefore if this vote is in a position to be utilised upon the same principle, I think the Government have a precedent for it.

Mr. BAKER. There are one or two things that the committee do not thoroughly understand. That committee, relying upon the veracity of my late colleague, Mr. Shakespeare, was formed on purpose to give Mr. McNamee justice, and also upon his verbal guarantee that if he got that money he would see these creditors paid, and that is why we, as British Columbians, ask the Minister of Public Works to see that, out of a sum voted by this Parliament to

Mr. BAKER.

Messrs. McNamee & Co., whatever portion rightly belongs to the creditors in Victoria and other cities in British Columbia, should be held by the Government, instead of the whole being handed to McNamee & Co. British Columbians do not come here to ask anything which is not accorded to the other Provinces, and if we did, I think there would be very little show of getting it, if the hon. member for Northumberland had anything to say in the matter.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think the hon. gentleman should make an attack upon me. I have always shown to British Columbia an amount of fair play that many other members in this House have not shown. I appeal to my hon. friend whether, in almost every instance where British Columbia has been concerned, I have not favored her. I had something to do with bringing her into Confederation; I had something to do with the conditions under which she came in; and I think those conditions were very liberal; and it came with bad grace from the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Baker) to insinuate that if I had anything to do with the Government, she would not get fair play. The hon. gentleman is making a statement which the facts do not justify him in making, and he cannot sustain it by my attitude or by my votes. It is true that I differed with the hon. gentleman on the Chinese question, but, because I believed in allowing the Chinese to come into the country, the hon. gentleman must not suppose that I am against British Columbia.

Mr. BAKER. I did not make any insinuations, I stated plainly that everything I said this afternoon had reference to what you said immediately preceding, and to nothing else.

Mr. MITCHELL. He says he don't mean to insinuate anything. What was it brought me to my feet but the insinuations of the hon. gentleman? Insinuations, I tell him, not warranted by the facts. He cannot point to one title of evidence to show that I have been hostile to British Columbia. I have always been a friend of British Columbia.

Mr. BAKER. The hon. Minister of Public Works said if there were any unpaid claims—I have two in my hand, one from John Kinsman and the other from the Bank of British North America. The two of them amount to \$1,100, and they have not been paid yet.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Why do not they execute their judgments against Mr. McNamee in Montreal?

Mr. BAKER. We have done so.

Mr. PRIOR. The Local Government has paid nearly the whole of that \$10,000 out to workmen who are creditors.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Not all the \$10,000.

Mr. PRIOR. Of the \$10,000 deposited, the greater part of that money has been paid out to workmen whom McNamee had employed on the dock.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am sure less than \$7,500 of that money has been paid out.

Mr. PRIOR. I have got assurance from the Provincial Government that such is the case. I did not pay it myself.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If there is any equity in the matter, the Province of British Columbia ought to pay it, and not Mr. McNamee.

Public Works, chargeable to Income, Quebec..... \$56,300

Mr. LAURIER. In regard to the item of \$13,600 for St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, I should like to know the particulars.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The expenditure is for building operations.

Public Works, Ontario..... \$31,967

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire information in regard to the expenditure of \$6,000: improvements, furniture, &c., Speakers' apartments, Senate and House of Commons.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Among the other improvements made, I may mention a change in the staircase, improved heating apparatus, electric light, painting and papering, and other works in the Speaker's Chambers of the Commons. The amount of \$6,000 was about divided between the Senate and the Commons. The alterations in the Speaker's Chambers in the Senate included new heating apparatus, improved ventilation, change in the passage leading to the refreshment rooms and other works.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How many additional rooms does the Speaker of the Commons now occupy—how many rooms have been expropriated by him.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think he has any new rooms.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The room off the chamber is occupied by the Speaker, and I understand he has a room formerly used as part of the reporters' gallery, and that another small room has been partitioned off.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think he has any more rooms than last year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does Mr. Speaker receive \$4,000 salary as before, and for the same reasons?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Speaker receives the salary fixed by law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A statutory salary?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the rule of law is that when the reason ceases the appropriation ceases also.

Repairs, furniture, heating &c..... \$12,377

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like some explanation in regard to this item.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is the site of the old Parliament building at Quebec. That property had been transferred to the Quebec Government for the use of the Legislature there. The building was burnt down, and the Government of Quebec constructed another building, and they, therefore, retransferred this property to the Government of Canada, saying they did not want it any more, and they declared at the same time they would transfer the amount of insurance on the building which they had received. Under the purchase deed, at the time of the old Province of Lower Canada, there is a ground rent of \$4,444 payable to the Archbishop of Quebec. We are now trying to have the Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec to accept the capital of that amount so as to extinguish the rent.

Mr. LAURIER. Were the Government bound to take back this property?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It had been handed to them only for that special purpose, and they said they did not want it any more.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that the Government considered they were bound to take back that property when offered it by the Quebec Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Is that the opinion of the Minister of Justice?

Mr. THOMPSON. I have not looked into the matter myself, but I understand the position to be this: that the title being with us we are bound to pay this rent.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood that it had been transferred to the Quebec Government by matter of contract?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This, as I understand, must have been a lease of the land from the Provinces of Canada to the old Province of Quebec.

Mr. LAURIER. Of Lower Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, of Lower Canada, who leased this from the ecclesiastical authorities. That was the original state of the case.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was an Act of Parliament passed at that period by which the Government of the Province of Lower Canada purchased from the then bishop of Quebec that property, on their paying one thousand pounds sterling annually.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was done by the old Province of Lower Canada?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government of Canada continued that. It became their property when Confederation took place. After Confederation—about a year after, I think—there was an Order in Council giving the use of that property to the Quebec Government on which to erect a Parliament House. Now the Government of the Province of Quebec say: We do not want the property now, it is for you to pay the rent, and we give you back the amount for which it was insured.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much was that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$33,000, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do we get that back?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will have that back.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope if the hon. gentlemen opposite are going to commute that they will commute it speedily before the rate of interest falls unduly low. At the present rate of interest it will only cost us \$100,000; but on the principle laid down by the Minister of Finance if we wait until the interest falls, we will have to pay \$200,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are in communication with the Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec about that. He opposes our right to take the capital, and the matter has been referred to the Minister of Justice, who, in a very few days I understand, will give his opinion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The site ought to be worth something.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Oh, yes.

Little Nation River—Removal of obstructions..... \$1,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I see no appropriation here for the repairing of the returning ground at Dresden. I have mentioned the matter before to the Minister of Public Works, and this place should be protected, by piling or otherwise. The banks of the river are giving away, and damage to life and property is likely to result. A little expenditure now will save the Government more than they would be obliged to pay for possible damage to property.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will have the matter looked into by my chief engineer, and I shall try to do what is right in the matter.

North Saskatchewan River..... \$6,000

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the Minister how this money has been spent?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to cover an expenditure of \$683 incurred up to the 1st of March, in connection with harbor and river works undertaken on the part of the Government, and to provide for requirements before the

close of the current fiscal year, to the extent of \$316.95. We want a small margin in case there should be anything more needed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not intend to object to this, but I should like to know what has been done in regard to the improvement of navigation on the Saskatchewan—what results have been achieved, and what is this money for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The chief engineer says this is to cover the expenditure in connection with the improvement of the North Saskatchewan River to September, and to provide for the additional sum which he thinks will be required for six months of the coming year. He says that the report of the engineer has not yet been received. The reason of that was the engineer was seriously ill, but he is now working at the report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know how many miles of that river are navigable now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have the statement here. The first and second rapids at the end of the falls, which were found to be slightly obstructed were cleared of boulders so as to leave a channel of three feet deep. At the third rapid a good depth of water was found and no further work was thought necessary for the present. The fourth rapid was obstructed by boulders and was entirely cleared, but at one place it is found impossible to clear more than about 16 inches deep for about 150 feet. The bottom being of hard gravel which could only be removed by dredging appliances which were not available then. There is a distance of water communication from the mouth of Red River to Edmonton on the Saskatchewan of 1,073 miles, but I cannot say what portion is navigable.

Mr. WATSON. I hope the hon. Minister will see that the money intended to improve the navigation of the Saskatchewan River shall be spent this year. It is very important that the navigation of that river should be improved, as the people of the Prince Albert district and other districts on the North Saskatchewan have no railway communication. I regret that I do not see any vote in the Estimates this year for improving the St. Andrew's rapids, which has been promised from year to year. Those rapids form part of the water communication between Winnipeg and Prince Albert and other points on the Saskatchewan, and it is very important that the lake boats should be enabled to go up the Red River to the city of Winnipeg, not only for the sake of the Saskatchewan traffic, but also to enable lumber from the timber limits on Lake Winnipeg to be delivered at Winnipeg by those boats.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My engineers think that we must have more information than we have before we can do anything with regard to those rapids, which they seem to dread more than any other work. It is a question whether the improvements the hon. gentleman speaks of would really be improvements, or whether they would be an injury. Therefore, before we can do anything, we must be sure what the result will be.

Mr. WATSON. The engineers of the hon. Minister have been there for two or three years, and a large amount of money has been expended on surveys; and surely there is sufficient information now in the department to enable it to go on with the work. A few months ago it was supposed that it would be gone on with immediately. It was also understood that the Assiniboine River should be improved from Winnipeg to Brandon, on condition that Manitoba should submit to the railway monopoly until 1891. But since the monopoly is done away with, perhaps the hon. gentleman will not see fit to make the improvements.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take a note of the matter, and see what can be done during the recess.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Dredging \$20,000

Mr. WATSON. Where is it intended to expend the \$5,000 for dredging in Manitoba?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The memorandum I have does not state where. It will be where it is wanted.

Mr. WATSON. A sum of \$10,000 was voted some years ago to improve the Water Hen River, but nothing was done there. I do not object to the way in which the money was spent, because I believe it was more beneficially used to improve the mouth of White Mud River. But it is important that Water Hen River should be improved so as to enable the holders of timber limits in that district to utilise them. The Government have not yet been able to collect any dues from those limits on that account; but I believe the revenue which would be derived from those limits would more than compensate the Government for the expenditure necessary to improve that river.

To pay litigation in *re schooner David J. Adams*
(Governor General's warrant) \$3,359 53

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this the result of some of those fisheries proceedings on the part of the Government last year?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is to pay the prosecution of one of the seized vessels.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the position of the case?

Mr. THOMPSON. Judgment has not been given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is just on account?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Pretty expensive business in every way meddling with the Yankee fishermen.

Mr. MITCHELL. I recollect the day that this vessel was seized, meeting the right hon. First Minister in the lobby. I said to him: You had no business to seize that vessel; it was an undignified proceeding. The First Minister replied, priding himself upon the fact that although the Government had missed them on the violation of the treaty of 1818, they had caught them on the Customs Act. Nearly two years have elapsed since the seizure was made, and here is an expense of \$3,200, and the matter is not yet settled.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who is to blame for that?

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman is to blame. The hon. gentleman influences the courts. He can control their proceedings, he kept this case in abeyance, and it is in abeyance yet; and all the country has got for it is an enormous expense for legal proceedings. Who is the law firm?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Graham, Tupper & Borden.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is no reason why we should pay legal expenses to Graham, Tupper & Borden. Is Mr. Tupper the hon. member for Pictou? This thing should be put a stop to and the bill settled up. The seizure of the *Adams* was a disgrace and a discredit to the Government, and the continuance of the case for two years, without a decision having yet been given, may fairly be charged as a discredit to Canada.

Mr. THOMPSON. The *Adams* was seized for two offences: For violation of the treaty and for violation of the customs laws. The case was a test one. It was the beginning of the fishing season when our protection began, and we thought it important to test our right to prevent foreign fishing vessels coming to our ports and buying bait. The seizure was made, and the proceedings carried on were necessarily expensive, from the fact that it was a test case.

The evidence was, on the application of the defence, taken in the United States at considerable cost. In July, 1886, the entire case was closed, in so far as the evidence for the Canadian Government was concerned and so far as the evidence for the defence was concerned; and, with the consent of the counsel, a day was fixed for the hearing of the case and the evidence. That was in July, 1886, and, on a special application on the part of the defence, when the judge sat to fix a day for the hearing, a commission was issued to take evidence in the United States, and that commission had a very long time to run in consequence of one of the witnesses being at sea. The result of that adjournment, which took place at the instance of the defence and not of the counsel of the Canadian Government, was a year's delay in bringing the case to trial. The case was heard early last summer, and judgment has been reserved ever since without the slightest demand on the part of the Canadian Government or its counsel to influence the court to delay for a single instant the delivery of the judgment. A large part of the item is not for counsel's expenses but for other disbursements, and the hon. member for Pictou has not the interest of one farthing in this vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does it go to his firm?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What firm?

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Wallace Graham is our agent, and the partnership arrangement between those gentlemen does not entitle Mr. Tupper to one cent. Mr. Tupper is a partner of Mr. Graham, but in these Government matters he is not entitled to any of the fees.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wonder if we could find out the secret arrangement of that partnership, whether by it, in some other things, Mr. Graham would not be entitled to any portion of the transactions which Mr. Tupper brings. However, my point is that this case, which has been before the court as a test case, has been allowed to drift on for two years. It is the duty of the Government to have interfered and asked the court to come to a decision.

Mr. THOMPSON. What I said was that we had not interfered to delay the judgment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have not charged you with that, but the hon. gentleman knows that it only requires a nod to keep things understood, and, if it is a matter involving international difficulties, it is not to the credit of the Government to have allowed this case to stand over for all these years. As to the case itself, it is one that never should have been brought up. As I have stated before, if it had been possible for the Government to select a weak case in order to test the rights as between the United States and Canada, they could not have selected a weaker one than this case of the *D. J. Adams*. I told the Minister of Marine before that here was a vessel which was seized under the Customs Act, which the officers had been on board of and examined twice, but she drifted out to sea and struck on a bar, and was seized because she was twenty-four hours there without reporting to Canada. I say it was a discredit to Canada to act in that way, and to take this as a test case in regard to the questions involved between us and the United States. It illustrates the impotence and the incompetency of the Government in dealing with this international question. A year ago, everyone saw the position we would be in, and now it is evident that the Government are afraid to bring this to a decision; and there cannot be any doubt that one word from them would bring the matter to a decision.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says that the member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) is not in any way concerned in this matter. You will find almost every year in the Public Accounts professional payments to one member

of that firm, and I venture to express the opinion, which is generally entertained, that I do not see the difference between legal gentlemen having their names in the Public Accounts and others who have had their names in the Public Accounts in connection with matters in which they were not directly interested. I remember that, in 1878, I happened to hold a few shares in a paper in regard to which I had no part in the management or control. It was a party paper, and because it received some Government printing my seat was threatened. I expressed the opinion that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) and other legal gentlemen in this House, have since that time rendered themselves more liable to a prosecution for a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act than I did on that occasion, and, if this matter was investigated to the bottom, I believe it would be found that, while the hon. gentleman might not be directly concerned in this matter, there are certain considerations which give him an indirect interest.

Mr. THOMPSON. The law is the same in regard to legal gentlemen as it is in regard to others, but Mr. Tupper is not directly or indirectly interested in this vote.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says so.

Mr. THOMPSON. The best way is for the hon. member to try it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We know that, when a partner of an hon. member gets large sums out of the public chest, it must inure to the benefit of the hon. member, possibly not directly, but indirectly, and I think it is a scandal for any member of a firm to sit in Parliament while another member of the firm is a pensioner of the Government. I think it is better that members of Parliament should be debarred from being members of firms which have any such connection with the Government. I do not accuse the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) with directly receiving any of this amount. I am quite aware that you can draw an act of partnership which will prevent one partner from directly benefiting from certain receipts of the firm, but undoubtedly he does indirectly benefit, and I think it is a vicious system that members of Parliament should be members of firms, legal or other, deriving emoluments from the Government, such as Wallace Graham & Co. do. I admit that we cannot touch that under the present law, but I think that is an error in the law and should be amended so as to render such a thing impossible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If we look back I think we will find the same arrangement was made in regard to the firm of Blake, Wells & Morrison, and when that was brought up in the House, it was defended by hon. gentlemen opposite. It was no scandal at that time, and I think the same arrangement was made in regard to the firm of Blake, Kerr & Co.

Mr. MITCHELL. I object strongly to this answer which we so often hear. You are another. Whether Blake, Wells & Co. or anybody else did this, it is wrong. Mr. McCarthy's firm is deriving large benefit from their employment as counsel in the public service, and so with others. I say it is wrong for members of this Parliament, although they may not come within the provisions of the Act, to have these considerations. It may not be within the letter of the Act, but it is certainly in violation of the spirit of the Act that the partners of these hon. members should derive this benefit. If we go a little further, we find that the sons of these men who control and rule the country are obtaining these benefits, and we remember the scandal which occurred as to the bill of Tupper, Macdonald & Co. for their services in the North-West. Was it creditable that the son of the Premier and the son of the Finance Minister should send in bills demanding one-third of the amount for getting this and

that bill through Parliament? Is it prudent or right or likely to elevate public opinion in this country?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think it is generally considered that this should be stopped, whether it is right or wrong legally. Mr. Wallace Graham is a very eminent legal gentleman, and is highly qualified for his position, but he was a Reformer in the old times, and there is no doubt that he would never have been placed in that position had he not been a partner of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper).

Mr. THOMPSON. That is a great mistake. Mr. Wallace Graham was a Conservative almost from childhood. It is true that he was seduced by the hon. gentleman's persuasive eloquence to support his party for a time in a moderate way, but he changed his views, and his present position has nothing to do with this. He changed his opinion years before he received the appointment.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I believe the hon. Minister himself was a Liberal in his early life.

Mr. THOMPSON. Certainly.

Mr. LISTER. This is the point. The First Minister has stated that this side of the House, when in power, did what we complain of now. Hon. gentlemen led by the First Minister objected to that course of procedure at that time and said it tended to demoralise the public men of the country; but, when they came into power, they pursued the same tactics which they had condemned. If it was wrong then it is wrong now, and the Government have no right to follow it out. I do not believe it was right then. At all events, whether they be true or not, the course followed by this Government is one which they strenuously objected to when they were in Opposition. I can only echo the statement made by the hon. member for Northumberland when I say that this state of affairs is scandalous in the extreme—it is discreditable to the Government. Hon. gentlemen having seats in this House have no right to receive, directly or indirectly, any public moneys, and they have no right to allow their partners to receive any.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

North-West Mounted Police, required to complete the service for the year (Governor General's warrant). \$100,000

Mr. CASEY. Such a large sum paid on Governor General's warrant requires some explanation, especially since these warrants are only supposed to be issued in cases of emergency.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so; but the hon. gentleman will see that we must maintain the Mounted Police, and when it was found necessary to expend this \$100,000 it was just one of those cases of emergency for which the law provides a recourse to the Governor General's warrant.

Mr. CASEY. Will the hon. Minister tell us what were the special services that constituted this emergency?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There were no special services, but the service for the year involved a larger sum than had been provided for. I have no memorandum on the point, but I will ask the First Minister.

Mr. MITCHELL. It does appear to me that for a service like the North-West Mounted Police, an estimate that fell short \$100,000 shows a lack of information, or a lack of judgment, on the part of the officer making the report.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt there was lack of information. I presume the First Minister will give some information.

To meet expenses of Royal Labor Commission (Governor General's warrant). \$40,000

Mr. CASEY. It seems to me this commission has been a very expensive way of obtaining information on the labor question. An unnecessarily large number of commissioners have been sent about all through the country. What the benefit will be to the labor classes we have yet to see. We do not know what action the Government intend to take on the report of the Labor Commission. It does seem as if all this information could have been obtained by a limited number of commissioners sitting in a limited number of places, and that they could have obtained a good deal of information by sending out circulars instead of moving this cumbersome body round from place to place.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it expected the commission will extend much longer?

Mr. BOWELL. The labors of the commission have already ceased. The plan just suggested by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) is the plan that was adopted. After the commission had been sitting sometime in the west, they were instructed to confine their investigations principally to the trade centres in the Dominion. The evidence taken by the commission will be printed shortly.

Mr. MITCHELL. I particularly object to the course the Government has pursued. They should have appointed the Labor Commission earlier, when this Parliament might have had an opportunity of getting the result of their enquiry, and then they might have dealt with any questions of hardship. It appears to me they either appointed the commission too late, or that the commission have been lax in not getting on more rapidly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another matter in respect to which for many reasons it is to be regretted, and that is this: those gentlemen who have paid the slightest attention to the evidence taken before those commissioners are aware that the evidence taken and reported in the newspapers with respect to the treatment of little children and of women, particularly in the city of Montreal, shows a state of things so disgraceful that I think it calls for immediate legislation so as to make such conduct on the part of employers penal, more so than it is at present. I am not disposed to complain of the conduct of the Government in awaiting the report of this commission to introduce a carefully considered Bill dealing with the whole subject, but I think that, bearing in mind that year after year we have seen Bills introduced into this House by individual members and not advanced a stage further, and feeling the Government must be supposed to have been acquainted with what occurred in other countries, when they found such a state of things was disclosed, as was disclosed by the evidence in Montreal, they should have taken some steps in order that during the next year little children and women should be protected from the abuses which appear to have been perpetrated. No man can know better than the Minister of Finance that when children of eight or ten years of age are subjected to labor for a period of thirteen or fourteen hours, for even a few days, it is liable to injure the constitutions of these children for life. The evidence that was laid before that commission disclosed the fact, to our shame and disgrace be it said, that in the chief city of this Dominion children of tender years were obliged to work with very little intermission from 6.30 in the morning up to nine or ten o'clock at night. I say that is a condition of things in no degree removed from white slavery, it is a disgrace to all of us. I do not pretend to say that we on this side of the House are

perhaps entirely free from blame, because we have been a little lax in not at an earlier period of the Session pressing on the Government the need of legislation, but there was no fitting opportunity till that which now presents itself. I had hoped this item might have been reached earlier, and in that case we might have had an opportunity of taking some steps providing against tyrannous abuses being perpetrated during the ensuing year. I cannot, however, leave this item without expressing the shame and the humiliation I feel that in a country like Canada, which ought to be free from the state of degradation of semi-slavery that prevails in older and more thickly peopled countries, it should be possible that little children should be subjected to the gross oppression and tyranny which was disclosed before the commissioners. It cannot be said that that evidence was contradicted. Here is a portion of the evidence, and I call the attention of both the First Minister and the Minister of Finance to it:

"The children begin work at 6.25 in the morning, they are given 45 minutes rest at noon. Children of 10 years of age in the busy season work from quarter past six to nine p.m., and work continuously during those hours with the only exception of 45 minutes rest at noon; no time is given them for supper."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In what factory did that occur?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is in a factory in respect of which I am very sorry to see such a statement made—it is the Hudon cotton factory, employing 1,100 hands, of whom 200 are children. I am quite certain neither the First Minister nor the Minister of Finance, if these facts had been brought to their attention, could for one moment have tolerated—and they are the parties more especially charged with remedying such a state of things—the idea of allowing such a state of slavery, because it is slavery and worse than slavery, to go on in this country. Children cannot be worked, and no man knows it better than the Minister of Finance, who is a medical man of high reputation, even for a few days from six in the morning till nine at night with 45 minutes intermission without suffering the greatest possible injury, morally and physically. I do not hesitate to say that any child subjected to such treatment for even a few weeks would suffer permanent injury to their constitutions. I do not blame the Government, I say, for awaiting the result of this commission without bringing down a Bill dealing with the matter; but these are things in regard to which our criminal law ought to be amended, and most stringent penalties should be inflicted not merely on the overseers and the factory hands, but on the more responsible directors, or at least on some of those who are managers, and on the supervisors, that is to say unless the facts which are here stated, and which appear to be established beyond the possibility of a doubt, can be contradicted. Although, as I said, I suppose it is too late now to rush through a Bill rendering those acts penal as they ought to be and severely penal, I trust the First Minister will feel himself, in his capacity of First Minister, especially called upon to see that within the shortest time now possible this sort of thing is made impossible in Canada, this disgrace which should not have existed for one hour instead of, as it appears to have existed, for some years. I can conceive no possible ground or reason, no possible justification of such a state of things having existed at all anywhere.

Mr. CASEY. There is another point in this evidence almost worse than that to which my hon. friend has called attention. I think it was in the boot and shoe factories, or in the cigar factories, or both that it was proved that children had been flogged, that they were accustomed to be flogged for real or supposed failure to perform their day's work, the discretion being left in the hands of the overseer of the

room. He was an actual slave-driver, and flogged those children as much as he chose when they did not do the quantity of work he thought should be done, and it was proved that even quite big girls had been treated in this manner. Then there were cases where the children had not been flogged but had been imprisoned in a black hole, in the cellar of the factory, and kept there for a considerable period, a most terrible and objectionable punishment for children. My hon. friend described this as something worse than white slavery, because the slave-owner owned the children and took at least as good care of them as he did of his working cattle. No man puts his horses or cattle to work before they are fit for it, because he knows it will not pay in the long run. When a man pays so much per day for the services of a child he is bound to get as much work as possible out of the child unless the law prevents him, and therefore the condition of the children is much worse than the real old-fashioned slavery. I do not think the Government's attention needed to be especially drawn to this question, because this evidence was given, some early in the Session, some before the Session, and the Government, no doubt, were aware of the evidence given before their own commission, and it was their duty, without any pressure being brought from this side of the House, to have taken action in the matter. The First Minister does not appear to think there is time to rush through a short Bill prohibiting this state of things, but I have seen Bills rushed through when no objection was offered, and no objection could be offered in a case like this. I would urge the First Minister to still further consider if it is not possible at some hour this evening or to-morrow to put a Bill through its different stages by the unanimous consent of the House, so as to prevent this disgraceful system of slavery being continued.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can quite appreciate the reasons which have induced the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to bring forward this subject, and I do not think his language is a bit too strong with respect to the lamentable condition of affairs disclosed by the labors of this commission. The hon. gentleman will, however, remember that this is a delicate subject; it has always been considered as such by Parliament, in consequence of the question arising whether duty and the power of passing such laws did not rest rather with the Provincial Legislatures than with the Dominion Parliament. My hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), some years ago introduced a Factory Bill, I think in more than one Session, and I thought it was a rather complete Bill; but it was strongly opposed by the manufacturers, who said there was no necessity for any such legislation, and that it might well be that labor legislation of that kind would be required in England, or in the older countries where the laborer was at the mercy of the employer, but in this country where there was plenty of employment for young and old, that there was no necessity for introducing severe and strict legislation; that here the parents were quite able to support their children, without sending them to work and thus preventing the necessity of their being reduced to such servile work at this period of time. There was, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) may well remember, a question arising as to where the legislation should begin. It was a matter of doubt, so much so that the Ontario Legislature passed a Bill, and the Attorney General was so uncertain as to whether the power existed that it was provided in that Bill it should be brought into force by proclamation. After some communication on the subject between the Minister of Justice, then Sir Alexander Campbell, and the Attorney General of Ontario, it was thought well to issue the proclamation for that law of inspection in the interests of Ontario. There was no great pressure brought upon the House for this Bill. Some petitions were presented, but those petitions were principally directed to the necessity of

establishing safeguards around machinery, and thus protecting persons employed from being exposed to be caught by the machinery. There was no suggestion at all, according to my recollection, of there being any cruelty or anything like the state of things that exists in the labor market of Montreal. Of course there was no doubt that for a serious neglect of the rules of inspection, such serious neglect as to threaten health or life that it would probably come within the criminal law, and if these serious malfeasances occurred it should be declared a misdemeanor. I see my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is not so sure that we can declare, on our will, anything we please to be a misdemeanor, but surely such cruelty as making children work for the hours mentioned by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is such an offence against the person as would bring it fairly within the law of misdemeanor, the same as any other offences of a like nature. It was very fortunate, I think, that the Labor Commission brought out—even at the eleventh hour—the evidence of this lamentable state of affairs. The hon. gentleman will quite see that a measure of this kind has got to be drawn with great care. A measure if passed by the Dominion Parliament must take care not to infringe upon the prerogative of the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures, and therefore it would be quite impossible to run a Bill through that would be of any value at the present moment. That class of Bill must be carefully considered. Those children and the operatives are greatly interested in this report, and I believe that the very fact of those disclosures will have a preventive effect in themselves. No manufacturing establishment will venture, in the face of the public indignation which has been already evoked by these disclosures, to continue such a state of things. I think that we may reasonably expect and hope during this present season, that the warning given by the evidence which has come to light, and the still greater warning which they will receive from the report of the commission, when they do report, will prevent any recurrence or continuance of this state of affairs. Meanwhile I accept the responsibility which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has thrown upon the Government, to take up this question, and as far as we can, within the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament, protect in the future the operatives, young and old—especially the young—until we prepare a measure which we can submit to Parliament.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will observe that I did not even suggest that a general Act could have been prepared. What I thought was that on these disclosures of two or three most flagrant abuses, such as compelling children of tender years to work for such a number of hours, the corporal punishment which appears to have been inflicted on children who did not work as their employers thought fit, and also the treatment of women in some cases (although those cases were not so numerous and not so well authenticated as the others) should have induced some remedy. Of course, the hon. gentleman is correct in saying that public opinion, properly directed, will possibly change a great deal of this, and on his pledge, as I understand him now to give it, that this matter will be dealt with next Session, at any rate, so far as making such cases severely punishable by law. I do not intend to say anything further with respect to the Hudson Cotton Company. There were several witnesses, all of whom agreed that children under ten years of age had been worked for fourteen or fifteen hours. One witness deposed that children of eight years had worked, and that is worse still. They work from half-past six to nine, and as the witness deposes, he had seen them severely punished.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the children, it is a case of assault and anyone inflicting this corporal punishment can be dealt with summarily or by indictment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is true in one sense, but it is not true in another. The most grievous feature of this is that, to a very considerable extent, the parents of those children, I am sorry to say, actually sold their children into this slavery, for the purpose of benefiting by their wages.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This was found to be the case in England and other countries, until the legislation in England established such severe penalties on the employers that they dare not allow the parents to live on the wages of the children.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This whole subject was before Parliament some time ago, although this particular phase of the question was not. I think the first Bill on the subject was introduced by the late Finance Minister, Mr. Tilley. That Bill was introduced two Sessions in succession, but it was ultimately abandoned, and then the member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) introduced a measure directed in the same sense. While this question of the jurisdiction of this Parliament and the Local Legislature was being discussed in this House, at the instance of the Minister of Public Works, the debate was adjourned, and no action was taken. If I remember rightly, there was a discussion between the Minister of Justice here and the Attorney General of Ontario with regard to the right of the Provinces or the Dominion to legislate upon the subject. It was also agreed between those two officials that a case should be agreed upon, and that the subject should be referred to the courts for decision. That matter, I think, was about arranged when the present Minister of Justice succeeded to his office; and if I remember the facts rightly, the present Minister of Justice enquired of the Attorney General whether he had any doubt as to his jurisdiction. In fact, I think the present Minister of Justice abandoned the position taken by his predecessor in office on this question, and conceded that jurisdiction over the matter as a civil right belonged to the Provinces and not to the Dominion. I believe the reason why the Attorney General of Ontario did not, by proclamation, bring the Bill into operation at once was the objection made by the former Minister of Justice; and it was agreed that the question should be decided by the courts before the measure of either Legislature should be brought into operation. I have already discussed this question with as much care as I was capable of giving the subject, when the Bill of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) was before the House. I have no doubt in my own mind as to where jurisdiction over the subject belongs. The question raised by the hon. member for South Oxford is whether this Legislature might not deal with those features of the question relating to the grossly brutal conduct of parties employing minors—conduct of a criminal character. Of course, it is not easy to draw the line where police regulation ends and where ordinary criminal regulation begins. The 15th sub-section of section 92 of the British North America Act provides:

“The imposition of punishment by fine, penalty, or imprisonment for enforcing any law of the Province made in relation to any matter coming within any of the classes of subjects enumerated in this section.”

So that while the subject of criminal legislation belongs generally to the Parliament of Canada, it is perfectly clear that there are special subjects of criminal legislation which necessarily fall within the jurisdiction of the Province. For instance, with regard to the preparation of the voters' lists, the mode of conducting elections, the destruction of poll-books, misconduct during an election, unless the Local Legislature had power to make these things offences, and to say what punishment should follow them, its ability to carry on the Government of the Province might be rendered impossible. The question whether this 15th sub-section, con-

ferring power on the Local Legislature to attach such punishment as it deems necessary to the violation of the law, places factory regulations wholly within the jurisdiction of the Province, is an important consideration. For instance, whether a child shall attain its majority at 21 or at 15, it is for the Local Legislature to say; what shall be the control of the parent over the child, it is for the Local Legislature to say; whether the parent may hire out the child, and abandon to some extent his control over the child and confer it on some other party, it is for the Local Legislature to say. The question the hon. member for South Oxford raises is this: Can this Government intervene and declare that to be a criminal act which a Local Legislature might declare to be a civil right? Now, I am not going to discuss this subject; but it is perfectly clear that if those parties were to flog those children inordinately, they might be punished criminally as the parents might be punished criminally. If, however, they were to put the children in an unhealthy locality, it is a question whether that is not a police regulation. To compel a child to work inordinately long hours, may, in some cases no doubt, be made a criminal act; but there are cases in which that would seem to be a violation of police regulations; and while it seems to me well that the subject should be considered by the Minister of Justice, it is equally important that it should receive the careful consideration of the Governments of the respective Provinces. Surely, a matter of this sort, in which the civil right of a party is to some extent concerned, it is of the very first importance that it should be considered by the Provincial Governments.

Mr. CASEY. I am very glad to see the hon. First Minister so jealous about provincial rights, and so careful not to take a step which might infringe them. I remember that, when matters of less importance than the life and health of children were at stake, after hearing arguments as to the constitutionality of the measure he proposed to pass—the Dominion License Act—he said he was prepared to let it go and take the chances of its constitutionality. He has either learned a lesson about taking chances on the constitutionality of a measure, or else he is not so eager to protect the children as he was to do something for the harassed licensees of Ontario. But, coming to the question of constitutionality, I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell that there are grave doubts as to which body should pass a general factory Act, and I am quite with him also that when a Province has passed a factory Act which has been held to be within its jurisdiction, the enforcement of it belongs to the Local Legislature; but I cannot go with him in saying that it is impossible for this House to declare that the act of killing children by compelling them to perform inordinate labor, or the act of assaulting and flogging half-grown up girls, cannot be declared to be a criminal act by this House. If we cannot declare such acts as those to be criminal, we cannot declare any offence against the person criminal; and I think we can declare any offence against the person to be criminal, whether it is committed inside or outside of a factory. This House should declare it to be a criminal act to assault any woman or child for the purpose of compelling them to perform labor; that is slavery, and I think this House would be quite safe in taking such action.

Mr. THOMPSON. What the hon. member for Bothwell has said about the Ontario Factory Act is substantially correct; but I think he is mistaken in stating that there was any arrangement on the part of my predecessor to submit a case.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was retained myself.

Mr. THOMPSON. No doubt the Attorney General of Ontario retained the hon. gentleman for a case, but the proposal came from Ontario after I entered upon the office of Minister of Justice. I must say, as regards the general

tenor of that Act, and its provisions as a whole, that I thought it was clearly within the provincial powers, and for that reason I declined to enter into a controversy with the Attorney General upon the subject. There can be no doubt that the offences which have excited public indignation, in connection with the employment and treatment of children in the city of Montreal, are offences which we may punish in the exercise of our jurisdiction over the criminal law. We do not need to rush through a statute to-night or to-morrow on that subject, because these offences are punishable both by common law and by the existing statute on the subject; but the reasons they exist are given by the hon. member for South Oxford—the connivance of guardians, the want of a prosecutor, the want of evidence. The real cure for evils of this kind lies in practical inspection, in regulation of the hours of labor, the regulation of the ages at which persons shall be employed to work, and the regulation of the various methods that would be used for protection of laborers. These are matters connected with police regulations and appear to me to devolve on the Provincial Legislature.

Mr. CASEY. Before we pass this item, I would remind the hon. the Finance Minister that he promised that the right hon. the First Minister would, when he came in, give us particulars of that \$100,000 of police item.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. One considerable portion of that item was caused by the necessity of sending a detachment to British Columbia. The Government here were solemnly warned by the Government of British Columbia that we were on the eve of an Indian war. That great discontent had arisen among the Indians there in consequence of the land laws of British Columbia, and the sales by the British Columbia Government of lands that the Indians claimed belonged to them from time immemorial. It was a very dangerous crisis, and the Government could only, of course, take one step; that was to send at once a force there last year. Huts had to be put up for this force which was upwards of seven hundred men. These men have been there ever since. That caused an expenditure up to the present time of about \$30,000, and the force will be withdrawn during this summer, as soon as the roads will permit. However, there was strong remonstrance from the inhabitants of that part of that country against the withdrawal of the whole of that force. According to law, strictly, the Province should have reimbursed the Dominion treasury for this expenditure. They decline, however, to do so, but the Government came to the conclusion that in such a grave crisis it would not do to haggle, and we sent in a force with the intention of presenting our account to the British Columbia Government. They have refused to acknowledge that account.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did they admit the danger?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was they who informed us that there was great discontent among the Indians, but we had no idea it would amount to anything like the danger of war. We had, however, repeated official communications, most of them by wire, from the British Columbia Government that they considered the danger was imminent, and that a force must go out at once. A force was sent out to Kootenay to subdue the freebooter's hands. The danger was that the Indians were close to the frontier, and the evidence was strong that those Indians were in communication with, and expected strong support, not only from American Indians over the border but from the half-breeds and the refuse that infest the frontier in that wilderness. Then, the balance of the supplementary estimate is for services connected with the rapid movement of the detachment from place to place in the early part of the year, particularly in the south-western portion of the territory, in consequence of the unsettled state of the Indians,

The House will remember the reports that appeared in all the newspapers of risings, or threatened risings, among the Piegans and Bloods of the frontier, and their communication with the Indians of the same race and lineage across the line. We thought it a precautionary measure to keep a strong force along that frontier and to have it regularly patrolled, and their operations have been completely successful. Many outrages took place. Then, again, the system of raiding cattle on both sides has been increased to an enormous extent, and there is now a complete system of patrol along the whole of the frontier, including southern Manitoba, all of which, in consequence of the necessity of keeping all the patrol parties supplied with food along the line, has greatly increased the expense. The force has been eminently successful, this winter and spring, in suppressing raids and apprehending people in the very act of carrying off the cattle. A great many persons have been arrested, and a great many cattle have been restored to their owners. Then, again, the House will remember that there were four murders, under atrocious circumstances, by some of these people, who have been followed up with great pertinacity and at great trouble and expense. These parties have been caught, and two of them now stand for execution. All this has caused this expense of \$100,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is difficult to tell what value to attach to these rumors. That reminds me of a little incident that transpired when I was out west last fall. At Gleichen there was some trouble among the Blackfeet, some crimes had been committed, and there was talk of an uprising. When we got there, a mounted policeman came through the train, and he spoke as if there was danger of an immediate uprising. He spoke in what I thought was an injudicious way, and seemed scarcely responsible for what he said. He said there would be one grand uprising and that would be the end of it. Listening by was a quiet looking gentleman who seemed to have listened until his patience was exhausted. Then he abruptly broke in on the policeman, and said: "What do you want to tell that gentleman a lie for; there is no trouble among the Blackfeet at all." I asked him: "Are you a Government official." He said: "Yes, I am a distributor of rations"; and he added: "The Indians were never more peaceable than they are to-day, although, to judge by the report of that policeman, you would imagine they were in a complete state of insubordination." I give this instance as an illustration of the difficulty of knowing what reliance to place on these reports.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This raises a very important question, and I am not going to detain the committee, at the lag end of the Session, by discussing it. But if I understood the First Minister rightly, he holds that each Province is responsible for maintaining the peace, and that if the Government is obliged to send a police force to the assistance of a Province, it must be at the expense of the Province.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That probably is my opinion, but it is not on that point that this charge has been made. In the North-West Mounted Police Act, it is provided that the North-West Mounted Police shall be employed in the North-West, but there is a clause which provides that the general Government may afford the assistance of the police to any Province upon requisition, and upon the Province agreeing to pay the expenses of the force sent. If you do so, it is upon the Province agreeing to pay the expense of the operation when they send in their requisition. In this case, they sent the requisition, but they did not say they would pay the expense. If it was an ordinary case of apprehended riot, of course the Government would not have sent the police, but there was the statement of the British Columbia Government that there was danger of an Indian rising, and we felt that we could not refuse to send the police, trusting to adjust the account afterwards with the Province.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The provision to which the hon. gentleman refers is, as he will see, an evidence that it is the duty of the Province to maintain peace, otherwise it would not be with any propriety that the police could act. The same thing, of course, would occur in regard to the ordinary militia. I suppose, however, that the British Columbia Government assumed that an Indian rising is different from any other, and that, the Indians being placed under the charge of this Government, they are responsible for preserving peace among the Indian population.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the contention.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That was the supposition, though I have not seen the papers. I think that is a contention which we ought not to assent to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with you.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) Although the Indians and the lands reserved for them are under the control of the Government, I think that is to be interpreted in connection with the action which has been taken in regard to those people elsewhere. Many of them have gone out and mingled with the white population, have adopted the habits of civilised people and have become responsible for their duties. So far as they have done so, and have mingled with the rest of the population You have not attempted to follow them with any distinct legislation, and, if we confine our pretensions within reasonable limits as to what control we have in regard to Indians, there is no reason why the Indians should not be dealt with, in cases of this kind, in the same way as any other rioters, and no reason why the Local Government should not be responsible in regard to them as well as in regard to others.

Mr. CHISHOLM. I happen to know something of these Indians, and I may say that, probably, if they did rise, our Indians were not so much to be dreaded as those on the other side of the line. If the Government sent the Mounted Police over there, it was not so much to protect the people from the Indians residing in British Columbia as from the Indians on the other side. I think it would be very unfair for the people of British Columbia to be compelled to pay for their protection against foreign Indians, and I think it was the duty of the Government here to send the police to Kootenay to protect the people against those Indians who might come over to engage in this Indian war. When I was living at Kootenay, there were about 5,000 Indians of the Spokane, the Nez Percés and the Tobacco Plains, who went across to fight the Blackfeet. They are all related to the Indians of Kootenay. Even if it was incumbent on the people of British Columbia to pay for all the raids made by our own Indians, I do not think it would be right for the Government to make them pay for a war that would be made on these Indians by a foreign class of Indians.

Washington Fishery Commission (Governor General's warrant)..... \$18,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume the hon. gentlemen have no further information to give us as to the state of things at Washington?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I regret to say it is still in doubt what the action there will be. I am, however, still hopeful, although the majority of the Committee of the Senate to whom this matter was referred reported adversely, that having been accompanied by a very strong report indeed from the minority, who stood four to five, urging by every possible means on the Senate the desirability of the adoption of the Treaty; but it is still in doubt whether it will be rejected or will be laid over until after the presidential election.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The First Minister promised that, before prorogation, he would let us know what policy

the Government have decided upon in relation to that treaty, and I hope he will not forget it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is aware that the Bill which has been passed authorises the Government for two years, or until the treaty is rejected by the Senate, or until it is otherwise decided by the Governor in Council, to issue licenses under the *modus vivendi*. Practically the same Act has been passed in Newfoundland. If the treaty is rejected then it is in the discretion of the Governor General in Council to terminate that system, but it requires a proclamation to do it, and, in the absence of that, the system of licenses can be continued for two years under the existing legislation, notwithstanding the rejection of the treaty by the United States. A number of licenses have been already applied for by American fishermen, and it is hoped that, by pursuing that policy, matters will proceed without irritation. The policy of the Government is, while vigilantly protecting our fishing grounds from incursions by American fishermen, to avoid by every possible means in their power any irritation. They will carefully protect our fishing grounds from invasion or molestation by fishermen who may have no right under that *modus vivendi* or under the treaty to come in there, but they hope to avoid any possible cause of irritation with our neighbors.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understand the position in which the Treaty places us for the present, at least, but my object was to ascertain, if possible, whether the Government, in the event of the rejection of the treaty by the Senate, would still act under the *modus vivendi*, and permit licenses to be taken out, or whether they would issue the proclamation and restore matters to the position they were in before the fishery negotiation commenced. That is the point upon which I thought probably the Government must have consulted, and it is important to know whether they have arrived at any conclusion on this subject.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that matter remains an open question, and even if a conclusion had been arrived at, I think it would be premature to announce it. It will be a question to be taken into careful consideration by the Government when such a contingency arrives, in connection with all the attendant circumstances.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand the Minister to say that even if the treaty is rejected, the Government here have power to suspend the *modus vivendi*?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. By proclamation.

Mr. MITCHELL. You think it would be wise not to express any opinion as to the course you may pursue, and I agree with you about that; but I was a little in doubt as to whether you had the power.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes, express power.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to know you have. I think in relation to the treatment of this question, we ought to deal most liberally with the American people. We know that the merits of the case will not determine whether the treaty will be accepted or rejected. The general impression prevalent, not alone in the United States but in Canada, is that the United States, in accepting or rejecting this treaty, will be more influenced by political considerations than by the merits of the treaty; therefore, I will suggest to the hon. gentleman that, even if the treaty is rejected, a liberal treatment should be extended to the Americans so as to give them time to let their political excitement cool down in order that they may resume a calm consideration of the question before any action is taken by our Government which might have a tendency to excite them, and perhaps precipitate them into a hostile attitude, which otherwise might be avoided. I have no hesitation, myself, as to what the result of that treaty will be.

That it will not be accepted now, I consider as certain; that it may not be rejected is possible. My impression is that it will very likely be rejected. But I think that after the election is over, after the excitement which will prevail during those elections, has subsided, I believe the calm, sober second-thought of the American people will lead them to see that they have got a treaty that, perhaps, they may never have an opportunity of getting again, that they have got advantages under that treaty which they would be very foolish, indeed, to reject, or to preclude themselves from taking advantage of. Therefore, I think that most liberal treatment should be extended to the American people in the protection of our fisheries during the next season. The utmost care should be used in the selection of men, and strict instructions should be given to them not to do what has been done, in the year before last, particularly, when it was made an object for the commanders of these crews to capture vessels. The object should be to avoid anything like that, and while maintaining the rights of Canada, to give the greatest latitude and extend the utmost courtesy and consideration possible to the American fishermen, while, of course, maintaining and asserting our own rights in the premises. That is the course, I think, which ought to be pursued, and I trust the Government will view it in that light, and endeavor so to conduct the affair as will lead to friendly results.

To pay C. E. Rouleau for 25 copies of *Débats du Conseil Législatif, Quebec*..... \$75

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it ought to be certified to that some member of the Government has read these debates. I will not object to the vote, if any member of the Government will read these debates and tell us what they are about.

To meet expenditure in connection with consolidation and preparation of Orders in Council..... \$8,300

Mr. THOMPSON. That is for the preparation of the 4th volume connected with the consolidation of the statutes. The other three volumes are distributed, this one is in the press, and it contains a compilation of the Orders in Council which have the force of law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When this passes through the press, it is to be submitted to this House as the other was?

Mr. THOMPSON. These are purely Orders in Council that have been consolidated, rearranged, and repassed by the Governor General in Council, and they have already the force of law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would observe that in the consolidation of the statutes, some very considerable differences were made in the existing laws that were passed upon by this House. What the hon. gentleman, as I understand, proposes to do, is, by one comprehensive Order in Council, to validate this whole consolidation.

Mr. THOMPSON. One Order in Council for each department.

Amount required for lithographing Statistical Diagrams..... \$3,110

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have a volume in my hand which, I suppose, is the subject of this vote. Many of these diagrams, I think, are useful and convenient things to have; but I notice that in drawing these some little matters have been slipped in which, I think, are not quite correct. For instance, I notice under the head of total exports of Canada in the year 1874, and for four or five years thereafter, they are marked "revenue tariff," and then "protective tariff." Now, as a matter of fact, the hon. gentleman knows quite well that from the year 1868

to 1874, or indeed to the year 1879, for the matter of that tariff, it was quite as much a revenue tariff as it was after 1874, because any alterations that were made rendered it perhaps a little more protective.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is not that marked revenue tariff?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, it is not. All the years prior to 1874 are left blank; and it is so marked as to appear that from 1875 to 1878 some of which years as hon. gentlemen know, were years of serious depression all over the world, a certain state of things resulting. Had the table been marked for 1878 revenue tariff it would have shown a correct representation; but this certainly conveys a very deceptive meaning to outsiders who are not familiarly acquainted with our fiscal legislation. They would suppose that the first half of the dozen years was under something different from a revenue tariff. That is one point to which I wish to draw the hon. gentleman's attention. The table should have been amended, and as I do not suppose any other edition will be published, it should at all events be noted. I notice another, and a rather more serious matter. On page 23 there is a statement of the quantity of grain of all kinds entered for home consumption. That is made in such a fashion that, although it is technically correct as to our trade and navigation, it is very seriously misleading. The Finance Minister knows very well that in the years 1873-4-5-6-7-8 immense quantities of grain were entered nominally for home consumption, but which were really *in transitu* and were afterwards exported. The hon. gentleman is aware of the fact that a very small portion of that quantity, perhaps not one-third or one-fourth, really went into home consumption. After that date, those grains, being subjected to taxation, could not be entered for home consumption. So that table, not only not represents the things correctly but is entirely misleading. It should really be struck out. The same remark applies to page 24 where Canadian imports of articles of food for home consumption are also mentioned. An immense proportion of those were simply articles which passed through *in transitu*. These two pages are entirely incorrect in reality, although they may be correctly taken from our Trade and Navigation Returns. In the matter of business failures, I find that the same little device of making the revenue tariff commence at 1874-75 is repeated, and the years previous to that are left blank. That is not quite as it should be, and is misleading. Looking at the book casually I notice these errors, and two of them are errors of a rather serious character, although on the whole I believe the book will be found to be fairly accurate. The sum to be voted is a rather large one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I dare say there are some grounds for the criticism the hon. gentleman has offered, and although usually works of that kind which are prepared by a Government employé, are not credited to them, I felt it necessary in my remarks in my financial statement, to give Mr. George Johnson, the statistician who prepared these figures, the entire credit for the work. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite will accept my statement that there was not the slightest consultation with the Government, so far as I am aware, or with any member of it, or any suggestion offered, in regard to the compilation of these statistics. I think a point has been raised by the hon. gentleman which shows that although these statistics are not as perfect as they might be, this is a very graphic mode of presenting to the eye and making an impression on the mind stronger than the mere reading of figures, and it is really an improvement to have such a system for the purpose of impressing statistics upon the memory and making them more attractive to persons interested in the statistics of the country as is done by means of diagrams as well as by figures. I have no doubt that Mr.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

Johnson, who is the statistician, and who is alone responsible for the form in which these statistics are presented, will see the criticism of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and measures will be taken to remedy any possible cause of complaint in that direction.

Mr. MITCHELL. This document, for which we are paying \$3,000, may be very useful or it may not. My own impression is that a document emanating from a gentleman who was employed to get up campaign literature for the present Government during the last general election, is not a person from whom the general public will accept the statistics which are printed in this book.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At that period Mr. Johnson was not an employé of the Government. It was at a subsequent period that he was employed by the Government and engaged on this work. At that time he was entirely free to use his talents and abilities in any such way as he chose to employ them.

Mr. MITCHELL. We know that he did very good service from a party standpoint at the last general election, and no doubt Mr. Johnson has become an employé of the Government since. Of course, he got his reward from the party by being appointed to a lucrative position. I entirely disapprove of public money being spent in this way. The book may be valuable or not—I cannot see any great value in it—it is so much money thrown away. It may be that the Government may have taken this way of rewarding Mr. Johnson for services to the party at the last general election. If they have done so from a party standpoint, I have nothing more to say, because public money is spent in a great variety of ways in promoting party interest and advancing the interest of friends who support the Government. With that I do not propose to find fault, if the public are satisfied to allow things to run on in that way; but to spend \$3,000 in this way is a waste of money, because no one will look at the book after he has received it but will throw it on one side. That is my idea of the value of Mr. Johnson's book.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will find that, in the returns given on page 23 and 24, Mr. Johnson has given credit for the quantities of grain brought in for export. I see on looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns for that time, although the tables were not so clear as they are at the present time, there is a line for the articles imported, and also for the quantity entered for home consumption. I remember in conversing with Mr. Johnson on this question, when I was investigating the point which the hon. gentleman has raised as to the quantity of breadstuffs entered for consumption during a certain period as compared with another period, we took the particular quantities so entered and then deducted those which were exported. I am inclined to think that in that paper the hon. gentleman will find on investigation that this has been done, although I do not speak positively.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, the reason is obvious. During the other years those grains came in free, and it was a matter of perfect indifference to the party bringing them in whether they were called imported for home consumption or imported, so to speak, in bond or *in transitu* to pass through the country. That is the reason why these figures are misleading. The hon. gentleman will see that there were 10,000,000 bushels imported in 1874-75. That sank to 3,000,000 bushels in 1877-78. The hon. gentleman knows that was not the case, and that we did not consume the 10,000,000 in 1874-75. We exported a very large quantity of American grain, as will be seen by reference to the trade and navigation tables for those years, but we did not give ourselves credit for bringing them in for that purpose. It was, I admit, a natural mistake to

make. I do not say Mr. Johnson has not quoted correctly from the Trade and Navigation Returns—he has done so; I do not wish to say he has garbled the official documents, for he has not. He has taken the official documents, but, from the circumstances to which I have alluded, the official documents do not correctly represent the state of trade. We are alleged to have imported \$32,000,000 in 1873 and 1874, which is alleged to have sunk to \$13,000,000 in 1877-78; that may be technically correct, but is not really correct. We did not consume those. We simply passed a large quantity of this through the country and exported it.

Mr. BOWELL. That is quite true.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I quite agree with the opinion expressed by my friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I really do not see the value of those statistics to the members of this House, or to the public generally. It seems to me that any person desirous of availing themselves of the statistics of the country has the public records before him, on which he can rely with much more confidence than on any statistics prepared by Mr. Johnson. Undoubtedly members of this House will receive with a good deal of caution any statements made by Mr. Johnson, because he is pretty well known to be employed a good portion of the time in getting up statistics for speeches of members on that side of the House. During the Session I happened to hear frequently, that Mr. Johnson was preparing statistics for the hon. member for Cape Breton, and that he gave him all the statistical information which the hon. gentleman subsequently delivered to this House. Doubtless he also prepared statistics for other gentlemen on that side. We are given to understand that he was the celebrated author of the celebrated mode by which the Finance Minister reduced the national debt with such happy facility.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I take the opportunity of saying to the hon. gentleman, that I never exchanged a word with Mr. Johnson on the subject, and I am not aware that he gave it one moment's consideration.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then the hon. gentleman did not keep his secret, because three or four days before the hon. gentleman delivered his speech I heard it announced about the lobbies that he was going to show that our national debt was only \$50,000,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that I did not keep my secret well, or that Mr. Johnson did not keep it? Does he accept my word when I say that directly or indirectly I had no communication with Mr. Johnson in any shape?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I mean to say the hon. gentleman did not keep his own secret.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What does the hon. gentleman mean any way?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I knew three or four days before, that the hon. gentleman was going to deliver that statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I went across the House and told the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that I was going to deal with the subject. I did not propose to keep it a secret in any way. I was anxious that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) should be present, and I told him; there was no necessity for any secret.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Taking into consideration the assistance Mr. Johnston has given to members on that side

of the House it was not an unnatural supposition that he had communication with the Finance Minister in that direction. I merely wish to say that I regard this as perfectly useless, and I do not think that any statements coming from Mr. Johnston would be received with a great deal of confidence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend behind me called my attention to the matter we had been discussing. I do not want to make a misstatement, but I will explain how the error probably has arisen. If he will look to the Trade and Navigation Returns he will see that in 1873 the imports were \$128,000,000, and of those there were entered for consumption \$127,500,000, only leaving half a million, which escaped being entered for consumption. Notwithstanding this, in that identical year we find from another part of the returns that we imported \$9,500,000 of foreign goods and in the next year \$10,500,000. It is clear to demonstration that that which was nominally entered for consumption, was really goods passing in transit.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask the question why the table of exports from Canada is taken from the United States accounts, and the imports from the British North America accounts. Why not take our own trade returns for those matters?

Mr. BOWELL. On consulting with the American returns you will find that the exports from that country to Canada are much larger than our imports show. They have a better system of checking their exports than for checking imports, and for this reason, I will give you as an illustration. If you look at the item of pork, you will find from the American returns that some 34,000,000 pounds were exported to Canada, while in fact we have entered as imports from the United States only about 10,000,000 pounds. The way that occurs is this: They export pork in cars from Chicago *via* Sarnia and Montreal and thence to Europe, and the export entry is made in Chicago for Canada. The cars arrive at the border, and our officer simply sees that the seal is intact. They then pass on to Montreal, where the seal is broken and the pork is at once put on board a vessel and sent across the ocean or to its destination. No entry is made of that in our Trade and Navigation Returns for the simple reason that we do not know the exact quantity of pork each car contains, nor is it any particular interest to us to know. I have sent circulars to the inspectors to see if it were possible to adopt some plan by which we could show in the next Trade and Navigation Returns the exact amount of the transit trade through the country. I find that that is almost impracticable, unless we examine every car that comes into the country to see what it contains and the quantity and then enter it. I know they have a system in the United States by which they endeavor, as far as possible, to arrive at those facts, but you will see that after all they are mere guess work.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My observation extended more in the other direction; just in the reverse of the question. Taking the other side, I saw that they were nearly correct, and that is the table used here, of our exports to the United States, taken from the United States returns, not their exports to us. The Minister has pointed out that there is a discrepancy between their export entry and our import entry. Of course I have not had time to examine it, and we have to accept it subject to examination.

Further amount for the clothing and maintenance of patients from the District of Keewatin in the Manitoba Asylum for the Insane.....\$3,500

Mr. MITCHELL. Do we provide for the maintenance of insane people from Keewatin?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, Lunatics in the North-West are under the Dominion charge; and as there is no asylum put up by the Dominion for the North-West, lunatics are sent to the Manitoba asylum, where their board and lodging are paid for.

Further amount for works in connection with the Hot Springs Reservation near Banff.....\$8,782 64

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It seems rather unusual for the Government to take a Governor General's warrant for such an expenditure as this. I have always opposed this expenditure on public grounds. I do not think we have any right to establish and maintain a park at Banff, for the benefit of that section or the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If they want to attract people over their line, let them spend money themselves.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As regards the advantages of the Banff Park, I might leave that to the hon. member for South Perth.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). He is not sound.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. According to the memorandum I have on this vote, on the 1st of July last the whole sum available for the purpose of the Rocky Mountain park was \$30,829. It was intended to have caused this amount to be so expended that there would be \$4,000 or \$5,000 on hand with which to put the roads in good repair during the coming spring; but the late Minister (Mr. White) having personally visited the park and consulted with the superintendent, came to the conclusion that it would be in the public interest to push at once the construction of a road 8 miles in length to the Devil's Head Lake, one of the most attractive features of the park, and also considered it expedient to construct a tank and pipes for the purpose of distributing the water of the hot springs to the hotels and bath houses without further loss of time. The water is supplied to them at a rental.

Mr. MITCHELL. Did you drink any of it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it pleasant?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not particularly; I don't hanker after it. It is confidently believed that there will be a very large pecuniary return for all this expenditure. It is proposed to give a certain number of leases to parties who want to build villas, and who will build them in accordance with the views of the superintendent, so that there will be no buildings put up to disfigure the park: There will be a handsome ground rent charged for them. At the village of Banff there is a continual demand for lots, and \$4,000 and upwards have been received for lots sold within the last few months.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What further expenditure is contemplated there, or is this a final expenditure?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that substantially this sum will complete the park. Of course annual improvements will be suggested to beautify the grounds.

Mr. MITCHELL. What extent of area is included in the park?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 20,000 acres.

Mr. MITCHELL. I suppose the hon. gentleman proposes to cultivate all the wild animals, such as cinnamon bears, rocky mountain goats, &c., in that park?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will have to come to Parliament for a special vote for that.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Further amount required to provide for the expenses in connection with the Commission for the settlement of the Half-breed claims in the North-West Territories..... \$5,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to amend that by adding the words: "including \$500 to N. O. Coté for service as commissioner. As the nature of the work of the Half-breed Commission was very involved, it was impossible to estimate the amount that would be required under this head. The work was more severe than was anticipated, and it was found necessary for the commission to visit a number of places which had not been taken into account. This vote is asked to meet the additional expense, including the \$500 to be paid to Mr. Coté, who rendered valuable services as a colleague of Mr. Goulet.

To pay A. J. McKenzie, surveyor in Her Majesty's Customs at Hamilton, an allowance in addition to his salary, for services as Acting Collector, from 1st November, 1884, to 1st February, 1887..... \$1,237 50

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is this the gentleman who discharged the duties during two or three years?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. It is the difference between his own salary and that of the collector. He discharged the duties in an eminently satisfactory manner.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why then has he been reduced?

Mr. BOWELL. He has not been reduced. He was always a surveyor. During the vacancy that existed, he was asked to assume the duties of a collector until a new collector was appointed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It would have been only fair to keep him in that position, when he discharged the duties so satisfactorily during two years and a half, and not appoint another.

Mr. BOWELL. That is another question.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. McKenzie was a very efficient officer, and I did what I could to get him not only what has been allowed but double that amount. I found it very hard to get all I wanted from my hon. friend for Mr. McKenzie, but he would not give any more, and I am thankful to get this for him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am delighted to hear this testimony on the part of the hon. member, but I am not delighted to hear that a gentleman who filled the post so efficiently has had to make way for an outsider. I should have expected that the hon. member for Hamilton would have used his influence to prevent this. Can it be possible that the hon. gentleman wanted to get a dangerous rival out of the way? It looks suspicious.

Mr. BROWN. I had no such desire, and I am glad to be able to do justice to the gentleman whose name is under discussion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Still the fact remains that an officer who, according to the Minister of Customs and the hon. member for Hamilton, discharged the duties of collector for two and a half years in the most satisfactory manner, should, in spite of that, have to give up the place he so worthily filled to a gentleman who, I may say, is wholly unacquainted with business, for I believe he is a legal gentleman. This may not only have been doing an injustice to him, but also have been the cause of serious loss possibly to my esteemed friend from Hamilton, for, as a result of the appointment of that outsider, it was necessary to find another representative for the city of Hamilton, and to compel my hon. friend to absent himself on business and attend to parliamentary business for three months when he should have been at home. It would have been better had the Minister of Customs overlooked the fact that Mr. McKenzie was of a

different stripe of politics and have allowed him to remain permanently in the position he so satisfactorily filled.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is to be regretted that this officer to whom the hon. gentleman proposes to give an addition to his salary, to which he was entitled morally, at all events, if not legally, was not allowed to retain the position he filled so efficiently during two years and a half. Every one who knows Mr. McKenzie, knows that he is thoroughly acquainted with mercantile affairs, and that there is not, perhaps, an officer in the customs service to-day better qualified to discharge the duties of customs collector. He was for many years a merchant, and is certainly acquainted with the duties appertaining to the office of collector. Now, the hon. gentleman has taken a lawyer and appointed him over Mr. McKenzie's head. As far as we can judge, there was no reason for appointing the present collector of customs, except to make way for the hon. member for Hamilton. That seems to have been the only reason for the appointment. There are many appointments which are open to lawyers which are not open to non-professional men, and for one who was thoroughly conversant with the trade of the country, and so well qualified to discharge the duties of collector of customs as Mr. McKenzie, who was actually engaged by the Government to perform those duties for two and a quarter years, to be removed in that way was a most ungracious act. There was no reason for it unless it was that he belonged to a different political party from that of the Minister of Customs. The hon. Minister of Customs says he discharged those duties for two and a quarter years. Why was he allowed to continue in that position for that time? If he was competent during that time he was able to discharge those duties for two and a quarter years more, and for twice two and a quarter years. Why did the Minister keep that open so long? Was it because he had promised the appointment to an hon. gentleman who was then on the floor of this House? In what position did that member stand to the Government at that time? Was he competent to give an independent vote? No; during that time he was a mere instrument of the Government. From the time the Minister held out the expectation that he would be appointed to that office, he was not an independent member of this House, and was disqualified from the proper discharge of his duties. In fact, if the promise was made to him, and he knew he was to occupy that office, he was legally disqualified.

Mr. BROWN. He is the best collector we ever had.

Excise—To pay Peter Kastner duty on malt used in the manufacture of beer, destroyed by fire, 24th August, 1881, authorised by Order in Council, 20th September, 1887.....\$210 44

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know why, if this was a lawful and proper debt, six years have been allowed to elapse since the destruction of this malt without the amount having been paid?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My hon. friend should remember that when the Government get money into their hands, it generally takes several years to get it out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend no doubt speaks from experience, but that is not quite a satisfactory answer in Committee of Supply. There is a very serious objection to bringing up these old claims. If this claim is just, it ought to have been settled in a much shorter time than six years, and I think some explanation is due to the committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If any of Her Majesty's subjects have a claim against the Government, when they present it it has to be considered on its merits, whether it is an old or a new claim. My hon. friend the Minister of

Inland Revenue is not here to-night, so I cannot explain this particular case, but the enquiry was gone into, and it was found to be a good claim.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In all such cases, particularly when you refer to an Order in Council, I think the Minister in charge of the Estimates should be provided with the Order in Council, because *prima facie* that is not the sort of claim which the House should look on with favor. If there is one thing more than another in which the Crown is likely to be a victim of unfair claims, it is in these cases which have occurred years ago. The sum is small, but the principle is one of considerable moment. I suppose the hon. gentleman will produce the Order in Council at some reasonable time to-morrow. We ought to see the grounds upon which it is passed. Of course I do not know the merits of the case. It may be a perfectly just claim and it may not.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the claim was only presented last year, it would be rather a serious question, but if it was presented before, it is another thing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have sent for the Order in Council.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would call attention to one peculiar feature in this. This malt was destroyed by fire on the 24th August, 1881, and the Order in Council was dated on the 20th September, 1887, so that something over six years elapsed. If this claim had been good, the party might have taken steps to collect it, but he waited until the Statute of Limitation had run, and then presented the claim when it was open to the Government to accept or reject it. It certainly looks like a job.

Mr. TROW. I live within three miles of this brewery and I am aware that, in 1881, the brewery was destroyed by fire, and there was a current rumor at the time that Mr. Kastner had lost a considerable sum. I know he is a very respectable man. He does not live in my riding, but in North Perth, but I am sure that if he puts in a claim, he is entitled to be paid. I believe it is a just claim.

Outlers' contingencies..... \$1,500

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) I wish to call the attention of the Government to certain regulations recently passed by the Department of Marine by which certain taxes are imposed upon implements used by fishermen. Under a regulation or Order in Council—I do not know which—a license fee of \$2 a year and three or five cents a yard has been imposed upon hoop-nets, nets and lines. The effect of that tax is most disastrous to a certain number of fishermen who carry on that business around Lake St. Peter, that is, to fishermen from the counties of Berthier, Maskinongé, Richelieu, St. Maurice, Yamaska, and all the counties surrounding Lake St. Peter, on both sides of the St. Lawrence. Those fishermen do not catch marketable fish. Their catch consists mostly of eels, catfish, suckers, and other fish of that description. Their operations are not extensive, and if that tax is maintained it will result in depriving a large number of families from their means of subsistence. Last year the hon. Minister of Marine imposed the same tax, but upon representations made by the members for the interested counties, the regulation was suspended. Recently, the regulation has been put in force, although its injustice had been represented to the Government. I would like to know whether that regulation is to be cancelled, and I hope the hon. members for the interested counties will join me for the purpose of protesting against that regulation and asking that it be cancelled.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have received several petitions from the fishermen who are said

to be very poor, and unable to pay the fee that is charged. The Government have considered this carefully, but before coming to a final conclusion in the matter we were obliged to come here. The moment we have leisure, the day after prorogation, we will consider the matter. We desire, as much as possible, to meet the representations that have been made with respect to the fishermen.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the object of these licenses?

Mr. FOSTER. The object of these licenses is partly statistical and partly for the purpose of raising a revenue. We charge for these licenses the same everywhere. In the district of which the hon. gentleman has spoken, we now charge these fees; but previously this part of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence Rivers had not been under fees. Last year the matter was first brought to my attention largely for this reason: that this portion of the river presented an anomaly, and parties said rightly that in other places if these fees are not paid in one portion of Canada they should not be paid in any other portion. Last year the regulation was put in force, but owing to representations that the fish were not taken for commercial purposes, it was suspended. Since, the investigation has shown that these fish are taken for commercial purpose, and are caught and sold in large quantities. The fee is very small. 25 cts. are charged for 100 hooks, 2 or 3 cents per fathom for nets, and \$2 for hoop nets, the same charge as is made for hoop nets catching the same quality of fish in other parts of Canada. The fees were placed at \$2 for the hoop net. As I have said, representations were made to me, and as a compromise, I have reduced the fee one-half, making it \$1 for the hoop net. I believe it has been stated that it will cost these fishermen a large sum of money, because the nets were old and worn out and have to be replaced with others. Now, it is not the design to charge \$1 for every hoop net that is used to replace another. The fee is \$1 for fishing with a hoop net the whole season. If one hoop net wears out and is replaced by another, it is not at all the intention, or the practice of the department, to charge another dollar. However, as has been said by the First Minister, since this regulation has been in force, representations have been made, and they are now being considered, and the Government will, no doubt, do what is fair and right in the premises.

Mr. LAURIER. I think my hon. friend the Minister is altogether wrong. There should be no revenue at all from such a source. If it be for statistical purposes there may be some reason in it.

Mr. LABELLE. The result will be that these poor people will be taxed twice. In our Province the fishermen are differently situated from what they are in Ontario. In Ontario they have good fish, and fishermen can sell their catch by the dozen; whereas with us, they have to sell them by the cartload in order to raise a little money to buy pork and molasses for their families, who, in many cases, are next to starvation.

Mr. LAURIER. Can the hon. gentleman give an explanation as to the increase in this item of \$1,500 for cullers' contingencies? The revenue is largely decreasing from that source.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In the absence of the Minister we are not able to give information on that point. I will go to the department in the morning and make enquiries.

Railways and Canals, repairs and working expenses..... \$492,525

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman explain that item?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that \$2,600,000 were voted, and it was found necessary to obtain this additional amount of \$477,000, making a total of \$3,177,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

in order to work the traffic. That large increase was caused to a very considerable extent by a very sudden influx of ocean traffic, which was thrown upon the road unexpectedly, and which one year ago, when the estimate was taken, we had no reason to suppose would take place.

Civil Government, Department of Secretary of State..... \$2,725

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Please explain the payment of \$400 to C. A. Cattelier.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Cattelier is one of the oldest and most deserving officers in the Civil Service. He has the position of a Deputy Minister, but has never had the rank and salary of such; he is the Deputy Registrar General. His services have been recognised on this occasion by granting him an increase of salary amounting to \$100. He has really been Deputy Minister since 1869, and has never received anything but the salary of a chief clerk.

Legislation—Franchise Act..... \$30,500

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I move that the second item, "revision of voters' list, \$15,000," be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

House of Commons..... \$2,785

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to draw the attention of the committee to the names of four Sessional clerks. From the whole information I can gather, these have not done anything during the Session. Their names are J. E. Chagnon, Ouimet, C. J. Thompson, a lawyer in the city, who has not been here and has not attended to his sessional work but has drawn his money; and M. Haldane, who has not been here and has not performed any sessional work, although he has drawn his money. The latter is the owner or editor of a paper in Hull, I believe. I think it is unfair, and I think it is the duty of the Opposition to draw the attention of the Government and of the House to this fact. It is not enough that we are called upon to pay for a large staff of sessional clerks who do not perform any work, but we have to pay a lot of hangers on who virtually do nothing but draw their pay. In those four cases, I challenge the House or the Government, or whoever has those clerks in control, to show one single piece of work that those men have done. I venture to say they have not copied 12 sheets of foolscap during the Session, and yet they have drawn their salary. I would like to know under whose charge they are? I know from my information, and I have gathered it carefully, that they have not done a single item of work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That statement cannot possibly be allowed to pass without some explanation. If four persons have been appointed sessional clerks and have drawn their pay, and did not do any work, then there is no doubt that there is a gross abuse if it be the case. Of course my friend would not make such a statement unless he received creditable information on the matter. I think that charge must be answered by whatever official is responsible for the sessional clerks.

Mr. SPEAKER. I can only answer my hon. friend that I am not aware that one single individual has been paid who has not done his work. No later than to-day I have asked for a special report from the clerk who was in charge of them, and the Clerk of the House, who is here, can say the same thing. I think that every one of them, so far as I am aware, has earned the money he has been paid. I am not aware that a single man has been paid here who has not worked faithfully and done his duty; at least that is the report I have. I think that those reports outside are very much exaggerated about those clerks having nothing to do. Of course they have not work at all times, but sometimes the whole of them are required for the work of the House.

An hon. MEMBER. How many are there ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot say. The number is twenty-five provided for and fixed by a resolution of this House. I am not aware the resolution has been exceeded.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt at all that if this state of things exists, it is a very gross abuse and I hold it to be the duty of any member of this House on either side, who has knowledge of a fact of that kind, that a person who is receiving pay as a sessional clerk who does not do any service, to report it. I think the members should make it known to the Clerk of the House under whom those clerks are. I am aware that the Clerk of the House has heard this for the first time. I do think it is the duty of any member of this House, if he is aware of an abuse of that kind, to bring it at once to the notice of the clerk in order that the party may be forthwith discharged from the public service.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have taken some trouble to find out whether those clerks are in attendance or not, and I hold that it is the duty of the person in charge of the sessional clerks to note their presence and if they are absent to strike them from the list. Members of the House are docked for every day they are not present, and I think sessional clerks should be treated in the same way. I have taken trouble to make enquiries and not one of those clerks have been there when I made the enquiry. I understand that it is not the duty of the man in charge to report their absence, and that all he has to do is to see that they are on the pay list.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to hear from the Speaker that he has asked for the list of those clerks and the amount of pay they receive, and I trust that he will also ask for a return of the number of days each was present. I take exception to the statement of the Minister of Finance that it is incumbent upon members of this House to make complaints of this kind. I think it is the duty of those who have the control of officers of this House to see that they are present, and that he should be responsible for their presence. The members are not here to look after the officers of this House; that should be done by the committee, of which I believe the Speaker is chairman. I do not consider that members of this House have anything to do with the matter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that the English practice should prevail, which is that the appointment of extra sessional clerks should rest with the Clerk of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. So it is here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says so it is here. I should like to know whether the Clerk of the House is responsible for those sessional clerks or not, and I should like to know whether he has assumed the responsibility of asking the Government for the appointment of a large number of those clerks. One of those who my hon. friend has named is a student in a lawyer's office in this city, and is engaged the whole season. He has not been here, and yet that clerk is drawing his pay regularly. I would like to know whether a party who is connected with the editorial staff of a paper on the other side of the river, has been here or not? And I would like to know whether his appointment is not due to the fact that he has done political services elsewhere, and not because his services were required in this House? The whole difficulty has grown up on account of the interference with the clerk in the proper discharge of his duties. He is the proper officer to name the parties he requires and he ought to be held responsible, for power and responsibility should go together, but he is deprived of the power. When the officer is interfered with at every turn, when he has pressed on him

a number of inefficient men whose services he does not require, he cannot be held responsible for this large expenditure or for those inefficient appointments. We have here, as we have every year, a large number of persons appointed whose services are not required, and they are appointed not because their services are required, but they are appointed in order to compensate them for services rendered to the party led by the hon. gentleman on the other side of the Chamber. I say this is a gross abuse. If those parties have rendered the hon. gentlemen any important service, let them put their hands in their own pockets to pay them, and let them discontinue the practice of putting their hands in the pockets of the people of this country for such a purpose. That is what those gentlemen have been doing, and that is what they continue to do. At every turn we have abuses of this sort. These Estimates are filled with the names of parties who are pensioned on the public Treasury for the services they have rendered to the leaders of the Tory party. Why, Sir, an hon. gentleman named, to-day, a man who is to be appointed to look after timber at the source of a river where there is not a settlement within 500 miles, and where there is no person who could possibly cause any damage. What is that for? It is for political services, or to get him out of the way. The people of this country who are embarrassed in their circumstances, who find everywhere their burdens enormously increased, and who are obliged to curtail their expenditure in consequence of their strained circumstances, are obliged to pay this pension list. The people find their burdens increased by the hon. gentlemen opposite who in order to pay their parasites have fastened them as pensioners on the public Treasury. The condition of things is becoming intolerable, and it has not only extended to every branch of the public service, but it has found its way into this House. You can hardly move through the corridors for the number of people whom the hon. gentleman has placed here for the purpose of pensioning them. We cannot get proper ventilation in this chamber, and we are in danger of blood-poisoning, because of the impediments put in the way of fresh air coming in, in the shape of the persons who are crammed into the doorways and windows. Wherever you look you find them. The blackbirds in the corn fields are not more numerous or more dangerous to the prosperity and prospects of the people than those whom the hon. gentleman has placed on the pension list; and here, in the case of the extra sessional clerks, you find the abuse existing in its most aggravated form.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has rather widened the scope of the discussion beyond that of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who made an attack on some of the sessional clerks. With regard to the sessional clerks, the number of them was settled at 25 or 26 on a report from the previous Speaker, which was laid before Parliament, and I think approved by Parliament. The men who held the office at that time were considered as appointed merely for the Session; but it was provided that after that every sessional clerk, if he were considered a satisfactory clerk, although his duties were only for the Session, and although he was only paid for the Session, should have a right to come back here year after year if he proved to be a satisfactory clerk; so that the notion that these men are put on for political purposes I think has faded away. The number was settled by Parliament, and I think was considered on both sides as not excessive; and the proof that it is not excessive is that when Mr. Anglin was Speaker, the number was just twice what it is at this moment. It is 40 now; it was 80 in his time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman forgets that the number was 120 in his own day. Has he forgotten that there was a list brought down in 1880, containing the

names of upwards of 100, I think 118? And he knows that a number of names were struck off before the list was brought down, and put on again after the list was presented to the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. See the progress of reform. The hon. gentlemen, when in power, had 80; now we have got down to 40. I forgot to say, with respect to the three men spoken of by the hon. member for North Wellington, that there is a chief clerk in charge of all these sessional clerks, whose duty it is to see that they are at work the whole day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose they have nothing to do?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not their fault. But I believe these men are fully employed. There must be intermittent work during the Session, some days being heavy and some being light. Of course, the hon. gentleman speaks as he has been informed. I do not at all dispute that he has made enquiry, and that the information he gives is what he obtained. It is the duty of the Clerk of this House to see that the chief clerk performs his duty, and I have no doubt he has done so. The hon. gentleman says the clerk has been interfered with. I am a member of the Internal Economy Commission, and I have not heard our clerk say that he has been interfered with in any way. He has never made any such statement to me, and I do not believe he has made it to the Speaker or to any other member of the Commission.

Mr. McMULLEN. I enquired of the chief clerk of the sessional clerks whether it was his duty to see that they were in attendance, and he said it was not, but that it was his duty to see when they were there that they performed their duties. I know that these men have not been there. They always appear on pay day, that is a certainty, and they draw their pay regularly; but I warn the Speaker that if these men are paid in full for this Session, they are getting money for nothing at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think this thing might be managed on business principles. When a clerk does any copying day or night, if he made a little memorandum stating that he was engaged so many hours at that work, and what it was for, then every night it could be ascertained what amount of work was done, and who did it; and when that was compiled, it could be found whether a less number of clerks could do the work. I understand that the hon. First Minister says about the work being intermittent, being heavy one day and light another day; but it could in that way be ascertained, on the average, what work was performed. Certainly, what the hon. member for North Wellington has stated could not be allowed. He has simply done his duty, and the matter ought to be attended to.

Mr. TROW. The hon. First Minister says that if they have done nothing it is because there has been nothing for them to do. I would like to know how he accounts for so many returns which have been asked for not being brought down during the Session, if these men have nothing to do? They might have attended to that work.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It would not do to take these men from their work to send them to the different departments to make returns, which might occupy a man steadily for a fortnight or a month.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I trust, as the statement has been publicly made, that the authorities of the House will, to-morrow, inform us what the facts are. There ought to be no difficulty in ascertaining the facts in a matter of that kind, and we shall expect to know what is to be said on the subject to-morrow.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

House of Commons—To pay C. J. Coursol, Esq., M.P., absent through illness, balance of his sessional indemnity and mileage..... \$965.40

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The rule applies to a member who is ill, but in the city. This is, of course, adopting a broader rule, and it seems to me that it would be more appropriate to amend the Act in that particular, if every member who falls sick is to receive his sessional indemnity.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Coursol was here attending to his duties, but he was taken very ill, and went home to Montreal, and now lies at the point of death.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose any member was taken ill and obliged to absent himself, is it reasonable that this rule should be made of general application? I call this to your attention, simply because you put in the statute one rule, and once in a while you act differently.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would be very sorry to see the Act altered. Every case should be judged on its own merits. Mr. Coursol was here at the beginning of the Session, but he has been at the point of death almost ever since. If you were to lay down a general rule that a member who happened to get sick should have his indemnity continued, he might make a slight illness the pretext to stay home altogether. The statute is a great check and compels members to attend the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I remember calling the attention of the House some two years ago to a case parallel to Mr. Coursol's, the case of the late David Thompson, who was so ill that he was unable to attend the Session, and he never got any of his sessional indemnity. I do not object to this, but if there is a rule for this case it should be applied to others.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If Mr. Thompson's case had been called to the attention of Parliament, he would have received his indemnity.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I called the attention of the House to it at the time, and the hon. the First Minister told me the case was a good one and he would attend to it. There was not only the case of the member for Haldimand, but the case of the member for Lincoln, who was ill that Session. I also drew attention to his case and was told it would be attended to but it was not.

Senate—To pay amount of sessional indemnity to Hon. Mr. Fortin who was prevented by illness from attending Parliament \$1,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not this rather unreasonable? I can understand the case of Mr. Coursol, who attended here and was struck down by illness, but, although we all like Mr. Fortin, it seems to me that it is establishing a risky precedent to give a gentleman who cannot attend at all the full amount of his indemnity.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is not warranted by law, and that is why it is put specially here. But we all know Commodore Fortin, who, for many years, has been a member of Parliament here, and who, since he has been in the Senate, has been very ill. He is thoroughly broken down, and I am afraid he has not long to retain his seat in the Senate. I believe he is in *extremis* almost, and is now in the hospital at Montreal. I am quite sure the hon. gentleman will not object to this, and we have a precedent from the Senate in the case of Hon. Mr. Christie, who did not attend during the whole Session and whose allowance was paid.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no doubt that the rule laid down by the hon. member for Bothwell would be the best one, but I would object to having the law altered. We should have the rule as it is, and depart from it as occasion requires. In this case I think we should give the indemnity to Mr. Fortin. We know he could not attend at all,

and if he had been well enough to come to Ottawa, but would still be compelled to remain in his room, he would have been entitled to his indemnity. He could not come, and, under the circumstances, I do not see why he should not have the indemnity.

To repay the Government of Prince Edward Island the amount paid by that Province annually on account of pensions, from 1st July, 1873, and interest thereon, from dates of payment to 30th June, 1888—
 Sir Robert Hodgson, pension, \$4,029.81,
 interest, \$2,094.49..... \$6,124 36

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason of this?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Under the Union Act we are obliged to pay these pensions, and would have paid them had our attention been drawn to them by the Government of Prince Edward Island. They were overlooked, however, and were paid by that Government, which has now called on us to reimburse them.

To improve the outlet of Sunfish Creek from the Feeder to Grand River..... \$ 1,200
 Construction of a bridge across the Feeder, at the Forks Road 4,000
 Construction of dams above and below Dunnville weirs..... 13,650
 \$18,850

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I take this opportunity to reply to the question asked by the hon. member for North Ontario as to who is the lockmaster at Fenelon Falls. His name is W. MacCarthy. The construction of dams above and below the Dunnville weirs cost \$13,650. This is the approximate or the probable cost of building six dams, one above, one below, and one each on the three waste weirs, also filling out wash-outs with stones, repairing valve rods, uprights, flood gates, &c. The object in building these dams is to improve the three weirs, they being now in bad condition.

Construction of a bridge over the canal between Concessions C and D, Nepean Front..... \$7,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is for the construction of a bridge over the Rideau Canal below the railway bridge and opposite the upper part of Archville; it is the site recommended by Mr. Wise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that not an expensive bridge for the Rideau Canal, which is not a very large one?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose, probably, it is an iron bridge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far is it from the city?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A little below the Canada Atlantic bridge and near Archville. It will accommodate a large number of people and bring them in connection with the city.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What has this Parliament to do with that bridge?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is across the Rideau Canal.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the Government should only give liberty to build it, but should not build it themselves.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This is another expenditure for the benefit of the city of Ottawa of the same kind as those we took exception to the other evening. If the hon. gentleman establishes a precedent of this kind, the probability is that he will have a number of demands from all over the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been the practice to construct bridges across the canals where they were required. When you establish a canal, you cut off the communication.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That will not hold at all. It is quite indefensible to build this bridge. All that should be done is to give permission to build one there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is according to law. I think it is according to the Rideau Act. It is a very just provision, where the main road running through a county is interrupted by a public work—a canal or any other public construction—and is broken up, especially in the case of a canal. If the road is cut in two by the canal, surely the township is not obliged to build the bridge. It is right that their communication should not be interrupted, and if it is, it is quite just that the Government should pay for it. That has always been the practice, and I am quite satisfied that such a provision is in the Rideau Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are a number of bridges which, I think, have been constructed by the municipalities along the Rideau, which extends from Kingston to Ottawa. The principle laid down by the Government now will require that the Government either shall have built these bridges or shall make compensation to the municipalities for having built them; and the hon. gentleman may find that this expenditure of \$7,000 may lead to a good deal more. Unless I am mistaken, a great number of the bridges along the Rideau have been built by the municipalities at their own expense.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is on new roads.

Mr. SHANLY. This is a concession line.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that, on the old concession lines, the people have a right to these bridges.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then I am to understand that if the road existed prior to the canal and was used as a highway before the canal was built, the Government assume the responsibility of building the bridges?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then, in regard to all those roads which have come into use since that, the municipalities are to build the bridges?

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

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose the same rule would hold good on the Welland Canal?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt any road which is interrupted by a canal should be restored by the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand that, if the hon. gentleman maintains that a well established road, one which has been used as such, is interrupted by the construction of a canal, the Government might be called upon to build a bridge; but, if it was not called upon to build a bridge immediately afterwards, if the road was bridged by the municipality and the responsibility assumed by them for 25 or 30 years, it seems rather extraordinary that the Government should then assume the liability. When these canals were made, the municipalities and the canals were under the same Government. Before the Union, a canal was the same as any other channel and, unless it was understood that the work should be undertaken by the Government and not by the municipality, it does not seem reasonable that the Government should now undertake the work.

Kingston Graving Dock \$75,000

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Is that a Government work or is it let to a company?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a Government work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where do you propose to build it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is not decided. There are two locations offered, one in the city and one at Portmouth.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the member for Prince Edward county (Mr. Platt) stated that a graving dock of this kind had been required for some years, but I understood him to say that a private capitalist had commenced the construction of one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Ob, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of this expected to be?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We do not know exactly yet, because the site would have to be selected first in order to ascertain the best site for this dock, and the future cost of the dock will have to be considered at the same time, but I suppose it cannot be less than between \$250,000 and \$400,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. What size vessels is it intended to make this dock capable of taking in and docking?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The vessels that pass through the canal and come down the St. Lawrence generally come to Kingston, and a portion of them discharge their cargo there. There is no graving dock there where the cargoes are exchanged and we thought this was the best place to put it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Why Kingston? It seems to me that some other point would be better than this which is at the foot of the lakes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All the shipping interests have settled upon Kingston. The Board of Trade of Toronto, the Board of Trade of Hamilton, and various other commercial bodies have agreed that Kingston is the place for the building of this graving dock. At present, if an injury happens to any vessel she has to be taken across to the United States, and for fear of accidents in the fall, they often go to the United States direct without going to Kingston at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it absolutely necessary that the Government should undertake the cost of this work? In the United States there are docks at Oswego, Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, and these docks are all built by private companies. Why it is necessary for the Government to undertake the construction of a dock on this side, when a number are built on the other side by private companies, I am unable to understand. It strikes me that this work might be left to the shipping interests of the lakes to provide for themselves.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid they are not able to do that.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I am informed that there is a company already formed in Kingston for this purpose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I never heard of it.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I understood the member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) to say that some sixteen miles east of Picton, a dock was nearly completed, I think it was by Mr. Hepburn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A graving dock?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth.) That is his statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Quite a mistake.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). That is his statement, and that he thought, under those circumstances, it was hardly Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

fair for the Government to step in and interfere with private enterprise where they had already spent a large sum of money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no graving dock there, I can assure the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I presume the Government will take charge of it in any case, before the location is settled.

Public Buildings, Ontario..... \$17,925

Mr. CHARLTON. Improving ventilation of House of Commons, \$4,000—in what way does the Minister propose to improve the ventilation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This vote is taken in consequence of the complaints of hon. members, and of the suggestions that have been made. I am not in a position to say in what way the money will be used. We will use so much of it as will be required to improve the ventilation between this and next Session. If a plan cannot be found satisfactory to the Government, then, of course, we will not expend it; but I think there are certain improvements that we can make which will benefit the House and improve the ventilation.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sure the House will say that the money is properly used if the ventilation of the chamber is in any way improved. I ask this question because I feel a deep interest in it, and I hope that the money will be used in such a way as to secure the object for which it is voted. I fear, however, that the sum will be found insufficient to meet the changes that will be essentially necessary to secure the proper ventilation of this chamber. We shall have to adopt some different method of bringing in fresh air to secure an adequate supply. It occurred to me that, if possible, the cheapest way to obviate the difficulty that we labor under here to secure a well ventilated chamber, would be to build a new one, which would have three sides exposed to the air.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As I said the other day, I am ready to undertake a new building as soon as Parliament will give me the money. But the hon. gentleman knows that to erect a new House of Commons will require a large sum of money. We could not erect it in connection with this building without disfiguring it; but if, as I suggested the other day, we were to build it beside the Western Block, where there is a vacant space, we could there build a very good House of Commons, having ventilation and light on three sides, and with all the modern improvements. But, as I said the other day, that will cost a large sum of money; however, if Parliament is ready to undertake it, I suppose the Government will have to find the money. I do not suppose that we could build it for less than half a million.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope, at all events, the Minister of Public Works will give this matter his best attention, and will succeed in providing some remedy for the difficulty we labor under now with regard to this present Chamber. We have a difficult problem to deal with, no doubt. The situation of the Chamber is such that we cannot let the sunlight in. He may not be able to succeed as well as he might wish, but no doubt the effort might be made. However, I am sure he would have to ask for more money than is asked for here.

Public Buildings, North-West Territories..... \$155,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. North-West Mounted Police buildings, \$100,000—where are these to be built?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The chief architect has submitted a statement in which I find \$25,000 for the

Regina riding school; \$5,000 for additional barrack room; a new hospital at Regina, \$7,000; Medicine Hat, new town station and general repairs, \$2,500; Calgary, new building, \$26,878; repairs and alterations, \$10,000; Fort McLeod, general repairs, \$2,000; Fort Saskatchewan, general repairs, \$500; Edmonton, new buildings, \$10,000; Battleford, new buildings, renewals, repairs, fencing, &c., \$5,000; Prince Albert, additional buildings required to complete, fencing and new road to barracks, \$3,000. These items, along with contingencies, make up the sum we are asking for.

Mr. LAURIER. We have already voted \$27,000 in the same direction. Is there any connection between the two items?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is new. The other amount was for the year that will end in a month or two, and a large portion of it has already been expended.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Was the riding school at Regina totally destroyed, and if so what was the cause?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, and the cause was a defective flue.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I observe it is proposed to vote \$15,000 for Governor's residence at Regina. We voted \$11,000 two years ago.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is for new buildings. The present building was a portable building, but it is a very poor structure. The Governor could not pass another winter there without repairs, costing \$2,000. It would be more economical to build a new building rather than patch up the old one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The building is made of portable frames carried from Ottawa and Montreal before the railway was built, and another portable wing has been added since. It is a wretched place, and I do not see how the Governor's family live there during the winter. I have occasion to know that their sufferings from the cold in winter are very great. There were 17 stoves going continually, and the inmates could not keep themselves warm. My wife was there during a winter, and although there was a stove in the room, the water froze.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman sure that the water did not freeze when it was on the stove?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is \$15,000 the estimated cost of the new building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is about one-half the cost, the total cost being \$30,000.

Harbors and Rivers, Nova Scotia..... \$33,250

Mr. LOVITT. In what county is Beaver River?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is in the county of York.

Mr. LOVITT. I desire to call the Minister's attention to a breakwater at Green Cove. It has been there for twenty years, and is the most important breakwater in the county, but part of it has been destroyed. It affords valuable shelter for fishing vessels. I regret there is not an amount in the Supplementary Estimates to place it in proper repair.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will enquire into the matter.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The breakwater mentioned by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt) is one that was washed away, and is a very important one. It is a pity to allow it to remain in its present condition, because it will involve a heavier outlay at a very early day. I

regret the hon. gentleman has not paid attention to the representations of the hon. member for Yarmouth. It would be much more important to attend to a work of that kind, that is falling into decay, than to proceed with some of the works for which sums are now asked.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The case had escaped my memory; I will take a note of it. If there is an absolute necessity, I will try and attend to it.

Harbors and Rivers, New Brunswick..... \$27,750

Mr. MITCHELL. Where is Edgett's Landing?

Mr. FOSTER. In Albert county.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Where is Mizonette?

Mr. FOSTER. In the county of Gloucester.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Where is St. Louis?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the county of Kent. The vote is for a general landing wharf for shipping interests.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I never heard of any vessel going there, and no vessel will ever go there.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is done, I suppose, to meet the views of the Government supporters, and I recognise the principle that the Government must subsidise their supporters.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount of \$10,000, re-vote, for St. John harbor, is to place a quantity of large stones at the outer end of the works, according to the recommendation of the chief engineer, which had been carried away by heavy seas in 1886-87.

Richibucto Protection Works \$3,000

Mr. MITCHELL. What are those works for at Richibucto? It appears to me that the money is all going to Kent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is for works which the chief engineer reports to be necessary for improving the entrance of the Richibucto.

Mr. MITCHELL. I notice that all the grants are for the constituencies of members who support the Administration.

Campbellton Ballast Wharf..... \$1,500

Mr. MITCHELL. Are you going to build a \$1,500 wharf for ships to discharge their ballast cargoes?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If we do not the ballast will be thrown into the harbor, the same as it was at Dalhousie.

Mr. MITCHELL. Such a thing occurs in Quebec, but it does not occur on the north shore, for they are not allowed to throw ballast into the harbor. I notice that there are eleven votes here for New Brunswick, and not one of them are worth a cent, as far as the interests of the country are concerned. If it manages to get votes for the Government there, it is about as much as it amounts to.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what is the estimate of the cost of the work at Barrington pier?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The chief engineer says \$50,000.

Rivière Ste. Anne de la Pêrade..... \$1,000

Mr. LAURIER. What do you propose to do at River St. Anne?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to continue the channel at the mouth of the river.

Three Rivers Pier..... \$10,000

Mr. LAURIER. Where is that to be?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is a continuation of the works the Harbor Commissioners built there. We thought it should be a Government work.

Improvement of entrance channel of River
Thames, Ontario..... \$4,000

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before that vote is passed, I would like to say that this is one of the best appropriations that have been made. This work is very much needed. It was asked for by the late representative of the county of Kent, Mr. Henry Smyth; it was also asked for by myself last year; it has been pressed for by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson); and the board of trade and the town council have repeatedly urged the matter upon the attention of the Government; and I am very glad indeed that they have made this appropriation. I fear, however, that the hon. Minister is asking for too little; I think he should have made the vote about \$10,000 instead of \$4,000; but I suppose he has had his engineers investigate and report upon the work. I have a letter from the hon. Minister of Public Works, addressed to Mr. Henry Smyth, as follows:—

" OFFICE OF THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS OF CANADA.

" OTTAWA, 14th April, 1888.

" Mr DEAR MR. SMYTH,—

" I am in receipt of your letters of the 15th, 17th and 24th of March, and the 2nd and 4th inst. (the last enclosing a letter from Mr. Samuel Barfoot, President of the Chatham Navigation Company), on the subject of the improvement of the Thames River.

" I have directed my officers to place a dredge at the mouth of the river not later than the first day of May, and as speedily as possible give your county the necessary navigation, and to forward me without delay, a report upon the other improvements which you ask, particularly those spoken of in the communication forwarded by you from Mr. Knight.

" You are aware that there will be no funds available for the permanent work to be done at the mouth of the river, until the first of July next.

" Yours very truly,

" HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

" HENRY SMYTH, Esq.,
" Chatham, Ont."

It will thus be seen that the Minister promised that this work would be commenced on the 1st of May. I am sorry to say that it has not been commenced yet; and I have only this to ask of the hon. Minister—that seeing that this work is of great interest, not only to the county but to the whole surrounding country, he will at as early a date as possible, see that it is commenced. The prosperity of the town of Chatham depends on the navigation of this river. At present it is impossible to get a vessel in there drawing more than five or six feet of water. A great deal of lumber is brought in there; a large quantity of grain is shipped; large quantities of brick are also shipped from different points along the river. One gentleman told me that he had lost the sale of about a million of brick last fall because he could not get them shipped. I trust that the hon. Minister of Public Works will see that a dredge is put at work at an early day, and have the work completed. I would like to ask him how soon he expects to have a dredge begin the work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When I wrote that letter I expected that this vote would have been passed in the House before the first of May, and I would have then felt that I had the authority to go on and make some arrangements, knowing how pressing this matter was; but unfortunately delays took place, and not having the money I could not go on with the work. Now that it is voted, I will go on with the work.

Mr. LAURIER.

McGregor's Harbor, protection work \$2,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where is McGregor Harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is in North Bruce.

Bayfield Harbor—Repairs..... \$1,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the condition of Bayfield Harbor now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The engineer reports that to restore this harbor to its former state of usefulness, it would be necessary to rebuild the north pier, where the damage has taken place, to repair the upper end and make the harbor a depth sufficient for the accommodation of fishing boats. These repairs are estimated at \$5,000, and the cost of dredging, if done by the *Challenge*, at \$1,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To render the dredging of any use, you will have to expend a considerable sum on the pier.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This year we will go on with the dredging.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. From the nature of the case, if you go on with the dredging without repairing the other, the work will be undone by the first storm that sweeps in from the North-West.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The engineer states that perhaps some filling will take place, but it will still be good next year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have been there often. The last time I was there, ten feet of sand was washed in, in the course of two or three hours, by a North-West gale. I am certain that unless the clerk of the weather arranges matters to suit the engineer, and if the harbor is dredged out without the pier being repaired, the work will be undone.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will be well understood that I will make what use of this vote is best, either in dredging or anything else.

Toronto Harbor—Works at eastern entrance, the
city having contributed \$100,000. \$50,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Last year I moved for a return showing the blind bolts that were used in the construction of this work and that were washed away, and all the communications between the Minister of Public Works and the inspecting engineer in charge. That return has not been brought down. In a matter of this kind we should have all the information asked for. The hon. gentleman admitted there had been blind bolts used and that some were in his possession, and he promised to bring down a sample of them and the correspondence.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take a note of it.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman has taken no steps with regard to dredging St. John Harbor. Although he said it is a private property and that the corporation are simply trustees, it stands in the same position as other harbors which require the care of the Government, and something should be done towards removing the stuff from the river.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take a note of this, so as not to forget it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Last Saturday I called attention to the fact that there was no item for improvements in relation to the Horse Shoe Bar at Miramichi, and my hon. friend said he would furnish information with regard to that.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The chief engineer reports that the Horse Shoe shoal was completed in September, 1884, leaving a channel of 20 feet wide and 20 to 21 feet deep at low water, where previously the depth was 16 or 17

feet. At Grande Dune a cut was made 1,020 feet long, 120 feet wide, and 17 to 20 feet deep. No complaints have reached the department since then, nor has the department been informed that boulders exist in the river.

Mr. MITCHELL. I never made such a ridiculous assertion that boulders were in the harbor. The boulders are up the river sixty miles.

Roads and Bridges \$85,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under what principle are the hon. gentlemen going to justify this vote of \$10,000 for one-half the cost of the construction of a bridge across Grand River at the village of York? If we are going to construct bridges all through the Dominion of Canada, it is not \$10,000 but \$2,000,000 that will be required.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This vote is recommended by the chief engineer as an assistance to the county of Haldimand, on account of the increased width and depth of the water way, resulting from the dam built at Dunnville.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are a great many miles between Dunnville and York. From Dunnville to Cayuga by the river is about 12 miles, and it is not possible that the water could be dammed up beyond Cayuga. After you pass Cayuga, there is a distinct fall between York and Cayuga of about 13 feet, and I do not see how in any way the river can be dammed back by the dam at Dunnville so as to widen the river at York. It seems to me that the statement made by the hon. gentleman's engineers is an impossibility.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right when he says that it is not dammed up ordinarily by the bridge at Dunnville as far as the village of York, which is about twenty miles above, but the evidence of the parties who are residents there, both before and after the construction of the dam at Dunnville, goes very clearly to show that, since the river has been dammed at Dunnville, the ice forms above Dunnville very strongly, that the lighter ice above Cayuga comes down, and in the floods of the spring it forms an ice dam and floods the water back even over the village of York, and the water is flooded completely over the banks there. The evidence goes to show that the cost of bridging the river at York is increased by the dam at Dunnville. Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows Mr. Davis, the county treasurer of York, who has very considerable commercial interests at the village of York. He is a thoroughly reliable man, and he is opposed to me in political matters, and thoroughly in sympathy with the hon. gentleman, and this is what he states:

"During the freshet the water rises about 8 feet. It rose very rapidly twice during the last two years (last year was one of these). A jam formed three or four miles below Cayuga and forced the water back until it ran the reverse way over the dam. I am of opinion that if the river was not dammed the water would not have risen so high. I am not experienced in these matters, but I know that if the dam was not at Dunnville one-tenth part of the ice would not form that now forms, and consequently the water could not be backed up in the same way it now is. The summit level of the Grand River extends from Dunnville to about 18 miles above and forms a pond averaging half a mile in width. The extreme width of this pond is a mile or more in some places. The ice forms all over this and the whole of it has to escape over the dam at Dunnville. The running ice from above gets under the solid ice, at a point near Cayuga and upwards in the narrow part of the river, and there forms a dam which backs the water to York and above it. I consider that a bridge at York is necessary in the interests of the public."

That is the statement of Mr. Davis, and that is borne out by a large number of the residents there, and anyone who knows anything of the river there knows that a great deal of flooding has been caused by the dam at Dunnville. The Government has paid a large sum to owners of lands which have been flooded in consequence of that dam, and to townships for the construction of bridges across streams which have been affected by the action of that dam. I would ask

my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works if he has taken into consideration the claim which the county council has made upon the Government for a rebate upon the construction of the Cayuga bridge. The evidence all goes to show that the county has been very badly treated in this matter, that, owing to the existence of this dam, the county has been put to a large expense. For instance, the bridge at Cayuga need not have been within, I think, 15 feet as high as it is at the present time. Owing to the dam, the county was compelled to make a stronger bridge, and a great deal wider bridge than would have been necessary otherwise. A short time after they constructed that bridge, the Government raised the water by increasing the height of the dam at Dunnville, and the result was that the county has had to spend some thousands of dollars to increase the height of the piers in order to let the water under. If my hon. friend was acquainted with all the circumstances, I think he would not object to the vote, but that he would agree with me and with the Government, and with the engineer, that it is perfectly justified on the ground that the dam at Dunnville has caused an increased expense in bridging this river.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is about 40 years since the dam at Dunnville was raised to its present height. I have known that county myself since boyhood, and it has always been understood that the dam at Dunnville had no influence beyond Cayuga; that, I believe, is not disputed; and there are rapids, not of a very formidable character, certainly, but there are actually rapids between Cayuga and York.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, I admit that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My esteemed friend the late member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) had a mill a little distance above Cayuga. Whether the dam which he once made there for the use of his mill, is still in existence, I cannot say; but there is certainly a considerable fall from this point, between York and Cayuga. As to the extent an ice jam may form, I am not prepared to say. But I know that if we grant a vote for this purpose, the Minister of Public Works will have opened the door for an immense number of other demands in other quarters.

Mr. McMULLEN. This bears all the evidence of being a barefaced job. It would never have been put in the Estimates if the county had not been represented by the hon. gentleman opposite. It shows plainly that the Government have done it for the purpose, in the first place, of aiding him in getting elected, and in the second place, of sustaining him in his seat. This vote is in accord with many others that my hon. friend from Northumberland has been complaining about in New Brunswick and other places. Counties that have returned supporters of the Government stand a chance of getting their bridges built, of getting any mortal thing done, no matter what it is. As long as they return member to support the Government they are sure to come in for something. The hon. member for Haldimand had nothing else to aid him to secure the representation of that county, unless he could get the Government to agree to contribute money towards building a bridge. I would like to know if these matters are not under the control of the Local Government. The county of Haldimand is a very close one, and so \$10,000 is put in the Estimates to build a bridge in order to secure to the hon. gentleman a continuation of the seat he now occupies. We have too much of this kind of thing. In my county, for instance, there are three post offices in each of which the receipts are in excess of those in a town in another county where the Government are now spending \$10,000 to \$15,000 to build a post office and custom house, simply because the county sent a representative here to support the Government. If this system is to be carried out, I do not know where it is going to end. It will take all the

money the Finance Minister is authorised to borrow, and, if, Session after Session, we are to be called upon for items like this it is going to be a sorry day for this country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In reply to my hon. friend who last spoke, I thank him for the compliment he has paid me, in saying that it was my presence here that got this grant. I am sure if the hon. gentleman knew the circumstances, if he knew how the people had been annoyed by the existence of that dam, his spirit of fair play would have led him to admit that this item is justified. I do not desire to characterise what he has said, because the hon. gentleman, I understand, is not acquainted with the county.

Mr. McMULLEN. I mean to say that the promise of this vote was one of the reasons which secured the election of the hon. gentleman. I can judge from what I have seen in the past, and from the general tenor of the votes that have been going through, and I believe this is in accordance with all the rest. I do not say that it was altogether because of the hon. gentleman's ability; no, it is because he is always sure to vote right.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That claim made by the county council of Haldimand concerning their bridge, I have not been able to take up and submit to my colleagues, for want of time; but it is a matter which will be taken up at the close of the Session.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Will the hon. member for Haldimand tell us if there has been any estimate of the cost of the bridge?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The county council passed a resolution, I think, in the early part of the year, which was forwarded to the Minister, offering to build half of the bridge if the Government would build the other half. Since that time they have formulated a claim upon the Government for the half of Cayuga bridge. I think the Government employed a gentleman named Long, a provincial land surveyor and an engineer in Dunnville, to make an estimate of the amount which the Government were indebted to the county of Haldimand upon the Cayuga bridge, and I think he told me personally that his report showed that the county had a just claim upon the Government to the extent of \$18,000, without interest. I know from hearsay that the estimated cost of the York bridge is about \$20,000. The county claims that the Government should build the whole bridge in lieu of their giving up their claims to the Cayuga bridge, and I believe if hon. gentlemen opposite understood all the circumstances, they would agree it was correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no doubt that if the county was to wait a few years until another election took place and again returned the hon. gentleman, the Government would build the whole bridge for them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not exactly see how the ice jam or anything else can affect the river at Cayuga. From the statement made by my hon. friend from South Oxford, it seems that the water by the dam at Dunnville is not backed up the river further than Cayuga. The hon. gentleman who represents the county of Haldimand says that the ice jam caused the water sometimes to back further still in the spring. Well, Mr. Thompson's mill is above Cayuga, the river is dammed there for the purpose of the mill. Now, how is it possible that the dam at Dunnville can affect the river above another dam? The water has never backed over that dam at Mr. Thompson's mill, in consequence of the dam built at Dunnville. Then, if that is so, by no possibility can the dam at Dunnville be backing water directly or in consequence of any ice jam affecting the river up at York. According to the plan submitted, there is thirteen feet fall between York and Cayuga; there is the dam at Thompson's mill above Cayuga, and that dam backing water part of the way to York might possibly

Mr. McMULLEN.

cause an ice jam that would affect the river at York, although the hon. gentleman does not so represent it, and has no reason to suppose it does. But that dam intervening, it makes it utterly impossible that any ice jam caused by the dam at Dunnville could affect the river at York, and that being the case, no claim can arise in consequence of the dam at Dunnville for the construction of a bridge, by the Parliament of Canada, over the river at York. It is extraordinary the Government should undertake a work of this sort. How is it that twenty-one years have elapsed since the Union, and this claim has not been put forward before? How is it that the people of Haldimand never became aware that they had such a claim; how came it to be presented; who suggested it? There are rivers all over the Dominion that require to be bridged. The practice has been to bridge them at the expense of the community that uses them, and if you depart from that rule and undertake the construction of such works at the expense of the country at large, you break down all distinctions, not only between the Dominion and the Provinces, but between the Dominion and the municipalities, and all the advantages supposed to arise from our form of Government fall to the ground. What is the use of having Provincial Governments and municipal institutions which undertake works for the benefit of the people, if the Dominion Government can come down and ask appropriations for the benefit of the people in any particular locality? It is a monstrous proposition. It was reported in the papers, at the time that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) asserted to the people of Haldimand that, if he were elected, he would secure an appropriation for this purpose, and that if a member of a different political complexion was returned, such would not be secured.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who is your informant?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was so stated in the newspapers at the time, and it would not have been stated if the hon. gentleman had not said it or some one on his behalf. Now the hon. gentleman boasts that he has such influence with the Government that he is able to secure this appropriation. It is to be regretted that the Government are not restrained from appropriating public money, that is supposed to be for the general good, to undertakings connected with a particular municipality. This is a most improper appropriation, because everything goes to show that it is an appropriation for a work upon a pretext that has no foundation whatever in fact.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So far as this matter is concerned I suppose the residents of York, and those who are prominent in municipal politics in Haldimand, probably know as much about the question as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), though they may not know as much in regard to the science of the flowing of water. Evidence, however, is quite clear in opposition to the statement made by the hon. gentleman that water has not flowed over the dam. The statement is made by 17 prominent persons who reside in York, belonging to both political parties, that the water has flowed over the dam time and time again; and I could read to him, if it were necessary, the report of the local superintendent upon the canal, which shows that the river has widened in the spring from 350 feet to between 600 and 700 feet, and when the ice jam formed below the village of Cayuga the water was forced over the dam at York. I think if the hon. gentleman understood all the circumstances he would hold a contrary opinion to that which he has expressed.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like some explanation in regard to the item of \$45,000 new iron truss bridge, to replace the Union Suspension bridge, Ottawa.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Last Session the question in connection with this bridge came up. It was understood that we would have to leave it for another year without

replacing it, the chief engineer having stated that with some care it might last another year. Since that time he has warned the Government that the suspension bridge could not be relied upon for the future, and that we must provide to replace it with a fixed bridge. He has estimated the cost at \$45,000. We intend, during the summer, to make all necessary preparations, and when the ice takes on the river in the winter, we will have the traffic go over the river and we will pull down the cables and erect the new bridge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Please give some explanation in regard to \$2,000 for McLaren's bridge.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to make provision for an appropriation to the county of Carleton to assist in the construction of an iron bridge over the Rideau River, on the highway leading to Rideau Hall.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This system of subsidising the people of Ottawa, who should be able to carry out their own works, is a most improper one and opens the door to every imaginable demand of a similar kind from other places. There is no more reason in admitting this claim than there would be a claim from any municipality in the seven Provinces. I warn the hon. gentleman that, though this sum is comparatively small, the passage of such votes does more to injure the whole system of our confederate Government than almost anything else we can do.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The property at Rideau Hall and grounds form nearly one-half of that municipality, and from them the municipality does not obtain one cent. Under these circumstances the Government thought they could grant \$2,000 to assist in giving access to that municipality, and therefore to their own property.

Paving Wellington Street, Ottawa..... \$5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Could the hon. gentleman tell us what is the reason for asking this vote?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the arrangement we made with the corporation of Ottawa about the bridges and the street in front of the Parliament buildings, it is stipulated that the street should be kept in good order by the Government. We have tried macadamising, but the traffic is so great that we think it would be better to pave it, so that it would last for five, or six, or seven years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Pave it with what?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have not decided yet whether it would be wood or stone, but it will be whatever is best under the circumstances.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I suppose the Government has decided to do this, and it is not worth while questioning it any longer, but it seems to me one of the most objectionable items that could be placed in the Estimates. I cannot see on what principle this Parliament is called upon to vote those large sums for the city of Ottawa. It would seem that the hon. gentleman, having lived here so long in the Government, has conceived an attachment for this city, and wishes to spend the public money upon it. They must remember that every other part of the country has just the same claims on the public funds. The Government are building a bridge here over the Rideau and paving streets, and I would remind the hon. gentleman that his constituents have just as good a right to claim a bridge as the city of Ottawa has. He has made no explanation about this expenditure, which would be accepted as satisfactory before any court. It is late in the Session, and I do not wish to detain the House, but I think it is an item that should be voted upon in concurrence, because the Government may charge us afterwards, as they did before, with the remark: You spoke against it, but you did not vote on it. I was in hopes that after the

strong expressions of opinion made from this side of the House that the Minister of Public Works would have seen his way to take this sum from the Estimates. He surely cannot in his own mind see any just grounds for asking us to vote this sum. He is opening the door for similar applications from all parts of the Dominion which he cannot resist, because when you once establish a precedent you do not know what expenditure it is going to involve. I regret that the hon. gentleman will not be here always, and in future those who follow him will point to the action of the Government here to establish a similar claim. I think it is an extravagant waste of public money to vote this.

Mr. BARRON. Surely the advantage to the city of Ottawa of having the Government buildings here is quite sufficient without asking the country at large to keep up their roads and bridges. It is quite true that the Rideau grounds are not taxed, but the city of Ottawa gets an equivalent without this expenditure, inasmuch as it is the seat of Government. If the country at large is going to be asked to keep up the roads and bridges of the city of Ottawa, there are other cities which will come forward and say: We will take the seat of Government; we will put up buildings and exempt them from taxes, and not ask the Government to keep up our roads and bridges. Already there has been, as we know, efforts made to have the seat of Government elsewhere. I am quite sure that this practice will give rise to ill-feeling more than ever, and it is a very bad precedent to establish, for the public at large to keep up those roads and bridges for the city. I do not think this money should be voted for the purpose.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must express regret that the Minister of Public Works has not thought fit to give me that telegraph line along the shore of the Miramichi River from Newcastle to Tracadie. I spoke to the hon. gentleman about it, and I hope he has got a note of it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, I took a note of it.

Telephone communication between Wolfe Island, Lake Ontario, and the mainland.....\$2,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On this item I think something must be said, and a good deal ought to be said, although we may not be able to say it all to-night. It appears to me that it is introducing a new and most improper departure to establish this telephonic connection. On the telegraph communication there is not much to be said, but to ask this Parliament to establish communication between Wolfe Island, opposite Kingston, and the mainland, appears to me to be a very ras-cally job indeed. Why, in the name of all that is wonderful, should Canada be asked to support telephonic communication from an island in the St. Lawrence, two or three miles from Kingston, in connection with that town? There is no possible defence or excuse for this. It is true that it is in the immediate vicinity of my home, but that cannot make it any better.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The people of that island have got no communication with the outer world.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They have got the telegraph.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is the only thing we can do for them. We cannot give them a railway or anything of the kind, and this is the only thing they have asked from us.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is just as atrocious a job, although not a big one, as ever was perpetrated. There is no earthly reason, or ground, or excuse, why you should give telephone communication to an island in the St. Lawrence opposite Kingston. There is no justification in the world for it, and nothing to be said for it except that

you have no other way to spend public money there; and that is what the hon. gentleman in substance says—we cannot find any other way to bribe them except to give them telephone communication. I must say the hon. gentlemen appear to me to be laying their heads together in order to find ways and means to establish various things which will cost this country hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars. If you choose to do this kind of thing for every little municipality because you cannot find any other way to spend money for it, there will be no end of applications for such grants. The hon. gentleman has not advanced one solitary reason for this. These people have ample railway communication; and a steamer goes between there and Kingston every two or three hours. There is absolutely no ground for this. It is a regular job—a job of the worst kind.

Telegraphic connection of Bonilla Point with Victoria, British Columbia. \$15,000

Mr. JONES. (Halifax). What is that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to establish a telegraph line at Bonilla Point, where the vessels going into the Strait of Fuca must all pass, and by this means their arrival will be announced. Then, on account of the wrecks on the Pacific coast between that point and the entrance to Barclay Sound, it will also be very serviceable in protecting life and property, because if a wreck happens there, a notification of it can immediately be telegraphed, and vessels can be obtained from Esquimalt or Victoria to go to the rescue.

Examination in connection with spring floods at Montreal and vicinity \$2,500

Mr. MITCHELL. Is there any report on that yet?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The reports have been laid before the House, except the last one, which I have been told is coming in a few days.

Steam communication on Lakes Huron and Superior. \$12,000

Mr. MITCHELL. What is the explanation of that?

Mr. McLELAN. This is for the transportation of the mails at twelve or fifteen points along the Georgian Bay, as far as the Sault.

Mr. MITCHELL. What vessels get the subsidy? Who are the proprietors of them?

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know the proprietors. There are several lines. The Northern Transportation line last year had a portion, and there is another company running in the same direction.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the hon. gentleman should have been prepared to tell us what companies are running, what points they run from, what ports they touch at, what vessels they employ and everything connected with it. The information should be definite and specific.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This has been in operation for many years.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is all the more reason why the hon. gentleman should give us the information.

Mr. SPROULE. I may tell the hon. gentleman that there are two lines, one from Collingwood and one from Owen Sound, and that they call at all the ports on both shores from Owen Sound to Sault Ste. Marie.

Steam communication with the Magdalen Islands.... \$7,800

Mr. MITCHELL. What is the meaning of this?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This has been in operation for many years, between Pictou and the Magdalen Islands. It is the only regular means of mail communication as the hon. gentleman knows.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT

Steam communication between Halifax and St. John, via Yarmouth and Port Medway..... \$7,500

Mr. LOVITT. I see that is the only item in the whole list of subsidies that has been reduced; and, in addition, the provision that the vessels must call at Port Medway is added. The hon. gentleman knows that this line has been in existence for the last ten years, and that with the subsidy of \$10,000 vessels have been calling at Lunenburg, Shelburne, Liverpool and Yarmouth, and other ports. Port Medway is only 9 miles from Liverpool. I think the least the Government can do is to strike out Port Medway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not intended that the steamer shall call at Port Medway, but this is inserted for the purpose of requiring her to make connection with that point. There is a small steamer which has a small subsidy from the Local Government, and \$500 of this vote will enable her to make the connection, which I quite agree with the gentleman is otherwise quite impracticable. The hon. gentleman says that the subsidy has been received for ten years. That is quite true, but you often subsidise a line until it is self-sustaining, and then you do away with the subsidy altogether. And we believe that a subsidy of \$7,000 to this line will be quite sufficient, and we added the \$500, for the purpose of enabling the company to make connection with a small steamer at Port Medway, so as to give communication with that point, but it was not the intention to require the vessel to go in there at all.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman think it is fair, not only to reduce the amount but also to require the company to employ another vessel? You will observe that this is the only item that has been reduced, and they have no means of communication backwards and forwards except by water until the railways are finished, and I hope the Government will see their way clear to maintain the original grant until the railway is finished between Lunenburg and Liverpool.

Subsidy to steamer between Campbellton and Gaspé and intermediate ports..... \$12,500

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I notice the steamer *Admiral* only runs to Dalhousie.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now that the railway runs to Dalhousie, she makes connection there.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The Campbellton people complain of this, and if she gets a subsidy to go to Campbellton, she ought to go there.

Gen. LAURIE. I ask the Government if they could not continue the subsidy to the line running from Charlottetown to Halifax. The merchants of Halifax, generally, maintain it is most desirable it should be continued.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman made strong representations, backed by a great body of the merchants of Halifax. It is most difficult to take off any subsidy as a rule, but the hon. gentleman will see that there are many subsidies connected with the port of Halifax. There is communication with Prince Edward Island by railway from Halifax to Pictou, and a subsidised line of steamers from Pictou to Charlottetown. There is another subsidised line to Shediac and Summerside, and there is so many of these lines of communication that we are anxious to remove these subsidies wherever possible, and this is one we thought might, under the circumstances, be dispensed with. It was a matter of personal regret to myself, because it interferes with the interest of parties who have been maintaining the line, but the Government did not feel they were warranted in granting that subsidy, and I believe there is a company being formed for the purpose of having a service that will not require a subsidy.

For direct steam communication Antwerp or Germany or both..... \$30,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We struck out the subsidies of \$24,000 each for direct service, the one to Hamburg and the other to Antwerp, and have given a subsidy of \$30,000 instead, on condition that an equal amount is contributed by the Belgian Government, so as to establish a first class line of steam communication between Belgium and Canada. Strong representations were made by people in Montreal against the reduction of the two subsidies granted for many years to the White Cross and the Munderloh lines, and it was with regret we were not able to comply with their wishes. We felt that these lines were practically being subsidised by the Government to compete with private capitalists, who were performing, to a large extent, the same service, and we felt we were not warranted in continuing this subsidy, but would contribute instead \$30,000 to a first class line, on condition that the Government of Belgium would contribute an equal amount. Unless they do that not a dollar of subsidy will be expended by us.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Will the terminal point be in Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The terms are that we must have a direct service both ways. At present, the White Cross and the Munderloh lines are competing with private capitalists, and there was very strong ground to complain against that system. We require this line to be a direct line from Germany or Antwerp, or both, to Canada direct both ways, not calling at any other places either going or coming.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Have they not been in the habit of going in the winter to the American ports?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, but we do not permit that. They must make the Canadian ports their terminal ports, winter and summer.

Gen. LAURIE. I hesitate to press any other matter upon the Government, but the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), has asked me to call the attention of the Minister to the strong feeling which exists in favor of a subsidy for a line of steamers to the West Indies. It is rather a false position for me to be placed in, to press this on the Government, but, from my own point of view, I think it is a very desirable line; and, perhaps, if the terms upon which the subsidy to the Antwerp line should not be met by similar terms being given by the Government on the other side of the Atlantic, I would suggest that it may be possible that this money might be applied to develop a line of communication with the West Indies, which would certainly develop our trade very largely. I know there is an opposition to it, but it is believed, and most of us believe, that it would build up a trade which would be of great advantage, and that belief is held not only in the city of Halifax but in the ports along the coast. Those who are connected with the West India trade think that it is a trade that might legitimately be developed, and, as the Minister of Finance mentioned, in his speech in producing the Budget, that there were hopes that they might give some inducement to establish a line between Halifax or St. John and the West Indies, we hoped the Government would see their way to carry that out, but I see there is no provision for it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Is the French subsidy on the same terms as the Belgian subsidy?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I regret to say it is not. The matter had not been considered so carefully then as it has been since. That French company is required to run a direct line from France to Canada, but it is permitted to call at an English port on its return voyage, but not when coming this way.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It has to make its terminal points in Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My hon. friend from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) has spoken in reference to the subsidy for a line of communication with the West Indies, and I regret that the Government did not see their way clear to accede to the wishes of the delegation that waited upon them in favor of that project. I agree with my hon. friend that, if the Belgian Government do not agree to this proposal, this money should be applied to the development of that line, which should be a joint line from St. John and Halifax, which has been so strongly pressed upon the Government from both these cities.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This is not a Maritime Province question altogether, and, representing an Ontario constituency, I think it is a matter of great importance to the producers of agricultural and other produce in Ontario to have our trade with the West Indies encouraged as much as possible, and I think it is much more important for us to have a line of steamers to the West Indies than it is to have one either to France or to Belgium.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not understand, when the hon. gentleman knows that this vote for the French line is being renewed every year, on what principle the Government are not able to change that arrangement and to dictate their terms. They should place it in the same line with the German line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That was a contract for five years, except in a certain contingency.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am glad to hear the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) recommending this trade, because the recommendation comes from a class of persons who know nothing whatever about the trade of the West Indies, and the hon. gentleman has made a representation as to the people along the coast being interested in this line, which is utterly at variance with the facts. Every merchant in the county of Shelburne, which the hon. gentleman represents, every merchant in the county of Lunenburg, who is connected with the West Indies, signed a document directly at variance with the statement which the hon. gentleman has made; so I would suggest to him in future to confine his remarks to matters with which he is familiar, and with which he has some acquaintance, and not to interfere with those about which he knows nothing.

Gen. LAURIE. I generally speak of matters with which I am familiar, and I generally speak with some authority to sustain me. I have in my hands a statement of the leading firm of Lockeport. I spoke this evening on behalf of the junior member for Halifax, to a certain extent, but also on my own part; but, if I attempted to represent the city of Halifax, the hon. gentleman must be thanked for attempting to represent Shelburne county. I think I am quite prepared to represent Shelburne county yet myself. I have here a letter from the leading exporting firm in Lockeport, which is the largest exporting place in the county of Shelburne. The writer says:

"Have also noticed a move for a line of steamers between Canada and the West Indies which think is recommendable, as every chance for opening up trade should be the first care of the Government, seeing that our neighbors are always on the alert to do so."

Mr. JONES (Halifax). From whom is that?

Gen. LAURIE. That is signed by J. and F. Locke. My hon. friend knows them well. They are competitors with him in the West India trade.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Every firm in Lockeport signed the statement against it. I do not know what they may write to the hon. gentleman now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, you do, you have heard it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not know for what reason they should make that statement, but every firm in Lockport signed against it, and when I come here and have to discuss matters of business with persons who—not wishing to be disrespectful—have no acquaintance with the subject or with the nature of our trade with the West Indies, and who from their training and experience have no knowledge or experience of the matter, —

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think my hon. friend from Shelburne was mistaken in saying that I held out hopes, in making my financial statement to the House, that this subsidy would be provided for this Session. I did not intend to make any such statement. I explained a year ago that we were very anxious to establish a line of steam communication with the West Indies. And I explained that there were two or three difficulties in the way. One was that we proposed during the recess to be in communication with the Government of Spain in relation to a treaty for extending the trade between Cuba and Porto Rico and Canada, and that we felt it was not wise that we should anticipate those negotiations by providing a line of steam communication that we might make substantial use of in those negotiations when they were taken up. When I went to London, after the close of the Session, I was visited by the Spanish Minister, who communicated to me, in the first instance in writing, and afterwards requested an interview. I had a lengthened interview with him on the subject. He intimated that the Government of Madrid was quite ready to enter into negotiations for enlarged trade relations with Canada. I told him that we did not propose to go on with those negotiations, because I found they had extended the time for bringing the *modus vivendi* with the United States to a termination, in such a way as to lead me to suppose that they were still negotiating with the United States. If any such extended treaty as Spain had negotiated with the United States were entered into, it would be quite useless to make any such arrangement as Canada proposed to make with Spain; and I proposed, therefore, to allow the matter to remain in abeyance until that matter was brought to a termination. I believe, the 1st July will find that matter finally concluded, that the *modus vivendi* with the United States will be abandoned, and that we will then be in a position to resume these negotiations, with a fair prospect of making arrangements that will be greatly beneficial to Canada by the extension of our trade with Cuba and Porto Rico. I did not think it was wise to interrupt this line of steam communication, to which we knew Spain attached great importance, until we entered upon these negotiations. I may say to the hon. gentleman that we had a very large deputation from the city of St. John, who, I am afraid, were treated with scant courtesy by the hon. member for Halifax, who intimates that this large and what he supposes was an intelligent and influential deputation was a party deputation. I assumed that deputation represented, not the Conservative party, but all parties in St. John; that the deputation that came to the Government asking for the establishment of steam communication with the West Indies, was not a party deputation, but that it represented the mercantile sentiment of the city of St. John, embracing both parties. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the greatest importance was attached to their statements. They were told that we had sent, at their request, a delegate to the Argentine republic and Brazil, and that he would collect additional information; that step was one to which we attached great importance; and that as Halifax and St. John were combined in their application to the Government to establish communication between these two points, and different portions of the West India Islands, and,

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

perhaps, embracing the Spanish West Indies, the Government would give that subject the most careful consideration during recess, and we would be able, at the next Session, to provide for that service. We recognise the great value of taking means—the same as the United States have taken—by steam communication, to expand our trade with both the Spanish and the British West Indies, and with the southern countries. Now, suppose this vote is not taken, suppose the Government of Belgium does not provide an adequate amount, then we would not be able to touch a dollar of that money for an entirely different service. You must have the money voted for that service. I quite agree with the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) that the service that is now under consideration is of much greater importance than this continental service to which attention has been drawn. That subsidy may not be used, and it is, perhaps, doubtful whether it will be, with the stringent conditions attached to it, because the parties who approached us on behalf of the Belgian Government, asked that they might have permission to come during winter, at all events, to an American port as well as to a Canadian port. They have been informed that they must give an equal amount of subsidy to that which we vote, that the voyage must be a direct voyage, touching no place except between the continent and Canada, and that the ports, both summer and winter, must be terminal. Under these conditions it is perhaps unlikely that the vote will be used, but, in any event, I do hope that the Government will be able at the next Session to provide for what I am certain is calculated to benefit not only Halifax and St. John, but Canada as a whole.

Steam service between the United States and Victoria, B. C.

For steam communication between Canso, Arichat, Guysboro', Port Hood and Mabou, and such other places between above limits as may be agreed upon, touching daily at Port Mulgrave, and also to provide for continuance of service during winter, on the Port Mulgrave and Canso section \$5,000

Mr. MITCHELL. I see the Government have left the steam service between the United States and Victoria, B. C. Is there no subsidy there now?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will just mention that, on Concurrence, we may have something to say on that point; we will take it as in committee.

CAUGHNAWAGA RESERVE.

Mr. DOYON asked, For what purpose did the Government cause a survey to be made of the Caughnawaga Reserve, in the county of Laprairie? When do they intend to carry out their plans in relation to the said reserve? Is it their intention to lay before this House the report of the operations of Mr. McLea Walbank, as to the survey of Caughnawaga?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The survey of the Caughnawaga Reserve was ordered in the interests of the Indians occupying the said reserve in order that a fair distribution of the land composing it might be made among the members of the band. The Indians entitled to land upon this reserve have been located for various lots, and as soon as full returns of survey have been received location tickets will be issued. I am not aware of there being any objection to lay before Parliament the report of the operations of the surveyor as soon as the same has been received.

Mr. DOYON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to allow the inhabitants of the Caughnawaga Reserve to make an election of chiefs or councillors, in

pursuance of the Indian Advancement Act? If so, when do they intend to grant them such permission?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have been asked by a number of the Indians of Caughnawaga that they should be allowed to hold an election of councillors under the provisions of the Indian Advancement Act, and the question as to the time at which it will be best that such election should be held is at present receiving consideration.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House until this morning at ten o'clock.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1.35 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 22nd May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Ten o'clock.

PRAYERS.

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I move, seconded by Mr. Small:

That the accountant be authorised to pay their full sessional indemnity to Mr. Platt, member for Prince Edward county, and to Mr. Roome, member for West Middlesex, subject to the usual deductions for absence since taking their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER. I question the regularity of this motion, although the House may do what they like.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think if that is done—I am not against doing it—Mr. Edwards, Mr. Godbout and Mr. Campbell should be placed on the same footing.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

To provide for erection of piers and lighthouse in the Lower Traverse River (on account, estimated cost, \$100,000) \$10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is it that a single lighthouse, unless the pier is one of extraordinary dimensions, comes to cost \$100,000?

Mr. FOSTER. For a number of years we have had a lighthouse in this river. The passage there is a very difficult one, and the current extremely swift. The lightship which cost \$45,000, was run down and sunk, and these lightships are very liable to be sunk at that point. It will cost \$30,000 or \$40,000 to put a new lightship in position, and instead of having a temporary lightship, it was thought an opportune time to build a permanent pier and put a fixed light and fog-alarm on it. That will cost probably \$80,000; the first cost will be greater than that of the lightship, but the advantages are so largely in favor of the fixed light that its ultimate cost will be considerably less.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is a shoal in the centre of the channel at this place, and the channel is very narrow, and the lightship is liable to be run down. I have no doubt that the pier is very necessary in the interest of navigation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any fear of the pier itself being swept away?

Mr. FOSTER. My engineers and other engineers in Quebec agree that it is feasible to build it. Of course, it will require very careful consideration.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is feasible to build, but it is quite uncertain what the effect will be. The ice there is very strong and runs with a great deal of force.

Mr. LOVITT. I think it will be found cheaper in the end to build a stationary lighthouse.

Manitoba Indians—Additional sum required for erection and equipment of two industrial schools in Manitoba. \$14,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you propose to do with these young Indians—are you going to train them for mechanical or agricultural pursuits?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. General industrial purposes. It is found that the common schools are of comparatively little value. The young Indian learns to read and write, and then goes back to his tribe, and again becomes a savage. The object is to get the young men and the children severed from the tribe as much as possible, and civilise them and give them a trade. There is also provision made for girls. The system has proved very successful in the United States, and is proving successful in the North-West. The system has been at work for three years there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do the children go back to the tribe?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, we endeavor to discontinue that as much as possible. The young men when trained can get their homesteads, and if they can get white women or educated Indian women as wives, they sever themselves from their tribes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If they do not go back to the tribe, what good is gained, the number instructed is so extremely small.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Still it is better we should save these youths rather than run the great risk of sending them back. A little leaven will not leaven the lump of the band.

Mr. MITCHELL. I see an item to pay Rev. Mr. Richard for services to the Indians of New Brunswick, \$200. For several years I made diligent efforts for Mr. Richard, but could not succeed, and am glad to see somebody has got some justice for him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is the cause of this vote. With his usual persuasiveness, he got me to give a sum to the Rev. Mr. Banff. That was a new departure, and we had to do the same with regard to Mr. Richard.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the Government do not alienate any minerals found on Indian reserves but retain them for the present at all events?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the general rule.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it the invariable rule?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it is not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think for the present it ought to be the rule that valuable minerals on Indian reserves should not be alienated until the country gets better settled.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In some portions of the country, the coal lands are sold at the same price as those which are not on Indian reserves.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What becomes of the money ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is funded for the benefit of the band.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that, in the present sparsely settled condition of the country, considering that, in the matter of the Indian reserves, we are very strictly trustees, we ought to reserve those mineral lands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think if we get a fair price for them, and fund them for the benefit of the band, we are performing our duties as trustees. It would be a great pity to lock up a good mineral region simply because it happened to be on an Indian reserve. You cannot get royalties paid, because the people can go across the line and get this land there at \$10 an acre.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They will not do that very long.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They will not be able to get large areas, but they would be able to get small areas at the regular selling price. I do not think we can do better in this matter than to follow the example of the United States. As far as I have seen I think the Indian Department of the United States has been conducted with a desire to benefit the interests of the Indians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see an amount of \$3,700 to pay for the dwelling and other houses owned by Indian agent R. J. N. Pither at Fort Frances, which he had to leave for the use of his successor at that agency. The dwelling house may be reasonable enough, but what about the other houses ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are all outbuildings. There is one building to shelter the Indians, where they can stay when they come to the agency, and there are other outbuildings.

Indians—British Columbia \$11,317 64

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is perhaps the most proper moment to call the attention of the House to the unfortunate removal of Mr. Duncan's flock, or a large number of them, from the reserves in British Columbia to Alaskan Territory. I have not visited that place myself, but I have always understood that Mr. Duncan was one of those rare and very few men who have succeeded in civilising the Indians under their charge, that these Indians had made enormous progress; they had repeatedly been referred to in the reports which have been laid on the Table by the Ministers, and I think by their predecessor, my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) as affording an extraordinarily good example of what could be done by patience and kindness in dealing with these people. Now we find from some cause or other that settlement has been broken up, and a very large number, if not all, of those Indians have been transferred to American territory. We ought to have some explanation from the Government as to what they know about that state of things.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman will find all the particulars in the annual report. It is a very unfortunate affair altogether, but it is quite beyond the control of the Dominion Government. Mr. Duncan first went there as a lay reader, sent by the Church Missionary Society of England. He has been very success-

ful, he is a man of great administrative ability, and he really made an exceptionally good settlement there. He employed those Indians in the pursuits of white men, especially in tanning and similar pursuits. The *odium theologicum* arose there, which is the most uncontrollable of all sorts of animosities.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Worse than political ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have seen a good deal of that *odium*, and it is certainly a very different thing from Christian unity. Mr. Duncan, took, I think, peculiar views on religious matters, and severed himself from the church in which he had been. It seems that, years and years ago, when British Columbia was a Crown colony, Sir James Douglas granted a patent to the Missionary Society, or to the bishop as representing that society, of two acres of land. The Missionary Society sent a clergyman there. I think the bishop went there himself. That was resisted by the Indians and by Mr. Duncan. He set himself up to oppose the use of those two acres by the English Church bishop. The British Columbia Government said: We must sustain the law, these two acres were a Crown grant to the church, and they must be allowed to be in peaceful possession of them. The animosities became very great, and the Indians took up the quarrel. I may say that the Indians are not by any means unanimous in regard to this, but a majority followed Mr. Duncan. A very considerable minority, however, adhered to the system established by the Church Missionary Society, and a most unwholesome state of things arose. They began to pull down the houses, and Mr. Duncan, according to the report of law officers, broke the law. I may say that when I was in England I tried to mediate, and to have matters settled. I saw the leading officers of the Church Missionary Society. Mr. Duncan was in England at the time, and I offered him that if he would try and settle with the society, I would recommend his appointment as Indian agent for the north-east coast. He seemed inclined at one time to take it up, but in some way or other we could not come to terms. Then, I am sorry to say, Mr. Duncan took the extreme step of advising the Indians to resist the laying out of their reserves, insisting that the country belonged to the Indians, and that they had never surrendered anything.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is your doctrine.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, he carried that into practice, and refused to allow the surveyors to lay out reserves. I may say that Mr. O'Reilly was sent there with intimation that both the Dominion and the Provincial Governments desired that the most liberal terms should be made with the Indians, but they would not listen to anything. Mr. Duncan then, finding that the British Columbia Government were resolved to carry out the law, induced the Indians to go with him to Alaska, and they commenced, in the most wanton way, to pull down the buildings and improvements at Metlakahla, and some of the materials they carried off to Alaska. They made a complete waste of the whole thing, in fact there was a sort of civil war in that settlement. I believe the Indians, a good many of them, repented going to Alaska, because they had not found everything *couleur de rose* there, and they are returning in small parties to Metlakahla. It is a grievous thing, because Mr. Duncan certainly did great service when he first went there, but he had been so long governing the Indians in that whole region like a dictator, that he could not submit to the law.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is that the effect of long rule and government ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is, when it is quite unchecked by the second and third parties. They had not

a second or third party. If they had had a third party, especially one headed by the hon. gentleman, I do not think there would have been so great an autocracy established.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, that is not the reason, it is when there is no check inside the party, as in the case of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think what the hon. gentleman has said, has shown that it is because there was not a second or third party that all the mischief arose. Now, Mr. Duncan, I believe, is the most successful white man that has ever dealt with the Indians during this generation. He has had remarkable success in civilising the Indian population, in inducing them to adopt the habits of an industrial and civilised community. I think it is very unfortunate that the Government should have meddled with the theological disputes between Mr. Duncan and the Church Society.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is just what we did not do.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In my opinion all the difficulties have grown out of the meddlesome oversight which the Government undertook to exercise in connection with the Indian lands. If they had not offered their services as umpire, and interfered between Mr. Duncan and the bishop, it is probable the difficulties would not have arisen; and the Indian population, who had the greatest confidence in Mr. Duncan, and the vast majority of whom stood by him, would have continued to stand by him, and the bishop who interfered, would have been compelled to withdraw. Now, I do not think the Government have anything to do with the theology of the Indian population. It was none of their business whether Mr. Duncan was orthodox or heterodox. He was a good officer, a man who had remarkable success in dealing with the Indian population, and he was the party by whom the Government ought to have stood. It would be quite as improper for the Government to go into a Methodist Conference and interfere in the dispute that might arise between laymen and clergymen, as between Mr. Duncan and the bishop, who claimed to have sent him there. As I understand the question, and the hon. gentleman can correct me if I am wrong—I have not had an opportunity of looking at the papers—but it has been reported in the newspapers that Governor Douglas issued no patent to the Church Society for the two acres of ground upon which the church stood, but that such patent was issued by the present Government of British Columbia, at the instance of the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it is not so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, it has been so represented, that the whole of that territory was set apart as an Indian reserve, and that neither the Church Society nor any other party had a right to any portion of the land so marked out. Certainly, it would be altogether at variance with the policy which the Government has hitherto pursued, at all events, the Government of Canada, if any portion of an Indian reserve was handed to, and made the property of any religious body whatever. Churches are permitted to build church buildings, and a portion of the land has been set apart for that purpose, but the title to the land has never been taken from the Crown as trustee for the Indians, and handed over to any Church Society, and when that has been done, it is an exception to the general rule. There is no doubt whatever that very serious injury has been done to the settlement at Metlakahla by what has there transpired. It seems to me it was the business of the department to stand by the Indian population; they had nothing whatever to do with any religious body that might come amongst them except to give them fair protection. I understand that the church that was built there

was built by the Indians themselves under Mr. Duncan's directions, that the Church Society contributed nothing towards the erection of that building, and the buildings which the right hon. gentleman says the Indians tore down, were their own houses, which they undertook to remove elsewhere that they might occupy them in their new home. But certainly whatever damage has been done to the settlement has been done by the Government taking sides with the bishop, instead of allowing the bishop and the Indian population to settle their dispute in the best way they could.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot well go into the subject in full, but I can assure my hon. friend that he is not correctly informed. We have done everything in the world to avoid complicity with the quarrels that existed there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did you not invite a man of war to go there to restore order by taking sides with the minority against the majority of the Indian population?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, what we did was this: We sent a surveyor, under the arrangement the hon. gentleman made himself, I think, with the British Columbia Government, to lay out the reserves.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). To mark the limits off.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No more than to mark off the limits, because the assent of the British Columbia Government had to be given to every reserve. We sent Mr. O'Reilly there, and he was resisted, they would not give him the land, they said they would kill him. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there has been no intermeddling. So far from that being the case, when I was in England I pressed strongly the Church Missionary Society to give up their two acres, and to direct their energies to other portions of British Columbia among the heathen Indians, and leave Mr. Duncan there to govern the whole reserve, and for that purpose I offered to appoint him the Indian agent over the whole of the coast.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). I think the hon. the First Minister has placed the Metlakahla troubles before the House very fairly, and I am sure if the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had read the reports of the Provincial Government, of the commission appointed by that Government, and of the conference held between the Indians and the Indian superintendent and members of the Government, he would not have made the statements he has made to-day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta). The hon. gentleman certainly cannot have read them all or he would not have stated what he has stated. The differences were almost altogether of a religious character, and if the Government erred at all it was in not interfering sooner. Directly Mr. Duncan placed himself above the civil law, then the Government should interfere, and my opinion is they did not interfere quite early enough. With respect to the Provincial Government only granting the parcels of two acres quite recently, that may be true; but there was a written pledge given by Governor Seymour, who was Governor of the Crown colony, that two acres should be given. That being the case, how could the Provincial Government ignore a promise made many years previously?

North-West Mounted Police.....\$1,783

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On what principle has this gratuity of \$583.33, seven months' pay to ex-inspector Thomas Dowling, been fixed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The rule has been to allow a month's pay for every year in the service.

Culling timber.....\$200

Mr. LAURIER. Why is an increase of \$200 given to James Patton, Supervisor of Cullers, Quebec.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The salary of the previous supervisor, Mr. Quinn, was \$2,600 per annum, and as Mr. Patton is discharging those duties, it was thought that an additional \$200, which would make his salary \$2,400, would not be excessive.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Considering that we only received last year \$19,000 and had to pay \$55,000, an increase to the supervisor's salary is rather a stiff proposal to make. The whole matter looks like an abuse. Formerly we obtained \$40,000 or \$50,000 and had to pay out from \$50,000 to \$52,000. It is an abuse that we should be called upon to pay this large amount for ticketing timber sent down to Quebec. The item is small enough, but the principle of increasing the salary of the supervisor under such circumstances is a vicious one.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it was understood when we are discussing the regular Estimates, that the Minister would next Session if he was here, of which there is some doubt expressed, revise the entire system on which those men are paid.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it ought to be changed. I think the system has outlived its usefulness, and has become an unnecessary expense on the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the intention of the Government to endeavor to reorganise that system of culling which the hon. gentleman says has outlived its usefulness.

To pay H. J. Miller, Assistant Crown Timber Agent, Quebec, a salary of \$1,400 per annum, the estimate for this purpose being \$1,200..... \$200 00
To pay H. J. Chaloner, Crown Timber Agent, Quebec, a salary of \$2,400 per annum, the estimate for this purpose being \$2,200..... 200 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why should those men's salaries be increased? As far as I can make out from this office there is a loss of \$40,000 a year to the country. It does appear to me a very absurd thing that we should continue that, if we cannot make it pay, and still more absurd that we should increase the salaries under the circumstances.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. \$2,400 was his salary for a certain number of years as chief clerk. Those gentlemen have served a long time and they get this in the ordinary course of promotion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Those are things which if it be exactly as the hon. gentleman states—but sometimes he makes mistakes—which were thoroughly well known when the main Estimates were prepared, and they should have been included there, so that we would have an opportunity of discussing them. Now they are brought up at this extremely late period, apparently with the idea that they would pass through without more than a word of protest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The fact is they were forgotten.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think this is a thing which, if it was earlier in the Session, we should discuss, however, as the Government intend to revise the whole thing we might let it go.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not understand that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, the whole thing.

Mr. LAURIER. I remember in former years strong objection was taken to the fact that balances were left in the
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

hands of those agents, and the Minister had promised his attention to it, but I see no reform whatever.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Minister told me he would try to collect as much as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How long has Mr. Chaloner been in our employ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Ten years. He was appointed in 1879, I think.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Mr. Chaloner collects dues for the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec as well as for the Dominion, and as I understand it the two Provinces and the Dominion each pay one-third. When Mr. McLean Stewart was collector of crown dues his salary was \$2,600 per annum. Mr. Chaloner came in at \$2,000; he has been eight years in the department and his salary has increased to \$2,400, which is \$200 less than Mr. McLean Stewart was paid. One-third is paid by the Dominion and the other two-thirds by the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. LOVITT. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he has heard from the inspector about the post office at Pinkney's Point, which I spoke to him about?

Mr. McLELAN. No, I have not.

Post Office Department..... \$1,325,684 39

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I gave the Postmaster General a notice that I wished to obtain from him information in the shape of the last report he had in reference to this business at the Kingston post office.

Mr. McLELAN. I understood you to say the first intimation I had of the transaction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is one thing I desire to enquire. I understand the Minister received no intimation by telegram.

Mr. McLELAN. That letter was the first intimation I had. It was written on Friday, Saturday it did not come to me, but on Monday the 19th I got it and that was the first intimation I had.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will read that letter, and I certainly think there is grave cause for censure in this matter. The letter is as follows:—

"POST OFFICE,
"KINGSTON, 16th March, 1883.

"SIR,—I greatly regret to report that the Assistant Postmaster William Shannon was found with three letters in his pocket which he had opened to-day, and stolen the contents, some postage stamps, and a ten cent piece of silver. The inspector who will report the matter to you fully has allowed him to depart. The matter has come upon me so suddenly that I don't know what to do or say further.

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"JAMES SHANNON,

"Postmaster.

"The Honorable,
"The Postmaster General,
"Ottawa."

Of course Mr. James Shannon could hardly be expected to do anything more than that. But the House will note that according to the statement made to the department this party was caught *in flagrante delicto*; and although there is no room to doubt that he had committed numerous felonies before, the inspector allowed him to depart. He did not depart as a matter of fact for twenty-four hours. Surely, the Postmaster General must see that the reason he assigned to the House when this matter was brought up is a reason which can by no possibility be accepted by the House, and which I think ought not to have been accepted by the department. If an inspector, whose duty it is to see that the laws are enforced, has this idea of doing his duty, that a party caught in this fashion, with open letters in his pocket

from which he has abstracted the contents, is to be allowed to depart, then there is an end altogether to any discipline or justice in this country. The Postmaster General knows that several persons occupying much inferior positions, young men, under circumstances of infinitely more temptation than could have befallen this officer, have been ruthlessly prosecuted and sent to penitentiary for offences not so aggravated or so numerous, and committed under circumstances that afford much more excuse. I say that the excuse given, that the inspector was dazed and did not know what to do under such circumstances, is no excuse at all. A very grievous failure in public duty has been committed, and I cannot understand how the Postmaster General could have passed over such a thing. It appears to me, that if there is no other excuse to be made, the inspector is almost as culpable as Mr. William Shannon.

Mr. McLELAN. I stated before that there was a neglect of duty and a want of vigilance on the part of the officers. When the information came to the department that he had returned, it was determined to have him arrested, and the inspector was immediately telegraphed to take proceedings against him. But the answer was that he had never been on this side of the line since the 17th of March. There is no doubt that the inspector and the postmaster neglected their duty in not having him arrested at once. As I stated before, the postmaster and his friends had placed a sum in the hands of the department in order to make good the losses that have occurred, and investigation will be made regarding them. That is the first point, and the next is what punishment may be inflicted on the inspector for neglecting his duty.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no matter in which the public are more deeply interested than the proper administration of the Post Office Department, which ought to be, like Cæsar's wife, above suspicion. In this matter, nobody can escape the conclusion that the inspector has been derelict in his duty; and, as my hon. friend says, if the impression is to go abroad that an officer in the department can commit such grievous offences as that committed by Wm. Shannon and go, it will have a very bad effect; and that impression ought to be corrected by reaching the party who is guilty and who is still in the power of the department. The inspector ought not to go without a very severe reprimand at least.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another point as to which I wish to enquire of the Postmaster General. It was stated, I do not take it upon myself to say whether correctly or not, that Mr. Wm. Shannon's name was still left on the pay roll. Is that the case?

Mr. McLELAN. Oh, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presumed that it was not, but as it was publicly stated, I give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to deny it. I have been informed of another little matter, which I believe did occur, that all the clerks in the post office were taken down to some judicial authorities in Kingston, and were sworn to bear true and faithful allegiance to Her Majesty, which is well enough, but were also sworn to a sort of oath of secrecy, that they would not divulge the secrets of the prison house any more. Was any such oath administered?

Mr. McLELAN. I think the Auditor General has required the oath of allegiance to be taken by all the civil service. There is no special oath called for at Kingston any more than anywhere else.

Committee rose and reported.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Administration of Justice. \$50,280

Mr. LAURIER. I have received complaints from judges in Montreal, and from the Montreal bar, that the Government had not yet appointed or taken measures to appoint two judges required for that district by an Act of the Legislature of Quebec passed in 1886. I am quite aware that the anomaly is very great that any Province should make provision for the appointment of a judge, and that the duty of appointing him and the expense of paying him should be thrown upon the Dominion Government. But after all such is the law, and unless they have discretion in the matter, the Government can do nothing else than appoint those judges.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that when a Provincial Legislature passes an Act for an increase in the number of judges, there is no discretion left to this Government. On the contrary, we are bound, when we ask Parliament to vote the salaries, to justify the appointment, and on some other grounds than merely that it was the will of the Province. My own opinion was that possibly the appointment of any additional judge in the district of Montreal might be safely deferred until next year. But it was intended at the early part of the Session to have made provision for an additional judge, as the hon. gentleman knows, from the resolutions laid on the Table. These resolutions, for reasons I need not explain more fully now, we are obliged to hold over until the next Session, when the whole subject will be considered. I may say, however, that the representations of the hon. gentleman have been strongly pressed upon me by members of the bar, and I would now suggest that although it is not possible to go on with the resolutions, we might, with the unanimous consent of the House after concurrence, pass a resolution to provide for the salary of one additional judge.

Mr. LAURIER. That is better than nothing, and I have no objection to it.

Mr. DESJARDINS. That proposition ought to be accepted, because it is well known that in the district alone there is more business transactions than in the whole of the other districts together, and the work is really too much for the number of judges appointed.

Mr. LAURIER. I see no reason why you should not appoint two. I do not want to discuss the constitutional question, but there are serious complaints from all sides.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What power do the Government exercise in distributing the work of the judges in Lower Canada? There are a number of these gentlemen in the country districts, who are not overburdened with work. Is it in the power of the Government to assign to them larger districts or transfer them to headquarters.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is done by provincial legislation. The districts are created under provincial legislation, and we simply appoint the judges for the districts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is not quite the case in Ontario. There the judges' districts are settled by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. THOMPSON. The judges are appointed for the whole Province.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am speaking of the County Court judges, who, to a certain extent, answer to the judges of the rural districts.

Mr. THOMPSON. The districts are regulated by provincial legislation at any rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At any rate you practically provide for dividing the districts by appointing junior judges, and it seems to me the condition, as between the two Provinces, is very mixed. The present Govern-

ment divided the districts by appointing junior judges when they saw fit, and those are not appointed by the Local Legislature.

Mr. THOMPSON. The districts in Ontario, as well as in the other Provinces, are defined by the Provincial Legislature. Sometimes counties are grouped together as a judicial district, and power is given by provincial legislation to appoint junior judges. In such cases the junior has charge of the whole district as well as the senior.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary..... \$85,654 79

Mr. LAURIER. When we had this item in committee, the Minister informed me he was glad to say that under the new arrangement things were going on satisfactorily in this penitentiary. I have information which does not quite agree with the statement of the Minister, but I do not mean to say that his information is not correct or that mine is correct. I would like to ascertain from the Minister whether there has been any enquiry made since the outbreak in 1886—in May, I think it was—as to the causes of that outbreak and as to the arrangement of the penitentiary since.

Mr. THOMPSON. There was an enquiry made immediately afterwards by the regular officer, Mr. Moylan, and, in pursuance of the promise which I made a further enquiry was held in the absence of Mr. Moylan, which was conducted by the Secretary of State, myself and the Deputy Minister. We examined the officers of the prison and others, and we came to the conclusion that the difficulties which had given rise to previous troubles had been removed and that everything was going on satisfactorily.

Mr. LAURIER. That enquiry has never been brought before the House. Will the hon. gentleman bring it next Session?

Mr. THOMPSON. If the evidence is required I will endeavor to bring it down. There was no report.

Manitoba Penitentiary..... \$19,914 48

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When this item was under discussion I called attention to the extraordinary expenditures in connection with that penitentiary. Since that, the Ministers in charge of the British Columbia estimates stated that they found the expenses of living in British Columbia were considerably more than in Manitoba, but, notwithstanding that, the cost of maintaining the convicts in Manitoba is very much larger than it is in British Columbia. We also find that the expense of maintaining the convicts in Manitoba penitentiary appears to be some \$30 per head greater than the subsistence vote for mounted policemen in the North-West force, and we find in the details that four times as much meat and such matters per head were consumed in Manitoba than in British Columbia. Altogether the expenditure for this penitentiary appears to have been conducted in a very loose manner, and this seems to be a vote which hardly ought to be concurred with, unless there be some explanation to be given which we did not receive when the Estimates were being put through. I believe the Minister has some further information than we have yet received. This is two and a-half times as great an expenditure per head as that which is incurred in the Kingston penitentiary, but I am aware that, in the smaller penitentiaries, the gross expense per head is not quite a fair criterion. Still, I can see no reason why the expenditure in Manitoba should so much exceed the expenditure in British Columbia relatively, and I have not yet seen any reason for the enormous items which were put down in the various details to which I have previously alluded.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am in a position to explain some of the items which were excepted to. As regards the per

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

capita cost of maintenance, I hope that next Session, the system of rations having been abolished, a different result will be shown. In regard to the quantity of beef to which the hon. gentleman called my attention as indicating the enormous expenditure in that penitentiary, I may say that the 57,353 pounds of beef shown in the Auditor General's report, refers to cattle on foot. They are alive, and, when they are slaughtered, the quantity is reduced at least one-third.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the price per pound?

Mr. THOMPSON. It was mentioned at the time, but I forget.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that the price per lb was a price that ought hardly to be paid for cattle on foot.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it was higher than the price would be for dressed beef in the eastern Provinces, but it was bought under contract and this was the lowest price obtainable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That seems to be a very shady business, for surely cattle can be bought cheaper than that in Manitoba.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, that is the lowest price. Then, as to medicines and drugs. The warden was obliged to move his family to Winnipeg in order to give us greater accommodation for the half-breed and Indian prisoners after the rebellion. His wife was in a dying condition at the time, and afterwards died, and these were drugs and medicines furnished to her in consequence of her removal. As to the diet, and the cost of ink, and sugar, and travelling expenses, and so on, instead of reading the statement I have here I will send it over to the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know that it is in our power to investigate these matters more thoroughly, but I must say that the whole expenditure for this penitentiary appears to be conducted by the officials there utterly regardless of expense. I called attention the other day to one of the facts, which appears on the face of it to show that, beyond any possible explanation that could be given, the cost of the food of the mounted police appears to be \$90 a head, and the cost of the food for each convict in the Manitoba penitentiary is \$120. That cannot be the case without the existence of some serious negligence on the part of the officials.

PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that I have received a letter from the Governor General's Secretary intimating that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber to prorogue the present Session of the Dominion Parliament to-day, the 22nd instant, at 4 o'clock.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

Immigration, salaries of agents and employes..... \$116,389

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have the Government arrived at any decision at all as to the course they will pursue with respect to pauper and unfit immigrants being landed in this country?

Mr. CARLING. I think I mentioned to the House the other day that we were now enquiring into the reports that were made in the press, and if it was found necessary, a proclamation would be issued with a view of preventing pauper immigrants coming into the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the evil does exist in the proportion as alleged, I do not think a mere proclamation would meet the case. I doubt whether there is any possible way of dealing with that, except by fining the companies who bring such parties over here, or by compelling them to return the immigrants.

Mr. CARLING. I think we have the power to do so according to law by issuing a proclamation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And if you issue a proclamation any steamship company who attempts to land persons of that class here can be fined to what extent?

Mr. CARLING. I am not prepared to say to what extent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can you compel them to take these persons back?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, that can be done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And that the Government are prepared to do, I understand, if you find on examination that this evil is attaining any appreciable magnitude?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose I may hint, without breach of parliamentary etiquette, that there is a possibility that the hon. Finance Minister will be High Commissioner within a short time; and I suppose in that case the High Commissioner will feel it his duty to look into this matter on the other side of the Atlantic.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that in the event of my holding that office, I shall certainly consider it my duty, and whoever holds it, it will be his duty to do everything possible to prevent unfit persons being sent from the other side. I have already impressed upon the parties who have been in communication with the London office the necessity of resisting and refusing the emigration of infirm and unfit people. The only case in which I think it is legitimate to depart from that rule is where persons have relatives in this country who are able to take care of them.

Royal Military College of Canada..... \$59,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to enquire of the Minister of Public Works whether any steps have been taken to provide sleeping and dormitory accommodation for the cadets, as I am informed it is wholly inadequate for the number of pupils. Is anything being done to provide that requisite accommodation? It is not possible, as the hon. gentleman knows, to carry on an institution of that kind unless you either limit the number of pupils, or provide reasonable accommodation, which I believe is not the case just now.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My attention as Minister of Public Works has not been called to this subject lately by the Minister of Militia; I suppose he will do so later on, and of course I will then lay the matter before my colleagues, and see what can be done. I know that at times it has been rather crowded, but I have heard no complaints about it for some months.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think it is very necessary that some steps should be taken to provide additional accommodation for the cadets in that college. It is an institution supported by the Dominion, and admission to it is largely sought after. Some forty to fifty young men make application every year, while only twenty-four can be admitted. I believe they have there this summer upwards of a hundred, while they have not accommodation for more than sixty; consequently some of the cadets are sleeping in the hospital, or in the basement below; they have to double up in their rooms, or are sleeping in the educational rooms,

and are packed away in this very unsuitable manner. For a large institution of that kind, I think this state of things should not be permitted, and I hope the Government will at once provide the necessary barrack accommodation.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is no new thing for me to take exception to that Military College at Kingston. It is an institution that I never believed in, and I think it is an institution that ought never to have been established, because it takes the money of the laboring and middle classes of the community to educate the children of the aristocrats like my hon. friend here, and like my hon. friend opposite.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say, yes. From the great number which go there and who cannot get accommodation, I have no doubt of it. I can give instances. Every gentleman who has influence enough to get his son into that college would like to have him educated there at the public expense, because that is simply what it amounts to. I know that I am facing a determined cohort of military men, colonels in front of me, and colonels behind me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And on the flank.

Mr. MITCHELL. No doubt. The broad ground I take is this, that an institution like that which is kept up and established for the sole purpose of giving a free education to the sons of gentlemen—for that practically is what it amounts to—is one that should not be supported at the public expense. We have to pay \$60,000 a year to maintain this institution, and if my vote would abolish it, it would go down mighty quick.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I may inform the hon. gentleman that the most prominent cadets who have graduated from that college, are the sons of working farmers in this country, who have passed the most successfully.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is all very fine to speak of the sons of working farmers who live in the immediate vicinity, but I want to know how many working farmer's sons go in there from Cape Breton, and Nova Scotia and Manitoba and these distant places, even if they do get a free education. If my hon. friend will take up the list, as I have done, he will find there the names of the sons of men who can well afford to educate their own sons, without making the public pay for it.

Cornwall Canal \$724,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will this amount complete the whole work? I notice the amount is about three times as large as was voted in 1887-88.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a revote of \$224,000 and a new vote of \$500,000 for the enlargement. There will be required to complete this work \$2,180,000 additional.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will that do?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will give 14 feet navigation, which is now being aimed at, and the total cost of obtaining that depth throughout the whole route from the present time is, as nearly as can be ascertained, \$11,500,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be about \$5,000,000 more.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, for the whole of the St. Lawrence system.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When the hon. gentleman makes that estimate, I presume he has had complete surveys made of the whole channel of the St. Lawrence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are there not in many parts of it very large quantities of rock in the river bed,

the expense of the removal of which can hardly be ascertained?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. This matter has been going on for some years, and the chief engineer considers he can give now a close approximate estimate. I discussed it with Mr. Page personally, and told him we were desirous to be able to state the amount it would cost to complete 14 feet navigation throughout the whole system. He said that we might state the cost at \$11,500,000, less the estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About what time does the Minister expect that the work will be completed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are proceeding gradually. I shall hope before very long.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you mean by that statement within the next two or three years?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should say within three or four years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the canal you propose to have—the same as the Welland?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The same as the Welland.

Welland Canal..... \$190,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is estimated to be the cost of finishing the Welland Canal, beyond the present estimates, to the depth of 14 feet?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This will complete the amount and settle with the contractors.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Absolutely?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Public Buildings, Repairs, &c..... \$463,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In regard to this matter, considerable discussion took place in the Public Accounts Committee. The feeling of that committee, if I may refer to it, was somewhat to this effect: That no sort of practical supervision was exercised at present over the expenditure at Rideau Hall, and that such has been the case for many years, and it was desirable that some attempt should be made to exercise supervision. We are getting a new Governor General, and there is an opportunity for possibly a new departure. The consensus of opinion was that it would be better to assign a certain vote definitely for the purpose of maintaining the grounds and doing what was necessary in that regard, the Government to bring down that vote on their responsibility and a certain fixed sum instead of leaving it completely at loose ends as at present. That amount can be disposed of by arrangement between themselves and such portion of the Governor's staff as they might agree upon, if that could be done, or at all events it could be disposed of by the department with a distinct understanding that if they required further expenditure the Government must come to the House and obtain it in the usual way. As the matter now stands we vote a lump sum and there is practically no sort of control. I have no doubt that a great deal of laxity has prevailed under the various administrations, and a good deal of discussion of a somewhat unpleasant character has taken place in the newspapers. I do not think it is advisable that that system should be continued. In one way or another some definite arrangement should be arrived at, and if there was good reason for asking a further sum, the Government might come down with an appropriation giving the reasons therefor. I think the present system should not be continued; no one is held responsible, there is constant grumbling and unpleasant things are said; and I do not think the fault lies with the Govern-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

nor General, I think the fault lies with ourselves and with the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I go a great way with the hon. gentleman in his statement. I think the expenses have been increasing year after year. I do think they cannot do better than adopt the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman, that there should be some fixed sum for such supplies and works as ought to be defrayed by the Government. If any further sums are required by the Governor General we can come down to Parliament. I cannot forget that when the salary was increased from £7,000 to £10,000 I myself gave a pledge in answer to a question of Mr. Holton, that the £10,000 was to cover everything. At first it was kept very well within that, except the expense of some outside servants to keep the grounds. The Governor General said it is not my affair to keep up those large grounds and if you do not choose to keep them up they can run wild. With that exception I think the Governor General defrayed all expenses. There was some furniture put in of the larger description, and by degrees the supplies increased. I am not going to look back on who commenced the system of extravagance in increasing the supplies, such as furniture, glass and plate, but by degrees all those supplies were furnished and I have heard that some of those supplies mysteriously disappeared on the change of Governors. All that kind of thing had to be ended. I am sure that the remarks of the hon. gentleman of the party opposite will be of very great assistance to us when we are making new arrangements in the manner we contemplate doing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far north do these meteorological surveys extend?

Mr. FOSTER. As far as Prince Albert, and we have three corresponding stations along the Hudson Bay coast. There is a station at Fort Kino, another at Dunegan and one or two others in the North-West.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are they connected by telegraph?

Mr. FOSTER. No, they are correspondence stations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Practically speaking Prince Albert is the furthest northern point to which you have telegraph communication?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Surveys in Lakes Superior and Huron..... \$18,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How long are these surveys likely to last?

Mr. FOSTER. This survey was commenced originally with the intention of surveying Georgian Bay, but it was extended northward along the north coast. It will take this year to finish the work in Georgian Bay. Probably three or four years, including the present year, will complete the whole work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you intend to survey Lake Superior also?

Mr. FOSTER. That is not decided on.

Payments to Extra Clerks for preparation of Returns ordered by Parliament..... \$5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps it may be as well to enquire here what information has been obtained with respect to the statements made on the floor of the House by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that four sessional clerks have been drawing pay and not attending to their duty.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will send over an explanation to the hon. gentleman, and if he would like to have it read afterwards, I will read it.

Plant required for Government printing office and Government bindery..... \$175,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this, a divided statement was promised.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Last year a detailed statement was given to the House, which had been prepared by Mr. Romaine, who is a practical printer, and the Queen's Printer. When the superintendent of printing was appointed, an increase in the plant was provided for to the amount of \$32,000, for presses and a number of modern improvements.

Mr. MITCHELL. How much is the whole estimate from first to last for furnishing that building?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. \$128,000 was voted last year; we have to add this \$32,000, and \$63,000 for the plant for printing the voters' lists.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a quarter of a million dollars, just about the amount of the subscription list of the *Empire*. All I can say is that it is a good deal of money. As I know, machinery is pretty expensive. I have had to fit out an establishment this year, and it is a pretty good one, but I think I could fit out four or five like mine with that amount of money. I see the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Pope) here, and I take this opportunity of saying that there is no sight I have seen for a long time which pleases me better than the genial countenance of my hon. friend, with whom I have been associated occasionally in social and in business relations; and I take this opportunity of reminding him that there are three or four claims connected with the Derby branch which have bothered me a good deal, and which I hope he will bear in mind. Nothing delights me more than to see his genial old face again in our midst. No one has done more in directing the policy of the country—I will not except even the Premier—than our respected friend the Minister of Railways. He has been the brains of the Administration; and I only regret that his physical health has been such as to deprive us of his presence here during this Session. There are few men who can sit here with a solid countenance, and answer to all attacks and questions, that "there 'aint' nothing to it" better than my hon. friend. When he was here, we appreciated his presence; we recognised the supreme ability which enabled him, without those distinguished forensic powers that the hon. the Minister of Railways possesses, without that seductiveness and persuasiveness which distinguished the hon. the Minister of Justice, and without the dogged, persistent determination which is eminently displayed by the hon. the Minister of Finance, to hold his own against all comers. We all appreciate the Minister of Railways; and while I say I am glad to see him again in his place, I hope that he will see that these two or three paltry claims on the Derby branch are settled at once and forever. Of course, at the close of every Session you find generally that two great parties, the Government on the one hand and the Opposition on the other, take a slight review of the position. For myself, as a leader of the Independent party, I may say that party has done something to control the legislation of this country, because, however people may laugh at it, and although, if you were to estimate its power and influence by numbers, it would be in the negative, when you get down to hard pan discussing the policy of the country and the Estimates, the left centre counts for something in the country if it does not count much when it comes to a vote. I think that the representatives of this House have shown very little respect for their position and for the duties that devolve upon them as representatives of the country. I look around these benches, and I find almost four-fifths empty. I see none here but representatives for Ministerial honors. I see present the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) who is generally admitted to be one of those who occupy a prominent place in

the running; indeed, he is selling as first favorite. There is the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) another favorite, a kind of second horse in the race. And then there is the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and his colleague (Mr. Perley) running in pairs, neck and neck for the position. My hon. friend the solitary Colonel from Toronto (Mr. Denison) is also on hand and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown), and of course the British Empire remains here to the last, my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), always on hand. Of course, the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) has to stay, and he is sure of a position. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) I am not going to name because he is too entirely respectable for that combination. Then there is the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Haggart), and the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hudapeth), but he has yet to earn his spurs. It is lamentable to think that at the close of a Session such as this, when the money of the country is being squandered and thrown around everywhere, there should be so few present. They manage to get their sessional allowance and after that they go and leave the closing up of the business to a few of us patriots, who devote our time to the interest of the country, and who want nothing, and who are not likely to get much.

Steam communication between Canada and Antwerp, or Germany, or both..... \$30,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that the Government have discontinued steam service between Victoria and the United States. Now, what is their policy, or have they arrived at any policy, with respect to encouraging steam lines of communication in the Pacific from British Columbia, either in the direction of Japan or China? A good deal has been said at various times about what might be done, and what was expected to be done, by the Canadian Government in that direction. If I am correctly informed the British Government entered into some negotiations with them on the subject. Can the hon. gentleman state to us how far these negotiations have progressed, and if they have any defined policy on the subject?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The House will recollect that I stated a year ago that we proposed to Her Majesty's Government to give one-fourth of a subsidy of £100,000 a year for a fast and effective steam service fortnightly between Vancouver and Yokohama, Shanghai, and Hong Kong, or one-fourth of £60,000 per annum for a monthly service, upon Her Majesty's Government giving the other three-fourths in either case. After a great deal of discussion with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Goschen, he wrote to me to say that Her Majesty's Government had decided to give the three-fourths of the £60,000 for a monthly service, and authorise the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to open negotiations with them for the arrangement of a contract. That was communicated to the company, and the negotiations are now proceeding to settle the terms of a contract between the Canadian Pacific Railway and Her Majesty's Government for securing that subsidy of £45,000 a year which Her Majesty's Government have agreed to give for a monthly service between Vancouver and Shanghai, Yokohama, and Hong Kong. I may say that nothing has been done with Australia further than that negotiations have taken place; but nothing has been brought to a point in connection with the Australian service, although, provided the Australian Provinces will agree to provide the bulk of the subsidy, we have offered to give a quota towards that subsidy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is any definite appropriation named in that case?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think we have offered to give £25,000 a year for the purpose of providing for that

service, upon condition that the Australian colonies will furnish a sufficient amount to establish an effectual fortnightly communication between Vancouver and Australasia and New Zealand.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So, practically, the Government are committed to ask the consent of the House for one subsidy of £15,000 and another of £25,000, in the event of the Imperial and Australian Governments making up the difference?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Might I ask the hon. gentleman, while he is giving explanations, whether any steps have been taken, and what progress has been made with regard to service on the Atlantic.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That subject has also attracted the attention of the Government. We are most anxious that there should be a fast service across the Atlantic, corresponding with the progress of the day, in the same way as we are proposing to extend it across the Pacific. But in order to be in a position effectually to take up that question, the Government has given notice to the Allan Steamship Company to terminate the contract with them under which, as the hon. gentleman knows, we pay, I think, \$126,533.33 a year, and that contract is to terminate in one year from the present time, that is to say, next spring. We have received a number of tenders and we are in negotiations with parties in the hope of having a much more rapid and effective service across the Atlantic, making, in fact, this vast great transcontinental line of communication from London to Hong Kong.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very glad, indeed, to get the information the hon. Finance Minister has given this House. I am sure the country has looked with some anxiety to what might be done in relation to creating a fast line of steamers in connection with Canada and Great Britain on the Atlantic. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the present class of steamers, and their present rate of speed, are not such as to command the trade, which will naturally go where the fast boats are to be found, that is, to New York. I entirely approve of the course indicated by the Minister; and I may say that if, in the competition that is offered for a fast line of steamers, the Allan Company, who are the pioneer company, and who have certainly reflected credit upon Canada, and given proof of enterprise, zeal and ability, can compete on as favorable terms as any other company, my impression is that they ought to have the preference, but if they will not come up to the standard, and will not agree to enter into a contract for the rapid communication which is demanded, by the advancing spirit of the age, they must, of course, take their chances and give way to others. But everything being equal, I think we should encourage our own people, and encourage a company that has done so much to advance the reputation and credit of Canada in respect to a transatlantic mail service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would call the attention of the Minister to one point that, I suppose, he has looked into. In the Estimates he has neither put down a sum for a subsidy or a statutory grant, nor has he asked a vote, as I understand the statute has expired. Here we are paying money that is not provided for by statute, and for which no vote in Parliament is taken.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have overlooked that; but I will take care that the proper steps are taken.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But if the statute has expired you require a vote for it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But you have mighty little time to get it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is too late to be done now, of course.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not too late, but it is very expedient, in a matter to which attention is called, to have a Governor General's warrant issued. What does the First Minister think about it? If the permission under the statute has expired, I take it there cannot be a statutory provision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is a statutory provision, because the contract means that it shall be for a certain number of years terminable on a year's notice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think it has expired but we will not forget to look it up.

THE SUPPLY BILL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means to consider the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1888, the sum of \$1,794,772.62 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

2. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1889, the sum of \$24,548,591.25 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into committee.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second times and concurred in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 141) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively 30th June, 1888, and 30th June, 1889, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first, second and third times and passed.

INCREASE OF THE JUDICIARY.

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

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the judges of Provincial Courts as follows:—

That section four of the said Act (chapter one hundred and thirty-eight of the Revised Statutes) be amended by providing for the salaries of twelve puisné judges of the Superior Court, whose residences are fixed at Montreal and Quebec, each \$5,000.

Motion agreed to, and resolution considered in committee, reported and concurred in.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 142) to amend the Act respecting Judges in the Provincial Courts, chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second times and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. I suppose this Bill is intended to cover the law of the Local Legislature respecting a judge to reside in Montreal and not in Quebec.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. It is not for the district of Terrebonne.

Mr. THOMPSON. No; the Act of last Session provided for that. The judge is to reside in Montreal.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

TRADE COMBINATIONS.

Mr. GUILLET. With the permission of the House I desire to give notice that when the House is in committee on (Bill No. 138) or any similar Bill for the suppression of combinations in trade I shall move to add the following clause:—

That the provisions of this Act shall be construed as having taken effect and be in force on and after the 21st day of May.

House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

FAREWELL ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY.

House proceeded to the Senate Chamber where the joint farewell address of the two Houses was presented to His Excellency the Governor General (page 1561).

His Excellency replied as follows:—

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I thank you cordially for the generous terms in which you have been pleased to take leave of me. The unanimous expression of your goodwill, coming as it does from the whole Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, falls from your lips with an authority which admits of no question. I accept it from you as the representatives of the Canadian people, and to that people as well as to you I offer my grateful acknowledgment for the signal honor which you have conferred upon me.

I cannot avoid referring to the recent loss which your Houses have sustained not only by the death of your distinguished predecessor, Mr. Speaker, in the Chair of the Senate, a gentleman whose admirable qualities had earned for him the respect and affection of all who had the pleasure of his acquaintance, but also by the removal of other valued members of both Chambers, and I regret that I must include amongst those who have been taken from us one of the most trusted and honored of my Ministers—a statesman whose premature end has deprived Canada of an able and indefatigable servant and the representative of the Crown of a most faithful and loyal adviser.

A residence of nearly five years in this country as the representative of Her Majesty, has given me a deep and abiding interest in its affairs. I feel that I cannot overrate the advantage which it has been to me to have had a part in the administration of the Dominion and to have watched at close quarters the working of the wise and liberal institutions under which your community is governed. I shall rejoice if at a future time the experience which I have thus been able to gain, should as you have been good enough to suggest, enable me to guard the interests or to promote the welfare of the Dominion. Be this as it may, I can never entertain towards this country any feelings other than those of a friend bound to it by the deepest gratitude and respect.

I may, I hope, congratulate you on the fact that during the years which I have had the good fortune to spend in your midst, the main principles of the Federal constitution have successfully stood the test of experience and are regarded as the basis of an enduring political system well adapted to the requirements of your people.

Your relations with the Mother Country have been without exception of a cordial character. There has in no single case been a serious divergence of opinion between the Government of Her Majesty and that of the Dominion. A free interchange of views between the two has, in every instance, brought into prominence the closeness of the accord by which in all vital matters they are united—an accord which, I believe, reflects the ever increasing esteem entertained for each other by the peoples from whom those Governments derive their power.

I rejoice to know that you are pleased to recognise the deep concern which I have felt in the material progress of the Dominion, and I note with especial pleasure your reference to the completion of the national highway by which the Provinces are now united, a work which has so greatly contributed not only to the consolidation of the Dominion, but also to the strength and to the resources of the Empire.

I have felt it to be a privilege to be allowed to associate myself with your people in their spontaneous endeavors to obtain an increased share of attention for the fine arts and for literature and science, and I have observed with pleasure the degree of success by which those endeavors have been attended.

I cannot pass over in silence your reference to the fact that Her Majesty has been pleased to entrust to me the duty of representing her in another portion of the British Realm, one differing no doubt in almost every respect from that for which you are called upon to legislate, but forming like it a splendid and integral portion of the empire which is the common inheritance of all Her Majesty's subjects. Your congratulations and your readiness to regard with favor my selection for so arduous and important a post will inspire me with courage to undertake the heavy responsibilities which are inseparable from it.

I feel sure that your good wishes for our welfare are sincere, and I have heard from you with a feeling of the deepest gratitude that you regard our approaching departure from this country with regret. Your kindly and appreciative mention of her who has shared with me the happiness of the last five years has touched her heart and mine. I

thank you in Lady Lansdowne's name as well as in my own for your personal courtesy to us both. During our residence in Canada it has been our good fortune to become acquainted with a large number of the members of both Houses. We shall always look back with satisfaction to our intimacy with these representatives of the Canadian people, a satisfaction which is increased by the assurance which you have now given us that the regard which we have felt for you has been mutual.

I shall not fail to convey to Her Majesty the expression of your unaltered devotion to her, and of your loyalty to her Empire. I thank you in her name, and pray that there may be conferred upon the people who have reposed in you the sacred trust of watching over their interests in the councils of the nation every blessing which can serve to establish upon sure foundations the greatness and the reputation of your country. I trust that under the will of Providence it may long continue to present to the world the spectacle of a united and contented community, not only proud of its own prosperity and confident in its own future, but glorying in its connection with the British Throne and determined to bear its part in adding to the greatness and renown of the Empire.

LANSDOWNE.

22nd May, 1888.

The House having returned,

CLOSING REMARKS.

Mr. TROW. It is not my intention to inflict on this House a speech, for the simple reason that the members are on the *qui vive* to depart for home. The reporters are also anxious to leave, and not desirous by any means to take down any rambling remarks I may make on this occasion. The *Hansard* staff has been very busy this Session, having had to report over ninety speeches on one particular subject; and I fancy they are not, at all events, desirous to make any further reports. We have had on the whole, a very useful Session, and I believe it will be the means of doing very much good throughout the country. That lengthy discussion we had on unrestricted reciprocity, the most important question raised since Confederation, was unsurpassed for the debating abilities displayed on both sides, and I presume hon. gentlemen opposite will acknowledge throughout life that the Opposition had the best of the argument. Popular opinion is in our favor; the tide has turned throughout the country, and that measure, above all others, will place the Opposition in an advantageous position. Why, even the hon. the Finance Minister was converted. He, unfortunately, was not able to attend the debate on account of illness, but, no doubt, he read the speeches made on this side, and they evidently had a strong effect upon his mind, because when he made his appearance here, he cut the feet from under his supporters who had been speaking on that same subject. I was surprised at the calmness with which his supporters acknowledged that they had been for weeks in error, and had spoken sentiments diametrically opposed to those to which the hon. gentleman gave utterance. The next measure of great importance was the disallowance question, and I am very glad that that question, which created so much excitement throughout the west, has been settled. I am decidedly of opinion that for years it checked immigration. I am of opinion that the disallowance question had a tendency to check, and did check immigration during the year. Now, that is set aside. I do not know whether you paid too much for your whistle or not, because a great portion of the North-West is not adapted for settlement at all. Of course, you had no control over Manitoba or British Columbia, but it was only the new portion of Manitoba and the North-West that was affected by disallowance. I understand from the Minister of Agriculture that even up to the present the number of immigrants is much larger than it has been for some years. I hope that the proper encouragement will be given, and that competing lines will be made through that great country, for it is a great country. We have millions of acres there fit for settlement, and our whole dependence in the future rests upon the development of that country. I think the action which has been taken by the Government this Session, though it has been delayed

so long, will be the means of settling up that great country of ours. The Government have certainly had their troubles this Session, and we all regret the sudden and unexpected demise of our respected friend the Minister of the Interior. He was a man whom we all respected. I met him repeatedly in the North-West. He was becoming thoroughly acquainted with the duties of his office, and there was no man in the House or out of the House who was better fitted to perform the duties of that office than the late Hon. Thomas White. The Government have also had a difficulty in consequence of the illness of the Minister of Railways. I was happy to see to-day that he was in his seat, and I hope he will recuperate and will take his place as formerly in the council of the country. He seems to have renewed his strength and his health, and I hope that will continue. The other Ministers have been assiduous in the performance of their duties. There are some of them who can work in the Railway Committee all day and in the House all night. The leader of the Government has to take a little rest sometimes, but on the whole he has been very attentive, and I think he has renewed his youth, and we all wish that he may long continue, though not on that side of the House, but may live at least a quarter of a century longer, and give his counsels to the people from this side of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Over the left.

Mr. TROW. I do not know any Government that has so long continued in office that has not become corrupt. The Ministers have become extravagant, but not more than usual. We have learned a lesson during this Session. The Finance Minister has proposed a new way to pay our indebtedness. By one stroke of the pen, he thinks he has paid off \$53,000,000. I doubt if many people in the country will credit the possibility of doing this, but he seems to think that by reducing the rate of interest he reduces the principal. I am not of that opinion. At all events, we have had a very happy time. I believe the Opposition are in a better position to-day than they were when the Session commenced. You must have noticed that during the recent elections we carried everything before us, and I have no doubt that the Reform party will continue to carry everything before them, that they will carry Cardwell and all other ridings which are opened between now and next January.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then we will not open them.

Mr. TROW. In that case, we shall be in the same position. I know the reporters are not anxious to take down very much to-day, and therefore I will conclude.

ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY.

Mr. SPEAKER I have the honor to inform the House that, in conformity with the resolution of this House for the presentation of a joint address of the Senate and House of Commons to His Excellency the Governor General, I have been in the Senate and presented said address and received the answer, of which I have left a copy on the Table.

Mr. TROW. I notice my hon. friend, Sir Donald Smith. He closed the Session once in a very agreeable manner, and I hope he will do so now.

Sir DONALD SMITH. I had not the pleasure of listening to the admirable address of the hon. gentleman. I came in just as he was about closing, so it would not be possible for me to follow what he said; but I am sure that on both sides of the House we are a ways delighted to hear the hon. member, and not the less so when we are all very greatly delighted to get away at the close of the Session. We have all very great esteem for the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), and we trust that he may long be spared to address the House in such felicitous terms on these occasions—as an hon. member reminds me from

Mr. Trow.

the opposite side of the House. However, from whichever side of the House he may address us, I am sure we shall always be happy to listen to him; and if he should ever decide to come over to this side of the House, the members here will welcome him with open arms.

Mr. DAVIN. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the remarks that fell from the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) and I am glad that this Session should close with such emphatic utterances as to the importance of the North-West. At an earlier period in the Session I endeavored to make an argument in the same direction though, perhaps, not in so happy a vein. Sir, I think it is a good omen that the Session should close with these words from my hon. friend, so strong in their appreciation of the position that the North-West occupies in regard to the Dominion of Canada. For, Sir, let there be no mistake about it—that great region is to be the backbone of Canada. It has already given to Canada a position before the world that she would not otherwise have attained; and the more the minds of statesmen, like my hon. friend, are directed towards the development of the North-West, the more rapidly will the Dominion of Canada advance in the path of prosperity and greatness.

PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:—

Mr. SPEAKER,

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate.

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

- An Act respecting the Federal Bank of Canada. (Assented to Friday, 4th May, 1888.)
- An Act to incorporate the Eastern Assurance Company of Canada. (Assented to Friday, 4th May, 1888.)
- An Act to make further provision respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.
- An Act to confirm the Charter of Incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.
- An Act respecting the International Convention for the Preservation of Submarine Telegraph Cables.
- An Act to incorporate the Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert.
- An Act to incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company.
- An Act to amend the Act relating to the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.
- An Act to incorporate the Uxathan Railway Company.
- An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Maskinongé and Nipissing Railway Company.
- An Act to incorporate the Tobique, Gypsum and Colonisation Railway Company.
- An Act to incorporate the South-Western Railway Company.
- An Act to grant certain powers to the Nova Scotia Telephone Company (Limited).
- An Act to empower the Merchants' Marine Insurance Company of Canada to relinquish its charter, and to provide for the winding up of its affairs.
- An Act to incorporate the Bronsons and Weston Lumber Company.
- An Act to incorporate the River Detroit Winter Railway Bridge Company.
- An Act to incorporate the Grenville International Bridge Company.
- An Act further to amend "The Speedy Trials Act," Chapter one hundred and seventy-five of the Revised Statutes.
- An Act to authorise the construction of Bridges over the Assiniboine River at Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie, for railway and passenger purposes.
- An Act further to amend "The Indian Act," chapter forty-three of the Revised Statutes.
- An Act to make further provision respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited)
- An Act to incorporate the Montreal Island Railway Company.
- An Act authorising the Town of Kincardine, in the County of Bruce, to impose and collect certain Tolls at the Harbor in the said Town.
- An Act to incorporate the New York, St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter ninety-seven, respecting Ferries.

An Act to incorporate the Keystones Fire Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Buffalo, Chippawa and Niagara Falls Steamboat and Tramway Company.

An Act to amend the several Acts relating to the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto.

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Plate Glass Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Annapolis Atlantic Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Central Ontario Railway.

An Act respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.

An Act relating to the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company.

An Act to amend Chapter twenty-seven of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.

An Act respecting the advertising of Counterfeit money.

An Act respecting the York Farmers Colonisation Company.

An Act to amend the law relating to fraudulent marks on merchandise.

An Act respecting the Thousand Islands Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Board of Management of the Church and Manse Building Fund of the Presbyterian Church, in Canada, for Manitoba and the North-West.

An Act to amend chapter thirty-two of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Customs.

An Act respecting Gaming in stocks and merchandise.

An Act to confirm a mortgage given by the Central Railway Company to The Central Trust Company of New York to secure an issue of debentures.

An Act respecting the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company.

An Act to provide for the winding up the Bank of London in Canada.

An Act for the relief of Eleonora Elizabeth Tudor.

An Act for the relief of Andrew Maxwell Irving.

An Act for the relief of Catherine Morrison.

An Act to authorise the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the Public Service.

An Act relating to the interest payable on deposits in the Post Office and Government Savings Banks.

An Act to amend chapter thirty-four, of the Revised Statutes, respecting Inland Revenue.

An Act respecting the application of certain laws therein mentioned to the Province of Manitoba.

An Act to amend the Weights and Measures Act as respects the contents of packages of salt.

An Act to amend chapter thirty-three of the Revised Statutes of Canada respecting the duties of Customs.

An Act to make further provision respecting the construction of the ship canal between Montreal and Quebec.

An Act further to amend "The Dominion Lands Act."

An Act to amend the Act respecting Defective Letters Patent and the discharge of securities to the Crown.

An Act to amend "The Canada Temperance Act."

An Act in amendment of "The Canada Temperance Act."

An Act further to amend "The Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act," chapter one hundred and thirty-five of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

An Act to amend an Act of the present Session, intitled "An Act to amend the Act respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company."

An Act to amend "The Dominion Elections Act," chapter eight of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

An Act to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, chapter seventy-eight of the Revised Statutes.

An Act relating to certain advances made to the Quebec Harbor Commissioners.

An Act further to amend Chapter fifty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, "The Territories Real Property Act."

An Act to amend the Act of the present Session, intitled: "An Act respecting the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company."

An Act respecting a certain agreement between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act further to amend "The Criminal Procedure Act."

An Act to amend Chapter sixteen of the Revised Statutes, respecting the High Commissioner for Canada in the United Kingdom

An Act further to amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter five, respecting the Electoral Franchise.

An Act to amend the Act respecting Patents of Invention.

An Act to extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.

An Act to amend "The North-West Territories Representation Act."

An Act to amend "The Bank Act," Chapter one hundred and twenty of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

An Act to amend the Revised Statute of Canada, Chapter fifty, respecting the North-West Territories.

An Act to amend Chapter one hundred and seventy-eight of the Revised Statutes of Canada, "The Summary Convictions' Act."

An Act to amend Chapter one hundred and twenty-four of the Revised Statutes, respecting Insurance.

An Act to authorise the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

An Act respecting Railways.

An Act to amend "The Civil Service Act," Chapter seventeen of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

218

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts, chapter one hundred and thirty-eight of the Revised Statutes.

Then the Honorable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows:

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

The Commons of Canada have voted the supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill:—

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1888, and the 30th June, 1889, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service, to which Bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the Royal assent was signified in the following words:—

In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her Loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the Second Session of the Sixth Parliament of the Dominion with the following Speech:—

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In terminating the present Session of Parliament I desire to record my appreciation of the earnestness and zeal which you have shown in the performance of your public duties.

The measure for the ratification of the Fisheries Treaty agreed upon at the opening of the present year between Her Majesty's Plenipotentiaries and those of the United States, to which I have given the Queen's assent, will, I believe, be viewed with satisfaction by the people of the whole Dominion, as affording a crowning proof of Canada's constant desire to arrive at a just and honorable settlement of all questions arising out of the interpretation of the Convention of 1818.

I venture, with some degree of confidence, to hope that the several authorities, whose sanction of the treaty is necessary to its operation, may not be insensible to the great advantages to both countries which the removal of so fruitful a source of ill-feeling is calculated to entail.

The arrangement under which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has relinquished the exclusive privileges possessed by it in virtue of article 15 of the original agreement between Her Majesty and the company, will, I anticipate, meet with general acceptance, and by increasing its financial strength, enable the company to keep pace with the ever-growing requirements of the vast region which the railway serves.

The extension to the people of the North-West Territories of a larger measure of self-government than they have hitherto enjoyed, is satisfactory evidence of the rapid development of that important portion of the Dominion, and will, I trust, be attended with beneficial results.

The prospects for a large immigration this year of a desirable class of settlers are, I am glad to believe, exceptionally good.

The various amendments to the laws relating to the Inland Revenue, Railways, the Civil Service and to other Acts affecting the public interests which you have passed, seem well adapted to meet the circumstances which have rendered them necessary.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In Her Majesty's name I thank you for the supplies which you have readily granted for the carrying on of the public service.

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I cannot take leave of you for the last time without placing on record my deep regret that my official connection with your country should be at an end. It is a source of no slight satisfaction to me to call to mind under these circumstances the fact that within the last few hours you have been pleased to assure me of the favor with which you have regarded my endeavors to discharge the task committed to me by Her Majesty.

My interest in the Dominion will not cease with my departure from its shores, and I pray that in years to come its people may enjoy in abundance every blessing which it is in the power of Providence to bestow.

THE SPEAKER of the Senate then said:

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate, and Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It is His Excellency the Governor General's will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Saturday, the thirtieth day of June next, to be here held, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until Saturday, the thirtieth day of June next.

The Parliament of the Dominion of Canada was then prorogued to the 30th of June next.

INDEX.

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT, 1888.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1^o, 2^o, 3^o, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts, Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adj., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur. Con-
curred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; Hse. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; Ms., Motions; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref. Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Repts., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in *italic* and parentheses are those of the movers.

Amyot, Mr. G., Bellechasse.

- Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1534 (ii).
- C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1347 (ii).
- Cartridges, Rep. of Commission on Manufacture (Ques.) 1232 (ii).
- Cavalry and Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1220 (ii).
- Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 2, 1^o) 18; Order for 2^o read, 73 (i).
- (Ques.) 752 (i).
- Cornmeal, Flour, &c., on Res. (Mr. Mitchell) to remove Duties, 1560 (ii).
- Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com. (Translators) on M. to conc., 1501 (ii).
- Dorchester Election, Issue of Speaker's Warrant (Ques.) 27, 59 (i).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1146 (ii).
- Drill Shed at Quebec, Water Supply (Ques.) 85 (i).
- (M. for Cor.) 654 (i).
- Field Exercises (Military) Translation (Ques.) 85 (i).
- for Cor.) 655 (i).
- Fishery Protection, appointment of Magistrates (Ques.) 826 (ii).
- "Horse-Breeding in Canada," Translation of Pamphlet (Ques.) 85 (i).
- International Regulations *re* Trading and other Vessels (Ques.) 826 (ii).

Amyot, Mr. G.—Continued.

- Military School, St. Johns (Q.) services of Chaplain (M. for Ret.) 654 (i).
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1288 (ii).
- Morin, Dr. J. A., claim for services (M. for copy) 655 (i).
- Neely, Private T., provision for Widow, &c., on M. for Ret., 651 (i).
- Ottawa River, Improvements for Timber, &c. (M. for Stmt. of cost) 827 (ii).
- Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1598 (ii).
- Personal explanation, *re* charge of disloyalty, 598 (i).
- Quebec Drill Shed, Water Supply (M. for Cor.) 654 (i).
- (Ques.) 85 (i).
- Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1296 (ii).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1422 (ii).
- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 532-539 (i).
- St. Lawrence River Navigation, Montreal and Quebec (M. for Ret.) 71 (i).
- Salmon Rivers (Hudson's Bay) Lease (Ques.) 826 (ii).
- Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1641 (ii).
- Strange, Gen., Rep. submitted to Militia Dept. *re* Rebellion (Ques.) 98 (i).
- Subsidies to Rys. (Money) B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1593 (ii).

Amyot, Mr. G.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

- Civil Government* (Sec. of State) 1641 (ii).
Militia (Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1220 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Que.) 1534 (ii)

- Trades Unions, List (M. for Ret.*) 50 (i).
 ——— Regulations *re* Registry (M. for copies*) 50 (i).
 ——— Rules (M. for Ret.) 46 (i).
 Whale Fishery in Hudson's Bay (Ques.) 826 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J., South Middlesex.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamison*) in Com., 1256 (ii).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com on Res., 1366 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1191 (ii).
 Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2°, 769 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Civil Government* (High Commissioner's contingencies) 106 (i).
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1163 (ii).

Bain, Mr. T., Wentworth.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) on M. for 2°, 995 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Collection of Revenues* (Post Office) 1635 (ii).
Public Works—Capital : (Kingston Graving Dock) 1671. *Income* : Buildings (Ont.) 1539. Roads and Bridges, 1676 (ii).
 Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) for Sel. Com. 35 (i).

Bain, Mr. J. W., Soulanges.

- St. John and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Co.'s B. 7 (Mr. *Vanasse*) 2° m., 530 (i).

Baird, Mr. G. F., Queen's, N. B.

- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 315-351 (i).

Baker, Mr. E. C., Victoria, B. C.

- Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 973 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt., (B. 56, 1°) 309 (i).
 Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co's. (B. 35, 1°*) 124 (i).
 Representation Act Amt., (B. 55, 1°) 309 (i).
 South-Western Ry. Co's incorp. B. 54 (Mr. *Hall*) on M. for 3° (Ques. of Order) 954 (ii)

SUPPLY :

- Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 132 (i).
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1160 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1653 (ii).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. (B. 57, 1°) 309 (i).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 759 (i).

Barron, Mr. J. A., North Victoria, O.

- Bexley Postmaster, appointment (Ques.) 58 (i).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1539 (ii).

Barron, Mr. J. A.—Continued.

- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 944, 1138; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1403; neg. (Y. 59; N. 83) 1404 (ii).

- Fenelon River Navigation (Ques.) 97 (i).

- Gowanlock, Mrs., pension (Ques.) 58 (i).

- compensation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1016 (ii).

- Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1010.

- Ingoldsby Station Post Office (M. for Ret.) 1243 (ii).

- Muskoka and Parry Sound Judicial District (Ques.) 1232 (ii).

- Peace and Athabasca Rivers, Treaty with Indians (Ques.) 825 (ii).

- Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1175 (ii).

- Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2°, 768 (i).

- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 303-309 (i).

- Snetsinger, Mr., employment and dismissal by Govt. (Ques.) 825 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Collection of Revenues* : Canals (Repairs, &c.) 1624 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Sault St. Marie) 1442; (Welland) 1453; (Trent River Nav.) 1454, 1460 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ont) 1539, 1541. Roads and Bridges, 1677 (ii).
 Trent Valley Canal Commission (M. for Ret.) 71 (i).
 Victoria County (Ont.) Postal Service (Ques.) 825 (ii).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., Berthier.

- Criminal Laws, distribution to Justices of the Peace (Ques.) 59 (i).

- Ice-breakers in county of Berthier (Ques.) 45 (i).

- Judges of Provincial Court Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1691 (ii).

- Labor Commission, certified copies of Depositions (Ques.) 171 (i).

- complaints against Chairman (Ques.) 171 (i).

- Instructions issued (M. for copies*) 672 (i).

- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 392-396 (i).

- St. Lawrence River Floods, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 60 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Collection of Revenues* (Oulling, contingencies) 1667 (ii).
Public Works : Harbors and Rivers (Que) 1563 (ii).

Béchar, Mr. F., Iberville.

- St. John and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Co.'s B. 7 (Mr. *Vanasse*) on M. for 2°, 530 (i).

- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 463-467 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Beauharnois.

- St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 66, 1°*) 380 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Civil Government* (Sec. of State) 1641 (ii).

Bergin, Mr. D., Cornwall and Stormont.

Printing Com. (M. to conc. in Repr.) 454 (i).
 South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. Hall) on
 M. for 3^o (Amt.) 6 m. h., 912; neg. (Y. 57; N. 85)
 953 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 1634 (ii).

Bernier, Mr. M. E., St. Hyacinthe.

Criminal Laws, distribution to Justices of the Peace
 (Ques.) 59 (i).

Ice-breakers in county of Berthier (Ques.) 15 (i).
 St. Lawrence River Floods (Ques.) 899 (ii).

Borden, Mr. F. W., King's N.S.

Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cart-
 wright) and Amts., 358-362 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1133 (ii).

Bourassa, Mr. F., St Johns, Q.

Isle aux Noix Wharf (Ques.) 955 (i).

Bowell, Hon. M., North Hastings.

Behring's Sea, Clearances to Vessels (Ans) 44 (i).

Bridges (Ottawa) &c., in Com. of Sup., 1573 (ii).

Buildings in Com. of Sup., 1535 (ii).

Can. Gazette, in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com.,
 1256 (ii).

Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr.
Sproule) 1241 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com.,
 1169 (ii).

— Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 129 (i).

Customs Act Amt. (prop. Res.) 499; (B. 92, 1^o*) 598
 (i); 2^o m., 897; in Com., 898, 946, 1001; M. to conc.
 in Sen. Amts., 1472 (ii).

— Seizures at Quebec, on M. for Cor., 1068 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 1666 (ii).

Debates, Official, distribution to Press (remarks) 752 (i).

Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 in Com., 868 (ii).

Hawke, J. T., impugning Judge's decision, on Ques. of
 Priv. (Mr. Davies) 1301 (ii).

Labor Commission, certified copies of Depositions
 (Ans.) 171 (i).

— Composition and Amounts paid (Ans.) 1468 (ii).

— Cost (Ans.) 494 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).

Logs, Shingle-bolts, &c., Duties collected (Ans.) 86 (i).

N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald)
 in Com., 1481 (ii).

Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1031, 1611 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1431 (ii).

Ry. Commission, distribution of Evidence (Ans.)
 867 (ii).

Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.

Reciprocity with U. S., entry of certain articles free of
 Duty, 521 (i).

— on personal explanation (Mr. Davies) 239 (i).

— Rep. of Minister of Customs (Ans.) 647 (i).

Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 in Com. on Res., 891 (ii).

Rimouski Customs Collector (Ans.) 1067 (ii).

Statistical Diagrams, in Com. of Sup., 1164 (ii).

SUPPLY: (prop. Res. for Com.) 17 (i):

Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners, salaries) 129 (i).

Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1666 (ii).

Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1172 (ii).

Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1031 (ii)

Miscellaneous (*Can. Gazette*) 1611; (Labor Commission) 1658;
 (Printing) 1611; (Statistical Diagrams) 1164 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 1535. Roads and
 Bridges (Ottawa) 1573 (ii).

Trade and Navigation Tables (presented) 18 (i).

Ways and Means—(prop. Res. for Com.) 17 (i).

— The Tariff, in Com., 1129 (ii).

Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M.
 for 2^o, 918 (ii).

Wrecking in American Waters, on M. for papers, &c.,
 665 (i).

Bowman, Mr. I. E., North Waterloo.

Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cart-
 wright) and Amts., 543-547 (i).

Fire Insurance Risks under Dom. License (M. for
 Ret.*) 866 (ii).

Militia Clothing, Tenders and Contracts (M. for Ret.*)
 866 (ii).

Boyle, Mr. A., Monck.

Fraud, Prevention of, by Tree Peddlers, &c. (B. 105,
 1^o*) 899 (ii).

St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. (B 137) M. to
 suspend Rule 61 and 1^o*, 1522 (ii)

Trade Combinations, extension of powers of Sel. Com.
 (prop. M.) 103 (i).

Brien, Mr. J., South Essex.

Life-boat Service, in Com. of Sup., 1578 (ii).

Pelee Island and Mainland Cable, on M. for Com. of
 Sup. (remarks) 1011 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1187 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cart-
 wright) and Amts., 508-511 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia (Military Properties) 1221 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Rewards for Saving Life, &c.) 1578 (ii).

Brown, Mr. A., Hamilton.

Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr.
Sproule) 1240 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com.,
 1438 (ii).

Cruelty to Animals further provision (B. 29, 1^o) 97 (i).

Brown, Mr. A.—Continued.

Fraudulent Practices on Farmers (prop. Res. for Sp. Com.) 1244 (ii).

— examination of Witnesses on Oath (M.) 1382 (ii)

Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1408 (ii).

Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 904 (ii).

Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 288-294 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Capital Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 1462 (ii)

Collection of Revenues (Oustoms) 1666 (ii).

Tobique Valley Ry. Res (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1626 (ii).

White, Hon. Thos., decease of (remarks) 963 (ii).

Bryson, Mr. John, Pontiac.

La Banque Nationale Capital Stock reduction (B. 23, 1°*) 73 (i).

Pontiac and Renfrew Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 42, 1°*) 206 (i).

Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. White, Renfrew) on M. for 2°, 496 (i); on M for Com, 1148 (ii).

Burdett, Mr. S. B., East Hastings.

Culbertson, Archibald, dismissal (M. for Cor.) 977 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners, salaries) 135 (i).

Burns, Mr. K. F., Gloucester.

Tobique, Gypsum and Colonisation Ry. Co.'s (B. 79, 1°*) 489 (i).

Cameron, Mr. H., Inverness.

Cape Breton Ry. Contractors' Sureties (Ques.) 1067 (ii).

Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 1232 (ii).

Isbester & Reid, Messrs., completion of Contract (Ques.) 1067 (ii).

Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 610-611 (i).

SUPPLY:

Quarantine (Medical Inspection) 1197 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A., Kent, O.

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Out.) 1667, 1674 (ii).

Railways—Capital (I.O.R.) 1652 (ii).

Carling, Hon. J., London.

Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).

— deptl. Rep. (Ans.) 26 (presented) 455 (i).

Archives, in Com. of Sup., 1149 (ii).

Buttermaking, Translation of Pamphlet (Ans.) 98 (i).

Cattle Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).

Census, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1155 (ii).

Carling, Hon. J.—Continued.

Cincinnati Centennial Exhibition, Canadian representation (Ans.) 1136 (ii).

Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).

Concurrence, salaries, 1686 (ii).

Contingencies, Deptl, in Com. of Sup., 104 (i).

Criminal and Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1151 (ii).

Emigration from Dakota to Man. (Ans.) 495 (i).

Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1554 (ii).

— in Man. (Ans.) 495 (i).

Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).

"Horse Breeding in Can." Translation of Pamphlet (Ans.) 85 (i).

Lynch's Pamphlet on Dairy Practice, German Translation (Ans.) 496 (i).

Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).

Merrick, Richard, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 647 (i).

Monck, Richard, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 712 (i).

Patents of Invention (B. 38, 1°) 124; Deputy Commissioner (prop. Res.) 125 (i); 2° m. and in Com., 1511; 3° m., 1547 (ii).

Pauper Immigration (Ans.) 964; on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1595 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 1156 (ii).

Regina, accommodation for Immigrants (Ans.) 712 (i).

Royal Military College, conc., 1687 (ii).

Smyth, Henry, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 495, 647 (i).

Statistics, Criminal, Rep. (presented) 1551 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives) 1149; (Census, &c.) 1155; (Colonial and Indian Exhibition) 1638; (Criminal and Health Statistics) 1151; (Experimental Farms) 1154 (ii).

Civil Government (Agriculture) 95; (contingencies) 104 (i).

Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1160; conc., 1886; (Gratuities) 1638; (Pauper) 1156; (Pamphlets) 1160 (ii).

Militia (Royal Military College) conc. 1687 (ii).

Quarantine (Cattle, Que.) 1200; (Medical Inspection) 1195 (ii).

Wateret, P., employment as Immigration Agent (Ans.) 966 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P., K.C.M.G., Quebec County.

Ammunition, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1211 (ii).

Brigade Majors, in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).

Cartridges, Rep. of Commission on Manufacture (Ans.) 1232 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1436 (ii).

Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1212 (ii).

Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 1217 (ii).

Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1213 (ii).

Drill Shed at Quebec, Water Supply (Ans.) 85 (i).

Fenian Raid (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).

Military Branch and District Staff, in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).

Militia and Defence, deptl, Rep. (presented) 18 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P.—Continued.

- Militia, Books relating to Force, French Edition (Ans.) 85 (i).
- Properties, in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
- School, St. Johns (Q.) services of Chaplain, on M. for Ret., 654 (i).
- Neely, Private T., provision for Widow, &c., on M. for Ret., 650 (i).
- Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1600 (ii).
- Permanent Forces, in Com. of Sup., 1219 (ii).
- Properties, in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
- Rebellion of 1885 (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1202, 1205 (ii).
- Strange, Gen., compensation for loss of Pension (Ans.) 140 (i).
- Rep. submitted to Militia Dept. (Ans.) 98 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Civil Government* (Militia and Defence) 92 (i).
- Militia* (Ammunition, &c.) 1211; (Brigade Majors) 1209; (Clothing, &c.) 1212; (contingencies) 1217; (Drill Pay, &c.) 1213; (Military Branch and District Staff) 1209; (Military Properties) 1221; (Permanent Forces) 1219 (ii).
- Pensions* (Fenian Raid) 1201; (Rebellion of 1885) 1202, 1205; (Vets. of 1812) 1201 (ii).
- Veterans of 1837, Pensions (Ans.) 85 (i).
- Veterans of 1866-70, Medals (Ans.) 965 (ii).
- York-Simcoe Battalion, Kit Allowance, on M. for Ret., 68 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J., K.C.M.G., South Oxford.

- Adams, David J., in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).
- Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 1619 (ii).
- Adjournment for Easter (Ques.) 344 (i).
- Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 96 (i).
- depl. Rep. (Ques.) 26 (i).
- Alberta District, N. W. T., Leaseholders (M. for Ret.*) 498 (i).
- Banks and Banking, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 415 (i).
- Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 970 (ii).
- Bridges (Ottawa) in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).
- B. C. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1024 (ii).
- BUDGET, The (Ques.) 97, 822 (i); (reply) 1049 (Amt.) (1061) neg. (Y. 66; N. 117) 1120 (ii).
- Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1466, 1535, 1655 (ii).
- Business of the House (remarks) 125, 416, 457 (i).
- on M. to change hour of meeting, 1500 (ii).
- on M. to meet at 10 a.m., 1625 (ii).
- Can. Gazette, in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).
- Can. Temp. Act, in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).
- on prop. Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 81 (i).
- C. P. R., B.C. Sections (Ques.) 86 (i).
- (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles Tupper) on prop. Res., 1001; in Com., 1377, 1388 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 1223 (ii).
- Lands, Stmt. of Sales (Ques.) 496 (i).
- Mortgage, enquiry for papers, 1586 (ii).
- Mortgage for Guaranteed Bonds (Ques.) 1506 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).
- Cattle Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
- Cayuga, Indian Lands near, appointment of Commissioners (Ques.) 27 (i).
- P. O., purchase of site (Ques.) 28 (i).
- Chambly Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 940 (ii).
- Civil Service Act Amt B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1435, 1469 (ii).
- Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 113, 129 (i).
- Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
- Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1616 (ii).
- Concurrence, 1685 (ii).
- Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditure (M. for Ret.*) 38 (i).
- Consolidation of the Statutes, in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).
- Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 104 (i) 1218, (ii).
- County Judges (Ont.) salaries increase (Ques.) 899 (ii).
- Criminal Procedure Act Amt B. 123 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1513 (ii).
- Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1619, 1644 (ii).
- Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Bowell) in Com., 947, 1400 (ii).
- Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1629, 1666 (ii).
- Débats du Conseil Legislatif, in Com. of Sup., 1662 (ii).
- Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on reading Papers (remarks) 41 (i).
- on Ques. of Order, 721 (i).
- on prop. Res. (Mr. Laurier) 743 (i).
- distribution to Press (remarks) 750 (i).
- Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. to conc. in Res., 1383; in Com. on B., 1388 (ii).
- Delaney, Mrs. (pension) in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Thompson) on M. for 1°, 515 (i); on M. for 2° (Ques.) 942; in Com., 1144 (ii).
- Lands Act Amt B. 131 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 1514; on M. for 3°, 1549 (ii).
- Agents for Man. and N. W. T., Instructions, on M. for Ret., 37 (i).
- Man and N. W. T., Receipts from Sales (Ques.) 44 (i).
- Mines in Com. of Sup., 1635 (ii).
- Dom. Notes, Printing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 90 (i).
- Dorchester Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1021 (ii).
- Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1569 (ii).
- ESTIMATES, The, on presentation, (remarks) 50 (i).
- Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1653 (ii).
- Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
- Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1618, 1667 (ii).
- Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1575 (ii).
- Exports and Imports (M. for Ret.) 28 (i).
- Extra Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1615, 1637 (ii).
- Fabre, Mr. (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1614 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Fisheries Treaty, papers respecting (remarks) 20, 62, 99 (i)
 ——— Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 844-849; in Com., 873 (ii).
 ——— Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1662 (ii).
 ——— Reports, *re* superannuation of Valiquette (remarks) 1507 (ii).
 Franchise Electoral Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 2°, 1550 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1641 (ii).
 Fraudulent Trade Marks on Merchandise Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 943, 1004 (ii).
 Free List, O. C. respecting (remarks) 648 (i).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1405 (ii).
 German Emperor's Death, Official Information (Ques.) 110 (i).
 ——— (late Crown Prince) rumored death (Ques.) 206 (i).
 Govt. Business (remarks) 416, 457 (i).
 Govt. in N. W. T. (expenses) in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).
 Grazing Leases in the N. W. T. (Ques.) 495 (i).
 Gratuities to Canal Employés, in Com. of Sup., 1646 (ii).
 Grenville Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
 Haldimand, Dep. Returning Officer (Ques.) 648 (i).
 ——— (M. to adjn. House) 922, 930 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1462, 1562, 1656, 1674 (ii).
 High Commissioner's contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 105, 109 (i).
 ——— Office, application of Civil Service Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1502, 1506; on M. for 3°, 1547 (ii).
 Hot Springs (roads, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1617 (ii).
 Indemnity, Members, in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
 Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1010 (ii).
 Indian Affairs, in Com. of Sup., 1627 (ii).
 Imperial Federation, on Res. (remarks) 1091 (ii).
 Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1606, 1682 (ii).
 Immigrants, Pauper (Ques.) 934 (ii).
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1595 (ii).
 Inland Revenue Dept., in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
 Insurance Act Amt. B. 126 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1400 (ii).
 I. C. R., Receipts and Expenditure (Ques.) 65, 112 (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1224, 1620, 1651 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 912 (ii).
 Jones, Walter, and Haldimand Election (prop. Res.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1524; neg. (Y. 58; N. 98) 1533 (ii).
 Justice Dept., in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).
 Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1672 (ii).
 ——— Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 162 (i).
 ——— Post Office *re* Defalcations, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1012 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Labor Commission, Evidence before (Ques.) 98 (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, dismissal of Laborers (remarks) 164).
 Life-boat Service, in Com. of Sup., 1578 (ii).
 Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1021 (ii).
 Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1197 (ii).
 Military Branch and District Staff, in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1391 (ii).
 Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 93 (i), 1610, 1683 (ii).
 Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1646 (ii).
 Newfoundland and Confederation, on M. for Cor., 664.
 N.W.T. Representation B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1475; in Com., 1480 (ii).
 Obstructions, &c., in Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1581 (ii).
 O. C.'s collecting, in Com. of Sup., 1618 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Ives*) personal allusions, 524, 555 (i).
 Ottawa, additional Building, in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1231 (ii).
 Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1512 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1595 (ii).
 ——— (Ques.) 964 (ii).
 Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1639, 1671 (ii).
 Printing Bureau, in Com. of Sup., 92 (i), 1616 (ii).
 Printing, in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Davin*) 1093 (ii).
 ——— (Mr. *Mitchell*) Reciprocity deb., 345 (i).
 ——— (Mr. *Mitchell*) despatches *re* admission of Newfoundland into Confederation, 111 (i).
 Post Office and Finance Depts., computing Interest, in Com. of Sup., 112 (i).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1634, 1634 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1186, 1418, 1492 (ii).
 Railways and Canals, Cost (Ques.) 141, 170 (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1637 (ii).
 ——— Dept., in Com. of Sup., 97 (i).
 Real Property in Ter. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1412 (ii).
 Rebellion (1885) Claims of Scouts, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to reconsid., 1243 (ii).
 ——— Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1202, 1205 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) on fixing day for deb., 26 (i).
 ——— Res. First Order of the Day (Ms.) 43, 86 (i).
 ——— attention of Govt. called to Retaliatory Bill 516 (i).
 ——— on M. to adjn. deb. (remarks) 822 (i).
 ——— Protocols (remarks) 74 (i).
 Regina Jail, in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).
 Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. to conc. in Res. and in Com. on B., 931 (ii).
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1646, 1671 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—Continued.

Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1675 (ii).
 Ste. Anne's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
 St. Ours Locks, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 136(i).
 Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1624 (ii).
 Schools, Indian (Man.) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (ii).
 Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 92 (i), 1640, 1668 (ii).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1025, 1668 (ii).
 Sinking Fund, in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).
 Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1620, 1684 (ii).
 Statistical Diagrams, in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).
 Strange, Gen., compensation for loss of Pension (Ques.) 140 (i).
 Subsidies to Provinces, in Com. of Sup., 1604 (ii).
 ——— (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1587 (ii).

Reciprocity with U.S. (prop. Res.) 144-161; neg 646 (i)

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 114, 117; (Exchequer Court) 119 (i); conc., 1695 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives, payment to C. C. Chipman) 1149; (Colonial and Indian Exhibitions) 1638; (Experimental Farms) 1575; (Health Statistics) 1152 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Cornwall) conc, 1637; (Gratuities) 1646; (Grenville) 1459; (Murray) 1646; (Ste. Anne's) 1459; (Tay) 1460; (Welland) conc., 1-88. *Income* (Chambly) 1460; (Miscellaneous) 1646; (Rideau) 1646, 1671; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1624; (St. Ours Locks) 1460; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 1460; (Welland) 1460 (ii).
Charges of Management (Auditor and Asst. Rec. Gen., Winnipeg) 88; (Printing Dom. Notes) 90; (Sinking Fund) 89 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 96; (Auditor General's Office) 95; (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 113, 129; (contingencies) 104; (Fisheries) 96; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 85; (High Commissioner's contingencies) 105, 109 (i); (Indian Affairs) 1627 (ii); (Inland Revenue) 95; (Justice) 91; (Mounted Police) 93; (Post Office and Finance, computing Interest) 112 (i); (Post Office) 1638 (ii); (Printing and Stationery) 92; (Rys. and Canals) 97 (i), 1637 (ii); (Sec. of State) 92 (i), 1640, 1668 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Culling Timber) 1619, 1619, 1684; (Customs) 1629, 1666; (Excise) 1618, 1667; (I.C.R., Repairs, &c.) 1620; (Post Office) 1634, 1684; (Public Works) conc., 1688; (Slides and Booms, salaries, &c.) 1620, 1684 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Income (Mines) 1635 (ii).
Fisheries (David J. Adams) 1656 (ii).
Immigration (Pauper) 1155; (Pamphlets) 1160; (salaries, &c.) conc., 1686 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 1682; (Man. schools) 1691; (Ont. and Que.) 1606 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Indemnities) 1670; (salaries, &c.) 1025; (Sessional Clerks) 1025, 1668. *Miscellaneous* (Franchise Act) 1641; (Library, purchase of books, &c.) 1030 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses, &c.) 1681 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Antwerp and Canada) conc, 1689; (U. S. and Victoria, B.C.) 1680 (ii).
Militia (contingencies) 1217, 1644; (Military Branch and District Staff) 1209 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Can. Gazette) 1611; (Commercial Agencies) 1616; (Consolidation of Statutes) 1663; (Debats du Conseil Legislatif) 1682; (Extra Clerks) 1615, 1637; conc., 1688; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1614; (Fishery Commission) 1662; (Govt. in N.W.T.) 1611; (Govt. Printing Bureau, Plant, &c.) 1616; conc., 1689; (Hot Springs, Banff) 1617; (Labor Com-

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—Continued.

mission) 1659; (O.C.'s, collecting) 1618; (Printing) 1611; (Preparing Returns) conc, 1688; (Royal Military College) conc., 1687; (Statistical Diagrams) 1663 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1610, 1683 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Obstructions in Rivers) 1581; (Rewards for saving Life, &c.) 1578 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.O.) 1034; (Dorchester) 1021 (ii); (Kingston) 122 (i); (Man.) conc, 1686 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 136 (i).
Pensions, 1639; (Mrs. Delaney) 1201; (P.E.I.) 1671; (Rebellion of 1885) 1202, 1642; (Vets. of 1812) 1201 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1653; (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1463; (Harbors and Rivers) 1462; (Kingston Graving Dock) 1672. *Buildings* (Ottawa, additional) 1461. *Income*: Buildings (Man.) 1542; (N.S.) 1466; (N.W.T.) 1672; (Ont.) 1537, 1541; (Que.) 1535 (ii); (Repairs, &c.) 655 (i). *Dredging*, 1563. *Harbors and Rivers*, 1642, 1562, 1656, 1674. *Roads and Bridges*, 1675. *Telegraph Lines*, 1677 (ii).
Quarantine (Oattle, Que.) 1200; (Medical Inspection) 1197 (ii).
Railways—Capital (C.P.R.) 1223; (I.O.R.) 1224, 1651; (Oxford and New Glasgow Ry.) 1231. *Income* (Surveys, &c.) 1460 (ii).
Subsidies to Provinces, 1604 (ii).

Tariff Changes (remarks) 24 (i).

Tay Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, in Com. of Sup., 1574, 1677 (ii).

Thorold Canal, Water Power (Ques.) 647 (i).

Trade Combinations, on prop. M. to extend powers of Sci. Com., 103 (i).

—— B. 138 (Mr. Wallace) on M. to introd., 1545 (ii).

Travis, ex-Judge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 114 (i).

Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).

U. S. and Victoria, B. C., Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1680 (ii).

Ventilation of House of Commons (remarks) 171 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1200, (ii).

Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup. 1201 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Budget, 1049; (Amt.) 1061; neg. (Y. 66; N. 117) 1120 (ii).

—— The Tariff, in Com., 1121 (ii).

Weights and Measures, in Com. of Sup., 1619 (ii).

Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).

—— River, Bridge at Chippawa Village (Ques.) 65 (i).

Windsor Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1623 (ii).

Wrecking Vessels in American Waters, on M. for papers, &c., 667 (i).

Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 754 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E., West Elgin.

Banks, Supervision by Govt., on Res. (Mr. Casgrain) 672 (i).

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) on M. for 2^o, 999 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1438 (ii).

—— Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 130 (i).

Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 1218 (ii).

Calbute Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).

Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Ques. of Order, 720 (i).

—— on Res. (Mr. Laurier) 732 (i).

—— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 823 (ii).

Debt., Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1280 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.

- Fabre, Mr. H (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).
 Fisheries Treaty, bringing down papers (remarks) 63 (i).
 ——— omission of papers (remarks) 142 (i).
 ——— Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 872 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Davies*) 1329 (ii).
 Imperial Federation, on Res. (Mr. *Marshall*) 1078 (ii).
 Labor Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1292 (ii).
 Permanent Forces, in Com. of Sup., 1219 (ii).
 Post Office and Finance Depts., computing Interest, in Com. of Sup., 112 (i).
 Ry. Commission, dstbtn. of Papers (remarks) 867 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., new-paper Cor. re entry of certain articles free of Duty, 493 (i).
 ——— Proposals of Plenipotentiaries, presented (remarks) 88 (i).
 Revenue and Audit Act B. 87 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 891; in Com. on Res., 892 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Canals—Capital* (Culbute) 1460; (Tay) 1460; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 1459 (ii).
Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 130; (Post Office and Finance, computing Interest) 112 (i).
Militia (contingencies) 1218; (Permanent Forces) 1219 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Labor Commission) 1658 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1658 (ii).
 Tay Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
 Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
 Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 777 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. P. B., L'Islet.

- Banks, Supervision by Govt. (Ques.) 18 (i).
 ——— (prop. Res.) 668 (i).
 Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. (Ques.) 73, 516 (i).
 Fisheries Treaty, on non-production of papers (M. to adjn. Hse.) 143 (i).
 Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 120 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Quarantine (Medical Inspection) 1200 (ii).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 964 (ii).

Chairman, The (Mr. C. C. Colby) Stanstead.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 1246 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1254 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1440 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, dismissal of Laborers (Ques. of Order) in Com. of Sup., 1648 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1485 (ii).
 Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1512 (ii).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A., Terrebonne.

- Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 13, 1°) 62 (i).
 ——— Act Amt. (B. 117, 1°) 1063; 2° m. and in Com., 1433 (ii).
 ——— Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 113, 128 (i).
 ——— List, Canada (presented) 172 (i).
 Concurrence, 1689 (ii).
 Criminal Laws, distribution to Justices of the Peace (Ans.) 59 (i).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on presentation of papers, 39 (i).
 ——— on Ques. of Order, 719, 746 (i).
 ——— on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 716 (i).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 138 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1270 (ii).
 Dorchester Election, date of Issue of Speaker's Warrant (Ans.) 27 (i).
 ——— delay in issuing Warrant (Ans.) 59 (i).
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1654 (ii).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. (B. 117, 1°) 1063; 2° m., 1549; (B 5) 3° m., 1536 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1641, 1668 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Davies*) 1302 (ii).
 L'Assomption Election, Issue of Writ (Ans.) 110 (i).
 Printing and Stationery, Public, Act Amt. (B. 60, 1°*) 34 (i); 2° m. and in Com., 1005 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 92 (i); conc. 1689 (ii).
 ——— deptl. Rep. (presented) 138 (i).
 Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1640 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 565-571 (i).
 Sec. of State's Rep (presented) 20 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1590 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 113; (Printing and Stationery) 92 (i); (Secretary of State) 1640, 1668 (ii).
Legislation (Franchise Act) 1641, 1668 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Printing Bureau, Plant, &c.) conc., 1689 (ii).
Pensions, 1640 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1654 (ii).
 Returns, on enquiry for (remarks) 1136 (ii).
 Voters' Lists under Franchise Act, Amount paid (Ans.) 27 (i).
 ——— Revision, Suspension (Ans.) 965 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. J., North Norfolk.

- Boundary between Alaska and Canada (Ques.) 171 (i).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1672 (ii).
 Business of the House, on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Wednesdays, 1061 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 823, 1298 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1263 (ii).
 Dom. Lands Agents in Man. and N.W.T., Instructions, on M. for Ret., 37 (i).
 Fisheries Treaty, papers respecting (Ques.) 62 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1^o, 1063 (ii).
- Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1408 (ii)
- Graving Dock, Kingston, in Com. of Sup., 1672 (ii).
- I. C. R., Receipts and Expenditure (Ques.) 65 (i).
- Kingston Deputy Postmaster's Irregularities (Ques.) 899 (ii).
- Maritime Court of Ont., extension of Jurisdiction (B. 40, 1^o*) 124 (i).
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1281 (ii).
- Order (Ques. of) *re* Reciprocity deb., 523 (i).
- Ry. Act. Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1177 (ii).
- Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amt., 206-223 (i).
- newspaper Cor. *re* entry of certain articles free of Duty, 493, 521 (i).
- Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1446 (ii).
- Shannon, Wm, payment by Govt. of defalcations (Ques.) 965 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Canals—Capital* (Sault Ste. Marie) 1446 (ii).
- Public Works—Income* : Buildings (Ont.) 1672. Kingston Graving Dock, 1672 (ii).
- Ventilation of House of Commons (remarks) 171 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 1672 (ii).
- Welland River, Bridge at Chippawa Village (Ques.) 65 (i).
- Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2^o, 772 (i).
- Wrecking Vessels in American waters, on M. for papers, &c., 667 (i).

Chisholm, Mr. D., New Westminster.

SUPPLY :

- Mounted Police*, 1662 (ii).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., Montmagny.

- Criminal Laws, distribution to Members (Ques.) 86 (i).
- Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com. (Translators) on M. to conc., 1501 (ii).
- Dorchester Election, delay in issuing Warrant (Ques.) 59 (i).
- I. C. R., Receipts and Expenditure (Ques.) 27 (i).
- St. Charles Branch, Expenditure (Ques.) 97 (i).
- Land Villa Postmastership (M. for Ret.) 102 (i).
- Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 294-298 (i).
- Voters' Lists under Franchise Act, Amount paid (Ques.) 27 (i).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R., Centre Toronto.

- Federal Bank of Canada (B. 51, 1^o*) 270 (i).
- Lake Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 37, 1^o*) 124 (i).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R.—Continued.

- N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1496 (ii).
- Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 322-328 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, payment to O. C. Chipman) 1150; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1612 (ii).
- Canals—Capital* (Sault Ste. Marie) 1450 (ii).
- Immigration* (Pauper) 1158 (ii).
- Public Works—Capital* : Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 1462 (ii)

Colby, Mr. C. C., Stanstead.

- Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1298.
- [See also "Chairman" and "Speaker, Deputy."]

Cook, Mr. H. H., East Simcoe.

- Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1462, 1539 (ii).
 - Bridges (Ottawa) in Com. of Sup., 1572 (ii).
 - Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1277 (ii).
 - Engineers, Examination and Licensing provision (B. 103, 1^o*) 899 (ii).
 - Fabre, Mr. (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1613 (ii).
 - Fishery Overseers, in Com. of Sup., 1583 (ii).
 - Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1462, 1568 (ii).
 - High Commissioner's Office, application of Civil Service Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1506 (ii).
 - Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1023 (ii).
 - Midland Harbor Improvements (M. for Cor.*) 1259 (ii)
 - Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
 - N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1496 (ii).
 - Ottawa, additional Building, in Com. of Sup., 1462 (ii).
 - Patents of Invention Act Amt B. 38 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1511 (ii).
 - Penetanguishene Custom House, vacancy, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1020 (ii).
 - Midland, &c., Public Works (Ques.) 647 (i).
 - Ry. Act Amt. (B. 94, 1^o) 598 (i)
 - B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1185 (ii).
 - Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2^o, 762 (i).
 - Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1572 (ii).
 - Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1442 (ii).
 - Sherwood, Mr. A. P., and C. Breton Ry. (Ques.) 965 (ii).
 - Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1590 (ii).
- SUPPLY :
- Canals—Capital* (Murray) 1453; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1442; (Trent River Nav.) 1454 (ii).
 - Fisheries* (salaries, &c., Overseers) 1583 (ii).
 - Indians* (Ont. and Que.) 1607 (ii).
 - Miscellaneous* (Fabre, Mr., salary) 1613 (ii).
 - Penitentiaries* (Man.) 1023 (ii).
 - Public Works—Capital* : Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 1462. Harbors and Rivers, 1462, 1568. *Income* : Buildings (Ont.) 1539. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 1572 (ii).
 - Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1454 (ii).

Cook, Mr. H. H.—Continued.

Ventilation of the House, in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1114, 1120 (ii).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 756 (i).

Costigan, Hon. J., Victoria, N.B.

Adulteration Act Amt. (B. 47, 1°) 238 (i); in Com., 932 (ii).
 Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 1619 (ii).
 Analysis of Intoxicating Liquors (Ans.) 965 (ii).
 Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1619 (ii).
 Excise (salaries, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1618 (ii).
 Ferries Act Amt. (B. 39, 1°) 124 (i); in Com., 895 (ii).
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 122, 1°) 1137; in Com., 1401 (ii).
 Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1620 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Inland Revenue) 95 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Adulteration of Food) 1619; (Culling Timber) 1619; (Excise) 1618; (Slides and Booms) 1620; (Weights and Measures) 1618 (ii).
 Tobacco, Canadian Leaf, Purchase and Sale (Ans.) 66.
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. (Ans.) 97 (i).
 ——— (B. 118, 1°) 1093 (ii).
 ——— salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1618 (ii).

Coughlin, Mr. T., North Middlesex.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1470 (ii).

Coulombe, Mr. C. J., Maskinongé.

Maskinongé and Nipissing Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 52, 1°*) 270 (i).

Couture, Mr. P., Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Buttermaking, Translation of Pamphlet (Ques.) 98 (i).
 Fabre, Mr., in Com. of Sup., 1615 (ii).
 Lake St. John Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 1627 (ii).
 Quebec and Dequen Mail Service (Ques.) 98 (i).
 ——— and Lake St. John Ry. Subsidy (Ques.) 1432 (ii).
 Saguenay and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s transfer (Ques.) 1433 (ii).
 ——— River Buoys, Contract for maintaining, &c. (Ques.) 1433 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1615 (ii).

Curran, Mr. J. J., Centre Montreal.

Analysis of Intoxicating Liquors (Ques.) 965 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1440 (ii).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1407 (ii).
 G. T. R. Co.'s (B. 36, 1°*) 124 (1).
 ——— Double Track, application for assistance (Ques.) 1432 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, dismissal of Laborers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1647 (ii).
 Merchants Marine Ins. Co.'s winding-up (B. 11, 1°*) 62; 2° m., 125; adjd. deb. for 2° rsmd., 322 (i).

Curran, Mr. J. J.—Continued.

Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1289 (ii).
 ——— Govt Relief (Ques.) 27 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 1509 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 310-317 (i).
 South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. *Hall*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 953 (ii).
 SUPPLY.
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1170 (ii).
 Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 921 (i).

Daly, Mr. T. M., Seikirk.

C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1352; in Com., 1382 (ii).
 Church and Manse Building Fund Act Amt. (B. 97, 1°*) 711 (i).
 Great N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 25, 1°*) 85 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H., Queen's, P.E.I.

Allen, Warren, compensation for loss of Ice-boat (M. for Ret.) 833 (ii).
 Adulteration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 934 (ii).
 Archives, in Com. of Sup., 1149 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 971 (ii).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1358 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act. Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 1247 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1247 (ii).
 ——— on Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 83 (i).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 807 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1436-1468 (ii).
 ——— Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 113, 130 (i).
 Criminal Procedure Act. Amt. B. 123 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1173 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 959 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Ques. of Order, 720 (i).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1269; in Com., 1278 (ii).
 Divorce, publication of Evidence (remarks) 1414 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 945 (ii).
 Dom. Notes, Printing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 90 (i).
 Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1154 (ii).
 Fisheries Protection, on M. for adjmnt., 1403 (ii).
 ——— Treaty, omission of papers (remarks) 141 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

- Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 693-704 (i); in Com., 876 (ii).
- Franchise Electoral Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Chapleau) on M. for 1°, 1064 (ii).
- Fraudulent Practices on Farmers, on Res. (Mr. Brown) for Com., 1244 (ii).
- Fraudulent Trade Marks on Merchandise Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1002 (ii).
- Gordon, Commander, Reps. *re* Fishery Protection (M. for copies*) 86 (i), 866 (ii).
- Govt. Savings Banks (Interest on Deposits) B. 127 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 1401 (ii).
- Govt. Wharves and Piers in P.E.I. (Ques.) 935 (ii).
- Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House, 926 (ii).
- Hawke, John T. (Ques. of Priv.) Imprisonment for contempt of Court, 1299 (ii).
- Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1152 (ii).
- I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1225 (ii).
- Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 1401 (ii).
- Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 909 (ii).
- Kent (Ont.) Controverted Election, on M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 22 (i).
- Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii)
- Lévis Graving Dock, Expenditure (Ques.) 1136 (ii).
- Lobster Fishery, Rep. of Commissioners (Ques.) 73; (remarks) 139 (i).
- Merchants Marine Ins. Co.'s B. 11 (Mr. Curran) on M. for 2°, 126 (i).
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1285; in Com. on B., 1391 (ii).
- Northern Light and Steam Communication with P.E.I. (Ques.) 140 (i).
- Northumberland Straits subway, Engineers' Rep., &c., on M. for copy, 663 (i).
- North Sydney (C.B.) Pilots, Rets. to Govt. (Ques.) 1067.
- Onderdonk Arbitration *re* Plant taken over by Govt. under Award (remarks) 112 (i).
- Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1231.
- Personal Explanation *re* speech on Reciprocity, 239 (i).
- P.E.I. Mail Service, Cor., &c. (M. for Ret.) 47 (i).
- Quebec Harbor Commissioners, Amount advanced by Govt. (Ques.) 1232 (ii).
- (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1297; on M. to conc. in Res., 1393 (ii).
- Real Property in Ter. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1412; in Com. on Res., (ii).
- Rebellion (1885) Claims of Scouts, &c., on Res. (Mr. Davin) to reconsider, 1243 (ii).
- Reciprocity with U. S., entry of certain articles free of Duty (remarks) 519 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

- Reciprocity with U.S., newspaper Cor. *re* entry of certain articles free of Duty, 492 (i).
- on Res (Sir Richard Cartwright) 172-183 (i).
- proposals of Plenipotentiaries (remarks) on presentation, 87 (i).
- St. Louis Lake, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
- St. Lawrence River Improvements, Montreal and Lake St. Peter (Ques.) 1135 (ii).
- St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 138 (i).
- Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1442 (ii).
- Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).
- Summary Convictions Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1417 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice* (Miscellaneous) 114, 121 (i).
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics*, (Archives) 1149; (Dominion Exhibition) 1148; (Experimental Farms) 1154; (Health Statistics) 1152 (ii).
- Canals—Capital* (Lachine) 1452; (Lake St. Louis) 1453; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1442 (ii).
- Charges of Management* (Printing Dom. Notes) 90 (i).
- Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners, salaries) 113, 130.
- Legislation*: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1025 (ii).
- Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 138 (i).
- Railways—Capital* (O. P. R.) 1221; (I. O. R.) 1225; (Oxford and New Glasgow Ry.) 1231 (ii).
- Supreme and Exchequer Courts (Ques.) 1011 (ii).
- Terms of Union with P. E. I., carrying out (Ques.) 140 (i).
- Territories Real Property Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1412; on Res., 1416 (ii).
- Travis, ex-Judge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
- Ways and Means—The Tariff*, in Com., 1126 (ii).

Dawson, Mr S. J., Algoma.

- C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1357 (ii).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 945 (ii).
- Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 22, 1°*) 73 (i).
- Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1590 (ii).
- SUPPLY:**
- Canals—Capital* (Sault Ste. Marie) 1442 (ii).
- Indians* (Ont. and Que.) 1605 (i).
- Wrecks on the Great Lakes (M. for Ret.) 19; adjd. deb. rsmd., 723 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F. West Assiniboia.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 1258 (ii).
- C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1363 (ii).
- Civil Service List, Errors, &c. (Ques.) 965 (ii).
- Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 51.
- 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 823, 1298 (ii).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*

- Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 735 (i).
 Debt., Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1267 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) to M. for 3^o, 1404 (ii).
 Dom. Lands Agents in Man. and N.W.T., Instructions, on M. for Ret., 45 (i).
 Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1406 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Davies*) 1326 (ii).
 Imperial Federation, on Res. (Mr. *Marshall*) (remarks) 1091 (ii).
 Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1011 (ii).
 Personal Explanation *re* paragraph in *Evening Telegram*, 270 (i).
 Privilege (Ques. of) "Flies on the Wheel," 1093 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1194 (ii).
 Real Property in Ter. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1412 (ii).
 Rebellion (1885) Claims of Scouts, &c. (prop. Res. to reconsider) 1242 (ii).
 ——— Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1202 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amt., 223-234 (i).
 Regina, accommodation for Immigrants (Ques.) 712 (i).
 SUPPLY:
 Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 120 (i).
 Pensions (Rebellion of 1885) 1202 (ii).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 754 (i).

Davis, Mr. D. W., *Alberta.*

- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. (B. 63, 1^o*) 454 (i).
 Grazing Lands, Lessees and Leases (M. for Ret.*) 866 (ii).
 Inspector of Ranches, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 935 (ii).
 Land Leases, old and unoccupied (Ques.) 825 (ii).
 Mounted Police Headquarters, Edmonton District (Ques.) 965 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1482 (ii).
 Ont., Man. and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 81, 1^o*) 489 (i).
 SUPPLY:
 Indians (B. C.) 1683 (ii).

Denison, Mr. F. C., *West Toronto.*

- Bottles, &c., Owners Protection (B. 3, 1^o*) 27; 2^o m., 759 (i).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1437 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 51 (i).

Denison, Mr. F. C.—*Continued.*

- Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1213 (ii).
 Fenian Raid (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 G. T. R. Crossings in Toronto and decision of Ry. Com. of Privy Council (Ques.) 59 (i).
 Neely, Private T., provision for Widow, &c., on M. for Ret., 650 (i).
 Ry. Accidents reported to Govt. and Actions pending (M. for Ret.*) 62 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1186, 1431, 1469, 1494 (ii).
 Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2^o m., 762 (i); M. to dschg. Order and ref. B. to Com. on B. 24, 1247 (ii).
 SUPPLY.
 Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 1213 (ii).
 Pensions (Fenian Raid) 1201 (ii).
 Telegraph Lines, acquisition by Govt. (M. for Sel. Com.) 101 (i).

Desjardins, Mr. A., *Hochelaga.*

- Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 25 (i).
 (M. to conc.) 51 (i).
 ——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (M. to conc.) 489 (i), 823 (ii).
 ——— 3rd Rep. of Com. (M. to conc.) 1501 (ii).
 ——— dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 744 (i).
 ——— distribution to Press (remarks) 750 (i).
 Criminal Procedure Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1513 (ii).
 Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House, 928 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1292 (ii).
 ——— Govt. Relief (Ques.) 27 (i).
 Montreal Island Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70, 1^o*) 454 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1186 (ii).
 SUPPLY.
 Administration of Justice, conc., 1685 (ii).

Dessaint, Mr. A., *Kamouraska.*

- Léduc, Chas., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 140 (i).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amt., 203-205 (i).

Dickinson, Mr. G. L., *Carleton, O.*

- Fraternal and Benevolent Societies incorp. (B. 115) 1^o, 1062 (ii).

Doyon, Mr. C., *Laprairie.*

- Caughnawaga Indians, Election of Chiefs (M. for Cor., &c.) 899 (ii).
 ——— (Ques.) 1680 (ii).
 ——— Survey of Reserve (Ques.) 495 (i), 1680 (ii).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*

- St. Hyacinthe Public Buildings (M. for Ret.) 651 (i).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 396-401 (i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., West Ontario.

- Adulteration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 933 (ii).
- Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 96 (i).
- Behring's Sea, Clearances to Vessels (Ques.) 44 (i).
- Navigation by Canadian Vessels (Ques.) 44 (i).
- Seizures, on M. for Cor., 973 (ii).
- Bresaylor Half-breeds, Grievances, &c. (remarks) on adjnmt. of House, 1259 (ii).
- on M. for Com. of Sup., 1515 (ii).
- Bottles and Vessels, &c., Protection to Owners B. 3 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2°, 761 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 1245 (ii).
- Can. Fishing Vessels reporting, &c. (Ques.) 24 (i).
- C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1372; in Com. on B., 1389; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1587 (ii).
- Mortgage, Security for Bonds (Ques.) 1195 (ii).
- Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 936 (ii).
- Copyright, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 98 (i).
- Counterfeit Money, Advertising, B. 108 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1138 (ii).
- Criminal Law of England (extension to Mau.) B. 41 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1402 (ii).
- Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on presentation of papers, 41 (i).
- on Ques. of Order, 721 (i).
- distribution to Press (remarks) 751 (i).
- Divorce Bills, on M. (Mr. *Small*) to suspend Rule 65, 1468 (ii).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 942; in Com., 944, 1138 (ii).
- Ferries Act Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 895 (ii).
- Fisheries Commission, Instructions (Ques.) 270 (i).
- Trade Matters, Date of proposal (Ques.) 112.
- Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 861; in Com., 863 (ii).
- papers respecting (remarks) 101 (i).
- further papers respecting (remarks) 238 (i).
- Fraudulent Trade Marks on Merchandise Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1004 (ii).
- (M. for Ret.) 653 (i).
- Free List, O.C. respecting (remarks) 649 (i).
- Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1405 (ii).
- Great N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *Daly*) on M. for 2°, 123 (i).
- Amount deposited with Govt. (Ques.) 141 (i).
- Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House, 930 (ii).
- Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1007 (ii).
- Insolvency, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 495 (i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—Continued.

- Insurance Act Amt. Bill 126 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1401 (ii).
- Man. and North-Western Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Scarth*) on M. to recom., 953 (ii).
- Man. and N. W. T. Ry. Bills, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to withdr., 1585 (ii).
- Merchants Marine Ins. Co's. B. 11 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 126 (i).
- Militia and Defence Dept., in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
- Monck, Richard, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 899 (ii).
- N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1485 (ii).
- Ont. and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 1432 (ii).
- Oriental, Rep. of Inspector Risley on Loss (Ques.) 966 (ii).
- Patents of Invention, on Res. (Deputy Commissioner of Patents) 125 (i).
- Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1511.
- Post Office, Montreal, Electric Light (Ques.) 1625 (ii).
- Printing Dom. Notes, Contract (M. for copy) 649 (i).
- Printing and Stationery, Public, Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1005 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 93 (i).
- Procedure in Criminal Cases Act Amt. B. 48 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 942 (ii).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1175, 1417, 1492; on M. for 3°, 1507; (Amt.) 1507; neg. (Y. 54; N. 93) 1510 (ii).
- Rebellion of 1885 (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1208 (ii).
- Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 890; in Com., 932, 943 (ii).
- St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co's B. 61, on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1315 (ii).
- Sailors, Protection against Wrecks, &c., Legislation (Ques.) 966 (ii).
- Securities to the Crown, Discharge B. 4 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 762 (i).
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1403 (ii).
- SUPPLY:
- Civil Government (Agriculture) 96; (Militia and Defence) 92; (Printing and Stationery) 93 (i).*
- Pensions (Rebellion of 1885) 1208 (ii).*
- Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) for Sel. Com., 29; (Amt.) 31 (i).
- Treason and Felony Forfeitures Abolition B. 88 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1147 (ii).
- "Trusts" or "Combines" (M. for Sel. Com.) withdn., 60 (i).
- Welland Canal, deepening Section "A" (Ques.) 496 (i).
- Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 918 (ii).
- Wrecking Vessels in American Waters (M. for papers, &c.) 665 (i).

Eisenhauer, Mr. J. D., Lunenburg.

- Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 78°-790 (i).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 903 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1588 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 1465 (ii).
 Dredging, 1570 (ii).
 Fisheries (Bounty, expenses, &c.) 1604 (ii).

Ellis, Mr. J. V., St. John, N.B., City.

- Albert Ry. Co.'s Loan Account (Ques.) 826 (ii).
 Banks, Supervision by Govt., on Res. (Mr. Casgrain) 672 (i).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1468 (ii).
 Cavalry and Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1220 (ii).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 936 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1274 (ii).
 Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1570 (ii).
 Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 857 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1563 (ii).
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1229 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 906 (ii).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. to conc. in Res., 1397 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 335-344 (i).
 St. John Harbor Improvements, Mr. Peley's Rep. (Ques.) 86 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1593 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Militia* (Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1220 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Water Police) 1581 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) 1468. Dredging, 1570. Harbors and Rivers, 1563 (ii).
Railways—Capital (I.O.R.) 1229 (ii).
 Tobique Valley Ry. (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1626 (ii).
 Water Police, in Com. of Sup., 1581 (ii).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., Leeds and Grenville.

- Debates, Official, distribution to Press (remarks) 752 (i).

Ferguson, Mr. F., South Renfrew.

- Ottawa and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 75, 1°*) 454 (i).

Ferguson, Mr. J., Welland.

- Buffalo, Chippawa and Niagara Falls Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 67, 1°*) 415 (i).

Ferguson, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Can. Southern and Erie and Niagara Ry. Co.'s (B. 9, 1°*) 51 (i).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1267 (ii).
 Detroit River Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 31, 1°*) 110 (i).
 Great Western and Lake Ont. Shore Junction Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 18, 1°*) 73 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 458-463 (i).
 St. Clair River Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 17, 1°*) 73 (i).

Fiset, Mr. J. B. R., Rimouski.

- Fortin, N., accident on I. C. R. (M. for Cor.) 902 (ii).
 Gauvreau, Dr. E. D., grant for preparing Vaccine (Ques.) 140 (i).
 I. C. R., Matane Branch Line Subsidy (Ques.) 1299 (ii).
 Matane and Rivier Blanche Wharves (Ques.) 1067 (ii).
 Mégantic county Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 1232.
 Public Works in Rimouski county, Expenditure (Ques.) 1067 (ii).
 Quarantine Service of Can. (M. for Sp. Com.) 657 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 612-613 (i).
 Rimouski Customs Collector (Ques.) 1097 (ii).

Fisher, Mr. S. A., Brome.

- Can. Temp. Act, Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 982; (Amt.) 984; in Com., 1245 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) on M. for 2°, 938, 998; in Com., 1249 (ii).
 ——— on Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 78 (i).
 ——— (remarks) 922 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. Laurier) 742 (i).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1574 (ii).
 Imperial Federation, on Res. (Mr. Marshall) 1081 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 802 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1423 (ii).
 Repairs, &c., to Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1543 (ii).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1027, 1069 (ii).
 Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Ry. Co.'s (B. 73, 1°*) 454 (i).
 ——— M. to suspend Rules, 1563 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Legislation*: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1027; (Sessional Clerks) 1669 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Experimental Farms) 1574; (Repairs, &c.) 1543 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1127 (ii).

Flynn, Mr. E. P., Richmond, N.S.

- Cape Breton Ry., Cor. re Sims & Slater (M. for copies*) 1259 (ii).

Flynn, Mr. E. P.—*Continued.*

- Fishery Bounty Cheques, distribution (Ques.) 823 (ii).
Lobster Commissioners Rep (M. for copies) 86 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 571-576 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *King's, N. B.*

- Atlantic Ocean, obstructions to Shipping (Ans.) 1432.
Behring's Sea Seizures (Ans.) 779 (i).
—— on M. for Cor., 968 (ii).
Buoys (maintenance, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1582 (ii).
Can. Temp. Act, on Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 82 (i).
Can. Fishing Vessels, reporting, &c. (Ans.) 24 (i).
Cap Chat and Grand Vallée Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 1233 (ii).
Culling, in Com. of Sup., 1668 (ii).
Fisheries, Bounty Cheques, distribution (Ans.) 825 (ii).
—— (expenses, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1604 (ii).
—— Protection, appointment of Magistrates (Ans.) 826 (ii).
—— on M. for adjmnt. (Ans.) 1403. (ii).
—— Overseers (salaries, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1583 (ii).
—— Reps. *re* superannuation of Valiquette (Ans.) 1506 (ii).
—— Steamers (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup. 1603 (ii).
—— Treaty, papers respecting (remarks) 100 (i).
—— Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 813-820 (i); in Com., 868 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1673 (ii).
International Regulations *re* Trading and other Vessels (Ans.) 826 (ii).
Life-boat Service, in Com. of Sup., 1577 (ii).
Lobster Commissioners Rep., on M. for Ret., 86 (i).
—— Fisheries, Restrictions, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1554 (ii).
Marine, deptl. Rep. (presented) 138 (i).
McCuaig, Mr. A. F., appointment as Exciseman at Picton (Ans) 1432 (ii).
Northern Light and Alert, Cor., Tels, &c., on M. for Ret., 827 (ii).
—— and Steam Communication with P.E.I. (Ans.) 141 (i).
—— Cor. *re* Captain (remarks) 456 (i).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1560 (ii).
—— Employés, papers (Ans.) 1601 (ii).
North Sydney (C.B.) Pilots, Rets. to Govt. (Ans.) 1067 (ii).
Obstructions, &c., in Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1531 (ii).
Oriental, Rep. of Insp. Risley on Loss (Ans.) 966 (ii).
P. E. I., Winter Navigation (Ans.) 712 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 183; (Amt.) 194; agreed to (Y. 124; N. 67) 646 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

- Reciprocity with U.S. (remarks) on personal explanation (Mr. *Davies*) 240 (i).
Saguenay River Buoys, Contract for maintaining, &c. (Ans.) 1433 (ii).
Sailors, Protection against Wrecks, &c., Legislation (Ans.) 966 (ii).
Salmon Rivers (Hudson's Bay) Lease (Ans.) 8.6 (ii).
Ships' Safety Act Amt. (B. 112, 1°) 1000; M. to dschg. Order for -°, 14'3 (ii).
Signal Service, in Com. of Sup., 1582 (ii).
Stag Island (Ont.) Lighthouse (Ans.) 1174 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt (B. 99, 1°) 750 (i); in Com., 1402 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Fisheries) 96 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Culling, contingencies) 1668 (ii).
Fisheries (Govt. Steamers, &c.) 1603; (Life-boat service) 1577; (Obstructions, &c., in Rivers) 1581; (Overseers salaries, &c.) 1583 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Buoys, &c., maintenance) 1582; (Lighthouses, &c.) 1681; (Signal Service) 1582 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Water Police and investigation into wrecks) 1579 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N.B) 1673 (ii).
Surveys, Lakes Superior and Huron conc., 1638 (ii).
Vessels, overloading, Legislation respecting (Ans) 130 (i).
Water Police, in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
Whale Fishery in Hudson's Bay (Ans.) 826 (ii).
Wrecks, investigation, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 20, 754 (i).

Freeman, Mr. J. N., *Queen's, N. S.*

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*), 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 993; in Com., 1256 (ii).
—— on Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 77, 86 (i).
Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House, 929 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 499-508 (i).

Gigault, Mr. G. A., *Rowville.*

- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 274 (i).

Gillmor, Mr. A. H., *Charlotte.*

- Debates, Official, distribution to Press (remarks) 750 (i).
Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 912 (ii).
Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1292 (ii).
Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. to conc. in Res., 1399 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 635-642 (i).

Gillmor, Mr. G. H.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY :

Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1169 (ii).*Ways and Means*—The Tariff, in Com., 1130 (ii).**Girouard, Mr. D.**, *Jacques Cartier.*

G. T. R. Double Track, application for assistance (Ques.) 1432 (ii).

Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House 927 (ii).

Kent, Representation of (remarks) 309 (i).

Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1288 (ii).Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1296 (ii).**Gordon, Mr. D. W.**, *Vancouver Island.*

Behring's Sea Seizures (M. for Cor.) 966 (ii).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis*

Hadlow Cove Pier, extension (Ques) 140 (i).

St. Lawrence River Navigation Repeal (B. 23, 1°*) 97 (i).

Coal Supply to Govt., Tenders, &c., for past year (M. for Ret.*) 866 (ii).

Guillet, Mr. G., *West Northumberland.*Ellis, J. V., Esq., M.P., and Annexation (Ques.) 44 (i).
Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) for Sel. Com., 31 (i).—— B. 138 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to introd., 1545; M. to add clause, 1691 (ii).

Vessels, overloading, Legislation respecting (Ques) 140 (i).

Haggart, Mr. J. G., *Lanark.*Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to recom., 1245 (ii).—— B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) on M. for 2° (M. to adjn. deb.) 995; neg. (Y. 44; N. 88) 1000; in Com., 1258 (ii).—— on Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 84 (i).

Exchequer Court contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 121 (ii).

Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1407 (ii).Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Davin*), 1093 (ii).Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 527-532 (i).South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. *Hall*)
Speaker's attention called to expiration of time for Private Bills, 916 (ii).Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1587 (ii).**Haggart, Mr. J. G.**—*Continued.*

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 121 (i).Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 496 (i).Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2° m., 770 (i).**Hall, Mr. R. N.**, *Sherbrooke.*

Bank of London winding-up (B. 80) on M. to ref. back to Com., 963 (ii).

Hereford Branch Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act. Amt. (B. 33, 1°*) 110 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1177, 1429 (ii).South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54, 1°*) 270 (i);
on Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) 6 m. h., to M. for 3°, 914 (ii).**Hesson, Mr. S. R.**, *North Perth.*Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1240 (ii).

Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on printing papers (remarks) 43 (i).

—— distribution to Press (remarks) 750 (i).

Govt. Savings Banks, Interest on Deposit B. 127 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1401 (ii).Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Davies*) 1331 (ii).Ry. Act. Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1499 (ii).Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 583-588 (i).

Sarnia and Port Huron submarine Tunnel (Ques.) 1432 (ii).

Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1026 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1449 (ii).*Legislation*: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1026. Miscellaneous (Library, salaries, &c.) 1030 (ii).

Supreme Court Librarian, in Com. of Sup., 1030 (ii).

Trade Combinations B. 138 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to introd., 1545 (ii).*Ways and Means*—The Tariff, 1113, 1129 (ii).**Hickey, Mr. C. E.**, *Dundas.*Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 1245 (ii).—— B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1250 (ii).

Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 50, 1°*) 270 (i).

Privilege (Ques. of) paragraph in *Evening Journal re* New York, Waddington and Ottawa Ry. Co., 778 (i).Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1498 (ii).Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 483-487 (i).

Holton, Mr. E., Chateauguay.

Dom. Plate Glass Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 32, 10*) 110 (i).
 Ry. Commission, distribution of Rep. (Ques.) 778 (i).
 — Evidence (Ques.) 867 (ii).
 Wateret, P., employment as Immigration Agent (Ques.) 964 (ii).

Hudspeth, Mr. A., Victoria, O.

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital (Trent Riv. Nav.) 1456 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 467–473 (i).

Innes, Mr. J., South Wellington.

Banking Act (General) Amt. (Ques.) 19 (i).
 Banks, Supervision by Govt., on Res. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 669 (i).
 Libel Law, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 141 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1181, 1423 (ii).

Ives, Mr. W. B., Richmond and Wolfe.

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com. (Amt.) 984 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on presentation of papers, 40 (i).
 — on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 722 (i).
 Neely, Private T., provision for Widow, &c., on M. for Ret., 651 (i).
 Order (Ques. of) reference to paragraph in *Free Press*, 524 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., entry of certain articles free of Duty, 522 (i).

Jamieson, Mr. J., North Lanark.

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 978; in Com. on Amt. (Mr. *Ives*) 984; in Com., 1245 (ii).
 — (B. 10, 1°) 52 (i); 2° m., 935–994; in Com., 1247 (ii).
 — on Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 75 (i).
 — (remarks) 922 (ii).
 Privilege (Ques. of) deb. on Prohibition, 867 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (prop. Res.) 827 (ii)

Joncas, Mr. L. Z., Gaspé.

Address, The (seconded) 7 (i).
 Cap Chat and Grand Vallée Fisheries (M. for Ret.) 1232 (ii).
 Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 854 (ii).
 Ste. Anne des Monts, &c. (M. for Ret.) 1233 (ii).

Jones, Mr. H. L., Digby.

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 605 (i).

Jones, Hon. A. G., Halifax.

Adams, David J., in Com. of Sup., 1657 (ii).
 Adulteration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 933 (ii).
 Ammunition, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1211 (ii).
 Antwerp and Canada Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1679 (ii).
 Barracks (B.C.) in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).
 Bridges (Ottawa) in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1466 (ii).
 Buoys, in Com. of Sup., 1582 (ii).
 C.P.R., in Com. of Sup., 1223 (ii).
 Cap Chat and Grand Vallée Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 1233 (ii).
 Cape Breton Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1230 (ii).
 Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 935 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1470 (ii).
 — Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 132 (i).
 Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1212 (ii).
 Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 897; in Com., 898, 946 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1629 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1275; in Com., 1279 (ii).
 Divorce, publication of Evidence (remarks) 1414 (ii).
 Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1151 (ii).
 Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1570 (ii).
 Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1213 (ii).
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1654 (ii).
 Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 113 (i).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1154, 1574 (ii).
 Fenian Raid (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 Fisheries Commission, Chart showing delimitation (remarks) 646 (i).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).
 — Protection (remarks) on adjnmt. of Hse., 1403.
 — Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 779, 786 (i); in Com., 869 (ii).
 — non-ratification by U. S., Policy of Govt. (Ques.) 1433 (ii).
 — Overseers (salaries, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1583, 1602 (ii).
 — Reports, re superannuation of Valiquette (Ques.) 1506 (ii).
 — Steamers (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1603.
 — Bounty (expenses, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1603.
 Franchise Electoral, Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1°, 1064; on M. for 2°, 1550 (ii).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1405 (ii).
 Govt. Savings Banks (Interest on Deposits) B. 127 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 1332 (ii).

Jones, Hon. A. G.—Continued.

- Halifax and St. John Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
- Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1561, 1673 (ii).
- Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1153 (ii).
- High Commissioner's Office, application of Civil Service Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1504 (ii).
- Hot Springs, Banff (construction, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (ii).
- Insurance Act Amt. B. 126 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1401 (ii).
- I. C. R., Expenditure on Capital Account (M. for Ret.) 103 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 1224, 1645, 1650 (ii).
- Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 905, 911 (ii).
- Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
- Lake St. Louis Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
- Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1196, 1207 (ii).
- Military Properties, in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1282; in Com., 1294 (ii).
- N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1486 (ii).
- Ottawa, additional Building, in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).
- Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1230.
- Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1600 (ii).
- Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. 33 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1511 (ii).
- Permanent Forces, in Com. of Sup., 1219 (ii).
- Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1632 (ii).
- Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1296; in Com., 1298; on M. to conc. in Res., 1391 (ii).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1422 (ii).
- Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2°, 762 (i).
- Rebellion of 1885 (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1202, 1207.
- Receiver Gen., Halifax, in Com. of Sup., 88 (i).
- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amt., 246; (Amt. to Amt.) 257; neg. (Y. 67; N. 124) 646 (i).
- Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1542, 1668 (ii).
- Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1671 (ii).
- Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1677 (ii).
- Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1218 (ii).
- Lake St. Louis, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
- Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1446 (ii).
- Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 1001; on M. to dschg. Order for 2°, 1473 (ii).
- Statistical Diagrams, in Com. of Sup., 1665 (ii).
- Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1588 (ii).

Jones, Hon. A. G.—Continued.

SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice* (Miscellaneous) 119 (i).
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Dominion Exhibition) 1151; (Experimental Farms) 1154, 1574; (Health Statistics) 1153 (ii).
- Canals—Capital* (Lachine) 1452; (Lake St. Louis) 1453; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1446; (Tay) 1459; (Williamsburg) 1453
- Incoms* (Rideau) 1671; (Trent River Nav.) 1460 (ii).
- Charges of Management* (Receiver Gen., Halifax) 88 (i).
- Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 132 (i); (Post Office) 1638 (ii).
- Collection of Revenues* (Customs) 1629; (Post Office) 1638; (Public Works) 1632; (Railways, repairs, &c.) 1668 (ii).
- Fisheries* (David J. Adams) 1657; (Fishing Bounty) 1603; (Overseers salaries, &c.) 1583, 1602; (Steamers, repairs, &c.) 1603 (ii)
- Immigration* (Agents salaries, &c.) 1160; (Pamphlets) 1158 (ii).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Maintenance of Buoys) 1682 (ii).
- Mail Subsidies* (Antwerp and Canada) 1679; (Halifax and St. John) 1678 (ii)
- Miscellaneous* (Banff Springs, construction, &c.) 1666; (Fishery Commission) 1663; (Statistical Diagrams) 1665 (ii).
- Militia* (Ammunition, &c.) 1211; (Barracks, B. C.) 1644; (Clothing, &c.) 1212; (contingencies) 1644; (Drill Pay, &c.) 1213; (Military Properties) 1221; (Permanent Forces) 1219; (Royal Military College) 1218 (ii).
- Ocean and River Service* (Maintenance, &c.) 1577; (Water Police) 1580; (Wrecks, investigation, &c.) 1578 (ii).
- Pensions* (Fenian Raid) 1201; (N. W. T.) 1642; (Rebellion of 1885) 1202, 1207 (ii).
- Public Works—Capital* (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1463; (Esquimaux Graving Dock) 1654. Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 1461. *Income*: Buildings (N. S.) 1466; (Repairs, &c.) 1542. Dredging, 1570. Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1561, 1673; (P.E.I.) 1562. Roads and Bridges, 1571, 1677. Telegraph Lines, 1574, 1678 (ii).
- Quarantine* (Medical Inspection) 1196, 1207 (ii).
- Railways—Capital* (C.P.R.) 1223; (I.O.R.) 1224, 1645, 1650; (Cape Breton Ry.) 1230; (Oxford and New Glasgow Ry.) 1230 (ii).
- Tay Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1459 (i).
- Telegraph Lines, in Com. of Sup., 1574, 1678 (ii).
- Tobique Valley Ry., Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1626 (ii).
- Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- Water Police, in Com. of Sup., 1580 (ii).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff, in Com., 1125 (ii).
- Williamsburg Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
- Wrecks, investigation, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1578 (ii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E., Halifax.

- Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 787 (i).
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1167 (ii).
- Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 907 (ii).
- Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. to conc. in Res., 1395 (ii).
- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 381–392 (i).

Kirk, Mr. J. A., Guysborough.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1256 (ii).
- Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).
- Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1570 (ii).

Kirk, Mr. J. A.—Continued.

Eastern Extension Ry., Tenders for Fencing (M. for copies*) 866 (ii).
 ——— Refund to Municipalities (M. for Cor.) 903 (ii).
 Eight Island Lake Post Office (Ques.) 86 (i).
 Fisheries and Fishing (B. 58, 1°) 309 (i).
 Lobster Commissioners' Rep., on M. for copies, 86 (i).
 ——— Fisheries, Restrictions, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1551 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 593-598 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1463. *Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 1467. Dredging, 1570. Telegraph Lines, 1574 (ii).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A., Frontenac.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com. 1436 (ii).
 Concurrence, 1687 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on reading papers (remarks) 41 (i).
 Divorce Bills, on M. (Mr. *Small*) to suspend Rule 65, 1468 (ii).
 Merchants Marine Ins. Co's. B. 11 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 126 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1177, 1493, (ii).
 Royal Military College, conc., 1687 (ii).
 St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co's B. 137 (Mr. *Boyle*) in Com., 1522 (ii).
 Securities to the Crown, &c., Discharge (B. 4) 2° m., 761 (i).
 SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Miscellaneous) 1647 (ii).
Militia (Royal Military College) conc., 1687 (ii).
Pensions (N.W.T.) 1644; (Veterans of 1812) 1202.
 Wrecked Vessels Aid (B. 7, 1°) 44; 2° m., 770 (i), 918; 2° neg. (Y. 61; N. 84) 921 (ii).
 Wrecking Vessels in American Waters, on M. for papers, &c., 667 (i).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 754 (i).

Labelle, Mr. J. B., Richelieu.

Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1029 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues (Culling, contingencies) 1668 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1029 (ii).

Labrosse, Mr. S., Prescott.

Prescott and Russell Judicial District, Vacancy (Ques.) 27 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G., South Grey.

Books for Mechanics' Institutes, removal of Duties (Ques.) 899 (ii).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1655 (ii).
 Brant and Haldimand Indian Reserves, appointment of Doctor (Ques.) 647 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—Continued.

Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 738 (i).
 Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1216 (ii).
 Emigration from Dakota to Man. (Ques.) 495 (i).
 Employés, Public Service of Canada (Ques.) 495 (i).
 Experimental Farm at Grenfell, N.W.T. (M. for Cor. &c.*) 866 (ii).
 Indemnity to Members, in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, dismissal of Laborers, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1650 (ii).
 Lynch's Pamphlet on Dairy Practice, German Translation (Ques.) 496 (i).
 Macdonald, Geo. J., and Centennial Exhibition of 1876 (M. for papers*) 866 (ii).
 N.W.T. Representation B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1483 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1598 (ii).
 Post Office Irregularities, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1021 (ii).
 Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1189, 1427, 1492 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 476-483 (ii).
 ——— Rep. of Min. of Customs, re entry of certain articles free of Duty (Ques.) 554, 647 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Privy Council Office) 91 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Indemnities) 1670 (ii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 1216 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Water Police) 1579 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1655 (ii).
 Water Police, in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
 Winkler, Mrs. Barbara, payment for loss of Registered Letter (Ques.) 750 (i).

Landry, Mr. P. A., Kent, N. B.

Business of the House, on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Wednesdays, 1061 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1250 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 823 (ii).
 Fishery Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 860 (ii).
 Travis, ex-Judge, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 116 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 116 (i).

Langelier, Mr. C., Montmorency.

Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 728 (i).
 Halle, Rev. Charles, Pet. for protection against Artillery practice (M. for copy*) 672 (i).

Langelier, Mr. F., East Quebec.

- Bridges (Ottawa) in Com. of Sup., 1572 (ii).
 Bridge at Que., Govt. aid (Ques.) 1625 (ii).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1584 (ii).
 Cartridge Factory, &c., Water Supply (M. for Cor.*) 1092 (ii).
 Customs Seizures at Quebec (M. for Cor.) 1068 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com. (Translators) on M. to conc., 1501 (ii).
 Diamonds, Seizure from D. Levi (M. for Cor.*) 1092 (ii).
 I.C.R., claim of A. Pion & Co., for damages (M. for Cor.*) 1392 (ii).
 Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1196 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release Bill 134 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1290; in Com., 1294 (ii).
 North Stukely Postmaster, resignation (M. for O. C's. &c.*) 1092 (ii).
 Ocean Mail Service, Tenders (M. for copies) 1067 (ii).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1297 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1177 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1592 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Public Works—Incomes*: Buildings (Que.) 1534. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 1572 (ii).
Quarantine (Medical Inspection) 1198 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Water Police) 1581 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L., K. C. M. G., Three Rivers.

- Alberton Harbor, increasing Depth (Ans.) 712 (i).
 Albert Ry. Co.'s Loan Account (Ans.) 826 (ii).
 Allen, Warren, compensation for loss of Ice-boat, on M. for Ret., 833 (ii).
 Business of the House (remarks) 125; (M) to change hour of meeting, 1500 (ii).
 Bridges (Ottawa) in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1461, 1533, 1655 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. (remarks) 922 (ii).
 C. P. R., B. C. Sections (Ans.) 86 (i).
 ——— Guaranteed Bonds (prop. Res.) 1001 (ii).
 Cape Breton Ry. Contractors' Sureties (Ans.) 1067 (ii).
 ——— Steam Dredge, substitute (Ans.) 1432 (ii).
 Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).
 Caughnawaga Indians, Election of Chiefs, on M. for Cor., &c., 901.
 Cayuga P. O., purchase of Site (Ans.) 28 (i).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s (B. 101) on Res., 778 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1469 (ii).
 Claves, Mr. G., late M. P., deceased (remarks) 62 (i).
 Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Amyot) on M. for 1°, 18; on Order for 2°, 73 (i).
 Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 52 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—Continued.

- Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 489 (i), 824; (Amt.) 1298 (ii).
 ——— distribution of extra copies *re* Reciprocity deb. (remarks) 239 (i).
 ——— distribution to Press (remarks) 751 (i).
 ——— dismissal of Translators, on reading papers (remarks) 42, 128 (i).
 Divorce Bills, on M. (Mr. Small) to suspend Rule 65, 1468 (ii).
 Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1569 (ii).
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1653 (ii).
 Estimates, suppl., papers *re* certain Items (remarks) 1433 (ii).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1574 (ii).
 Fisheries Commission, Chart showing delimitation (remarks) 647 (i).
 ——— Commissioners' Instructions (Ans.) 270 (i).
 ——— Treaty, further papers respecting (remarks) 239 (i).
 Fortin, Noël, accident on I.C.R., on M. for Cor., 962 (i).
 Gauvreau, Dr. E. D., grant for preparing Vaccine (Ans.) 140 (i).
 German Emperor's Death, Official Information (Ans.) 110 (i).
 Great N. W. Central Ry. Co., Amount deposited with Govt. (Ans.) 141 (i).
 G. T. R. Double Track, application for assistance (Ans.) 1432 (ii).
 Hadlow Cove Pier, extension (Ans.) 140 (i).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1462, 1561, 1655, 1673 (ii).
 Ice-breakers in the county of Berthier (Ans.) 45 (i).
 I. C. R. (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1620 (ii).
 ——— Matane Branch Line Subsidy (Ans.) 1299 (ii).
 Inverness and Richmond Ry. Subsidy by Govt. (Ans.) 1232 (ii).
 Isbester & Reid, Messrs., completion of Contract (Ans.) 1067 (ii).
 Isle aux Noix Wharf (Ans.) 965 (ii).
 Kent, representation (remarks) 270 (i).
 King, James, claim of, M. to substitute name on Sp. Com., 1245 (ii).
 Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1672 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, discharge of Laborers (Ques. of Order) 1564 (ii).
 Labor Commission, complaints against Chairman, (Ans.) 171 (i).
 ——— Evidence before (Ans.) 38 (i).
 Land Leases, old and unoccupied (Ans.) 825 (ii).
 Land Villa Postmastership, on M. for Ret., 102 (i).
 Leduc, Chas., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 140 (i).
 Man. and N. W. T. Ry. Bills (M. to withdr.) 1585 (ii).
 ——— Legislation (remarks) 1403 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—Continued.

- Matane and River Blanche Wharves, repairs (Ans.) 1067 (ii).
 Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
 Merchants Marine Ins. Co.'s B. 11 (Mr. Curran) on M. for 2°, 126 (i).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1283; in Com., 1294, 1391 (ii).
 ——— Relief by Govt. (Ans.) 27 (i).
 Morin, Dr. J. A., claim for services, on M. for copy, 656 (i).
 Newfoundland and Confedrn., on M. for Cor., 664 (i).
 Northumberland Straits Subway, Engineers' Reps., &c., on M. for copy, 664 (i).
 Ocean Mail Service, on M. for copies of Tenders, 1067 (ii).
 Olivier, Geo., dismissal as Postmaster, on M. for Cor., 655 (i).
 Ont. and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 1432 (ii).
 Ottawa, additional Building, in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).
 ——— River Improvements for Timber, &c., on M. for Stmt. of cost, 827 (ii).
 Papineauville Harbor, dredging (Ans.) 495 (i).
 Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1598 (ii).
 Peace and Athabasca Rivers, Treaty with Indians (Ans.) 825 (ii).
 Pelée Island and Mainland Cable, on M. for Pets., &c., 827 (ii).
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1012 (ii).
 Penetanguishene, Midland, &c., Public Works (Ans.) 647 (ii).
 Pinette Harbor, dredging of Bar (Ans.) 140 (i).
 Point Tupper Ry. Pier, Tenders (Ans.) 1299 (ii).
 Post Office, Montreal, Electric Light (Ans.) 1625 (ii).
 Prince Edward Co. Election, admitting Member on certificate (M.) 380 (i).
 ——— construction of Public Works (Ans.) 1432 (ii).
 Printing and Stationery Dept., in Com. of Sup., 93 (i).
 Private Bills, Rep. from Com., Ms. to extend time, 514 (i), 1031 (ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Mitchell) re Disallowance (remarks) 111 (i).
 ——— (Mr. Laurier) dismissal of Debates Translators (remarks) 128 (i).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 833 (ii).
 Public Works in Rimouski county, expenditure (Ans.) 1067 (ii).
 Public Works Rep. (presented) 18 (i).
 Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Subsidy (Ans.) 1432 (ii).
 ——— Harbor Commissioners (Jévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1297 (ii).
 Rys. and Canals, Cost (Ans.) 170 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—Continued.

- Rys. and Canals, Dept., in Com. of Sup., 96 (i).
 Ry. Commission, copies of Rep. (Ans.) 646, 778 (i).
 ——— Cost (Ans.) 494 (i).
 Repairs, &c., to Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1542, 1655 (ii).
 Returns, on enquiry for (remarks) 1131, 1433 (ii).
 Revenue and Audit Act B. 87 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 891 (ii).
 Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1571, 1675 (ii).
 Robertson, Mr. Alex., decease of (remarks) 61 (i).
 Russell Representation, Issue of Writ (Ans.) 516 (i).
 ——— (M.) to admit Member on certificate of Returning Officer, 1415 (ii).
 Ste. Anne des Monts, &c., on M. for Ret., 1236 (ii).
 St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s B. 61, on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1345 (ii).
 St. Hyacinthe Public Buildings, on M. for Ret., 653 (i).
 St. Johns and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Co.'s B. 7 (Mr. Vanasse) on M. for 2°, 531 (i).
 St. John Harbor Improvements, Mr. Perley's Rep. (Ans.) 86 (i).
 St. Lawrence River Floods (Ans.) 899 (ii).
 ——— on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 60 (i).
 ——— Navigation, Montreal and Quebec, on M. for Ret., 71 (i).
 Saguenay and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s transfer (Ans.) 1433 (ii).
 Sarnia and Huron Submarine Tunnel (Ans.) 1432 (ii).
 Saufage, P. E. I., Improvement of Navigation, Rep. of Engineer, on M. for copy, 71 (i).
 Select Standing Coms. (M. to add names) 598 (i).
 Sessional Clerks, number and amounts paid (Ans.) 1299 (ii).
 Sherwood, Mr. A. P., and Cape Breton Ity. (Ans.) 965 (ii).
 Slides and Booms (salaries) in Com. of Sup., 1624 (ii).
 Snetsinger, Mr., employment and dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 825 (ii).
 Strathroy Public Buildings, selection of Site (Ans.) 66 (i), 1174 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1593 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
 Civil Government (Public Printing and Stationery) 93; (Railways and Canals) 96 (i).
 Collection of Revenues (Public Works) 1622; (Rys., I.O.R.) 1620; (Slides and Booms, salaries, &c.) 1684 (ii).
 Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 1461. (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1463; (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1653; (Harbors and Rivers) 1462; (Kingston Graving Dock) 1672. Income: Buildings (Experimental Farms) 1574; (Man.) 1542; (N.B.) 1468; (N. S.) 1465; (N.W.T.) 1672; (Ont.) 1655; (Que.) 1533; (Repairs, &c.) 1542, 1655. Dredging, 1566. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1563, 1673; (N.S.) 1561, 1673; (N.W.T.) 1655; (Ont.) 1566, 1655; (P.E.I.) 1562; (Que.) 1563, 1674. Roads and Bridges, 1571, 1675. Telegraph Lines, 1677. Miscellaneous, 1678 (ii).
 Quarantine (Medical Inspection) 1200 (ii).
 Telegraph Lines acquisition by Govt., on M. for Sel Com., 102 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—Continued.

Terms of Confederation, non-fulfilment with P. E. I.
(Ans.) 86 (i).

Thorold Canal, Water Power (Ans.) 647 (i).

Tignish and Miminegash Breakwater (Ans.) 86, 712 (i).

Trent Valley Canal Commission, on M. for Ret., 72 (i).

Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 322, 497 (i).

Ventilation of House of Commons (remarks) 171 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 1200, 1672 (ii).

Welland Canal, deepening Section "A" (Ans.) 496 (i).

Wharves and Piers in P.E.I. (Ans.) 965 (ii).

White, Hon. Thomas, decease of (remarks) 962 (ii).

Wood Island Harbor, P.E.I., dredging (Ans.) 140 (i)

Laurie, Gen. J. W., Shelburne.

Antwerp and Canada Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup.,
1679 (ii).

Atlantic Ocean, obstructions to Shipping (Ques.) 1433

Campbellton and Gaspé Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup.
1678 (ii).

Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).

Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1215 (ii).

Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*)
on M. for 2°, 790-793 (i).

Imperial Federation (remarks) on Res. (Mr. *Marshall*)
1091 (ii).

Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with
(M. for Cor.) 903, 911 (ii).

Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks)
1596 (ii).

Permanent Forces, in Com. of Sup., 1219 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 371-377 (i).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1167 (ii).

Mail Subsidies (Antwerp and Canada) 1679; (Campbellton
and Gaspé) 1678 (ii).

Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 1215; (Permanent Forces) 1219 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Dredging, 1571 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal Commission, Cor., &c., on M. for
Ret., 72 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1132 (ii).

York-Simcoe Battalion, Kit Allowance, on M. for Ret.,
70 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W., East Quebec.

Address, on The, 9 (i).

— to Gov. Gen., Farewell (seconded) 1586 (ii).

Adulteration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com.,
932 (ii).

Bresaylor Half-breeds, Grievances, &c., on M. for Com.
of Sup., 1521 (ii).

Bridge at Quebec, Govt. aid (Ques.) 1625 (ii).

Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1466, 1533, 1654 (ii).

Business of the House, on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to
take in Wednesdays, 1061 (ii).

— on M. to take in Thursdays, 711 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.

Can.; Temp. Act. Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for
2°, 979; in Com., 981; on Amt. (Mr. *Ives*) 984; on
M. to recom., 1245 (ii).

— on Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com.
of Sup., 75 (i).

C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*)
on Res., 1001; on M. for Com., 1339; in Com., 1379;
(Amt.) 1345; neg. (Y. 63; N. 111) 1370; in Com.,
1389 (ii).

— Lands, sold and unsold, acreage (Ques.) 1174,
1195 (ii).

Cattle Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).

Caughnawaga Indians, election of Chiefs, on M. for
Cor., &c., 902 (ii).

Choquette, Mr., M.P., Pet. against return (objection)
1332, 1458 (ii).

Cincinnati Centennial Exhibition, Canadian representa-
tion (Ques.) 1136 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com.,
1434, 1471 (ii).

Clayes, Mr. G., late M. P., decease of (remarks) 62 (i).

Criminal Procedure Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. *Thompson*)
in Com., 1513 (ii).

Concurrence, 1685 (ii).

Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1668, 1684 (ii).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc.,
489 (i), 824, 1298 (ii).

— 3rd Rep. of Com. (Translators) on M. to conc.,
1501 (ii).

— distribution of extra copies *re* Reciprocity deb.
(remarks) 239 (i).

— distribution to Press (remarks) 751 (i).

— dismissal of Translators (Ques. of Priv.) 20,
39 (i).

— on presentation of papers by Mr. *Speaker*,
39, 128 (i).

— (prop. Res.) 713; on Amt (Sir *John A. Mac-*
donald) 747; Res. neg., 749 (i).

— on Ques. of Order, 719 (i).

Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M.
for Com. on Res., 1265 (ii).

Disallowance of Man. Ry. Acts (M. for Cor.*) 672 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in
Com., 946, 1143 (ii).

Dom. Lands Agents in Man. and the N. W. T., Instruc-
tions, on M. for Ret., 37 (i).

Easter, adjmt. for (remarks) 415 (i).

Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup.,
119 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on
M. for 3°, (Amt.) neg. (Y. 53; N. 74) 1587 (ii).

— B. 117 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1°, 1063; on
M. for 2°, 1550 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 1642 (ii).

Fraudulent Practices on Farmers, on Res. (Mr. *Brown*)
for Sp. Com., 1244 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.

- Fraudulent Trade Marks on Merchandise Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1002 (ii).
- Fisheries Treaty, papers respecting (remarks) 20, 98, 141 (i).
- Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 851-854; in Com., 871 (ii).
- Fortin, Noël, accident on I.C.R., on M. for Cor., 902 (ii).
- Gowanlock, Mrs., claim for compensation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks), 1017 (ii).
- G. T. R. Co.'s Agreements B. 26 (Mr. *Small*) on M. to authorise Ry. Com. to divide Bill, 415 (i).
- Haldimand, Dep. Returning Officer, on M. to adja Hse., 925 (ii).
- Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1673 (ii).
- High Commissioner's Office, application of Civil Service Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1503 (ii).
- Indemnity to Members (remarks) 1586, 1670 (ii).
- I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1226 (ii).
- Kingston Post Office defalcations, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1017 (ii).
- Kent, Ont., Controverted Election, on M (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to ref. Judge's Rep. to Sel. Com. on Priv. and Elec., 18, 20 (i).
- Representation, Issue of Writ (remarks) 381 (i).
- L'Assomption Election, Issue of Writ (Ques.) 110 (i).
- Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
- Merchants Marine Ins. Co.'s B. 11 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 127 (i).
- Montmagny Representation, Pet. against return of Member Elect (remarks) 1332, 1458 (ii).
- Nesly, Private T., provision for Widow, &c., on M. for Ret., 651 (i).
- Newfoundland and Confederation (M. for Cor.) 664 (i).
- N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 454 (i), 1475; in Com., 1485 (ii).
- Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1697 (ii).
- Plumb, Hon. J. B., decease of (remarks) 124 (i).
- Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1685 (ii).
- Printing and Stationery, Public, Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com. (remarks) *re* absence of Dep. Speaker, 1006 (ii).
- Private Bills, Reps. from Com, on M. to extend time, 514 (i).
- Privilege (Ques. of) dismissal of Debates Translators, 20, 39, 128 (i).
- *re* Disallowance (Mr. *Mitchell*) 111 (i).
- Quarantine Service of Can., on M. (Mr. *Fiset*) for Sp. Com., 661 (i).
- Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., and in Com., 1296 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.

- Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1182, 1418; on M. for 3°, 1508 (ii).
- Ry. Commission, distribution of Rep. (remarks) 778 (i).
- Ry. Employés B. 5 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 917.
- Real Property in Ter. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1412 (ii).
- Rebellion Losses Commission, Reps. (M. for copy) 73.
- Reciprocity with U. S., newspaper Cor. *re* entry of certain articles free of Duty, 491 (i).
- on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 554-565 (i).
- Repairs, &c, to Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1655 (ii).
- Returns, enquiry for, 1136, 1433 (ii).
- Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 891 (ii).
- Robertson, Mr. Alex., decease of (remarks) 62 (i).
- Russell Representation, Issue of Writ (M.) 416, 455 (i).
- (Ques.) 499, 516, 525 (i).
- St. Hyacinthe Public Buildings, on M for Ret., 653 (i).
- St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 137.
- Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1641 (ii).
- Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1027 (ii).
- Slides and Booms (salaries) in Com. of Sup., 1684 (ii).
- Standing Committees (M. to ad l names) 823 (ii).
- Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res, 1546; in Com., 1590 (ii).
- SUPPLY:
- Administration of Justice* (Miscellaneous) 114, 119 (i); conc., 1685 (ii).
- Civil Government* (Sec. of State) 1641 (ii).
- Collection of Revenues* (Culling Timber) 1638, 1684; (Post Office) 1685; (Slides and Booms, salaries, &c.) 1684 (ii).
- Indians* (Ont and Que.) 1606 (ii).
- Legislation*: House of Commons (Indemnities) 1670; (salaries, &c.) 1047. Miscellaneous (Franchise Act) 1642 (ii).
- Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 137 (i); conc, 1686 (ii).
- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 1466; (N. W. T.) 1672; (Ques.) 1533, 1654; (Repairs, &c.) 1655. Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1673 (ii).
- Quarantine* (Cattle, Que) 1200; (Medical Inspection) 1200 (ii).
- Railways—Capital* (I.O.R.) 1226 (ii).
- Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 964 (ii).
- Travis, ex-Judge, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 114 (i).
- White, Hon. Thomas, decease of (remarks) 962 (ii).
- Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 917 (ii).
- Lavergne Mr. J., Drummond and Arthabaska.**
- Hay Duties by U.S., Refund (Ques.) 712 (i).
- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amt., 234-237 (i).
- Lister, Mr. J. F., West Lambton.**
- Adams, David J.*, in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
- Arkona Postmaster, dismissal (Ques.) 712 (i).
- on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1019 (ii).
- Banks, Supervision by Government, on Res. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 671 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*

- Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1465 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 1250 (ii).
 Clothing, &c. (Militia) in Com. of Sup., 1212 (ii).
 Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1151 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 51 (i).
 Debt., Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1267 (ii).
 Ellis, J. V., Esq., M.P., and annexation, objection taken to Ques. put by Mr. Guillet, 45 (i).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1405 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Davies) 1324 (ii).
 Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1152 (ii).
 Indian Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1009.
 Kettle and Stoney Point Reserves, claims of Indians (M. for Ret.*) 1259 (ii).
 Midland Harbor Improvements (M. for Cor.*) 1259 (ii).
 Monck, Richard, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 712 (i).
 N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 1483 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. McNeill) in Com. of Sup., 1208 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1189, 1420, 1494; on M. for 3^o (Amt.) 1507, 1509 (ii).
 Ry. Crossings Provisions (B. 111, 1^o) 964 (ii).
 Ry. Employes Protection B. 5 (Mr. Denison) on M. for 2^o, 765 (i).
 Sault Ste Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1443 (ii).
 Smyth, Henry, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 495 (i).
 Stag Island Lighthouse, construction (M. for Cor.*) 1259 (ii).
- SUPPLY:**
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics. (Archives, care of, payment to C. C. Chipman) 1149; (Criminal Statistics) 1151; (Health Statistics) 1152 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1443; (Trent River Nav.) 1454 (ii).
Fisheries (David J. Adams) 1658 (ii).
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1161 (ii).
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 1212 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 1465 (ii).
- Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Sel. Com., 31 (i).
 Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1454 (ii).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 758 (ii).

Lovitt, Mr. J., Yarmouth.

- Banks, Supervision by Govt., on Res. (Mr. Casgrain) 672 (i).
- SUPPLY:**
Fisheries (Overseers salaries, &c.) 1602 (ii).
Lighthouses and Coast Service (Lighthouses, &c.) 1583, 1681 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Halifax and St. John) 1678 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging, 1571. Harbors and Rivers (N. S.) 1561, 1673 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Water Police) 1580 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A., G.C.B., Kingston.

- Address, on the, 12 (i).
 — His Ex.'s reply (presented) 172 (i).
 — Farewell, to His Ex. (M.) to consider, 1561 (ii).
 — (M.) to conc., 1586 (ii).
Adams, David J., in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).
 Administration of Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1^o*) 2 (i).
 Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
 Banks and Banking, Legislation respecting (remarks) 415 (i).
 Barracks, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 971 (ii).
 Books for Mechanics' Institutes, removal of Duties (Ans.) 899 (ii).
 Boundary between Alaska and Canada (Ans.) 171 (i).
 Boundaries of Ont. (Ans.) 823 (i).
 Bridge at Que., Govt. aid (Ans.) 1625 (ii).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1673 (ii).
 Business of the House (remarks) 139, 416, 498, 711 (i); 1061, 1259, 1332 1507, (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 2^o, 979; in Com., 1247 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).
 — on Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 75 (i).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1388 (ii).
 — Lands held by Govt. west of Man. (Ans.) 1174 (ii).
 — Taxes (Ans.) 495 (i).
 — sold and unsold, acreage (Ans.) 1174, 1195 (ii).
 Cattle Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 Caughnawaga Reserve, Election of Chiefs, &c. (Ans.) 1680 (ii).
 — Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 1680 (ii).
 Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1242 (ii).
 Choquette, Mr., M.P., Pet. against return (remarks) 1332 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1440 (ii).
 Compensation for Injuries, in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).
 Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 104 (i), 1644, 1667 (ii).
 Culbertson, Archibald, dismissal, on M. for Cor. 978 (ii).
 Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1667, 1684 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators (remarks) 20 (i).
 — on presentation of papers, 39 (i).
 — on Res. (Mr. Laurier) (Amt.) 747; agreed to (Y. 113; N. 61) 749 (i).
 — (Ques. of Order) 719 (i).
 — 3rd Rep. of Com. (Translators) on M. to conc. 1501 (ii).
 Delaney, Mrs. (pension) in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 Divorce, publication of Evidence (remarks) 1414 (ii),

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1143 (ii).
 Dom. Exhibition, in Com of Sup., 1149 (ii).
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B., M. to introd. withdn., 1232.
 — (B. 131) 1°*, 1382; 2° m., 1514; 3° m., 1548 (ii).
 — (Mines) in Com of Sup., 1635 (ii).
 Easter, Adjamt. for (Ans.) 344; (remarks) 415; (M.) 494 (i).
 Employés in Public Service of Can. (Ans.) 495 (i).
 Excoise, in Com. of Sup., 1667 (ii).
 Extra Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1615, 1637; conc., 1688.
 Fabre, Mr. (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1613 (ii).
 Fisheries Treaty, papers respecting, omission (remarks) 141 (i).
 — Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 849-851 (ii).
 — non-ratification by U. S., Policy of Govt. (Ans.) 1433 (ii).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1°, 1066 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1642 (ii).
 Fraudulent Practices on Farmers, on Res. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sp. Com., 1244 (ii).
 Free List, O. C., respecting (remarks) 643 (i).
 German Emperor (late Crown Prince) rumored death (Ans.) 206 (i).
 Govt. Business (remarks) 139, 416, 498 (i).
 — Legislation respecting (remarks) 1507 (ii).
 — (M.) to take in Thursdays, 711 (i).
 — (M.) to take in Wednesdays, 1061 (ii).
 — (M.) to take in Saturdays, 1259 (ii).
 — (M.) to take in Mondays, 1332 (ii).
 Govt. in N. W. T. (expenses) in Com. of Sup., 1611.
 Gold as Legal Tender (Ans.) 171 (i).
 Gowanlock, Mrs., claim for compensation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1016 (ii).
 Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1639 (ii).
 Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House, 926 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1562 (ii).
 Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1153 (ii).
 High Commissioner's contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 107 (i).
 — Office, application of Civil Service Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1506 (ii).
 Hot Springs (roads, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1617, 1666 (ii).
 Imperial Federation, on Res. (Mr. *Marshall*) (remarks) 1091 (ii).
 Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1007 (ii).
 Indian Affairs, in Com of Sup., 1637 (ii).
 Indemnity to Members (remarks) 1586, 1670 (ii).
 Insolvency, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 495 (i).
 Inspector of Ranches, Duties (Ans.) 965 (i).
 Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 27 (i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

I. C. R. (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1623 (ii).
 Jubilee Address to the Queen, Mess. from His Ex., despatch from Colonial Sec. conveying thanks of Her Majesty, 24 (i).
 Kent (Ont.) Controverted Election (M.) to ref. Judge's Rep. to Sel. Com. on Priv. and Elec., 18, 19; on adjd. deb., 23; agreed to on a div., 24 (i).
 — Representation, Issue of Writ (remarks) 381, 494 (i).
 — Issue of Writ (Ans.) 499 (i).
 Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 123 (i).
 — Post Office defalcations, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1014, 1020 (ii).
 Labor Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1659 (ii).
 Library of Parl., in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
 Man, Lunatic Asylum, in Com. of Sup., 1666 (ii).
 Man. and N. W. T. Ry. Bills, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to withdr., 1586 (ii).
 Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1199 (ii).
 Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 24, 27, 173 (i), 1231 (ii).
 Monk, Richard, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 899 (ii).
 Mounted Police Headquarters, Edmonton District, (Ans.) 965 (ii).
 — Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 499 (i).
 — Dept., in Com. of Sup., 93 (i).
Northern Light, Cor. re Captain (Ans.) 416 (i).
 N. W. T. Legislation, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1231 (ii).
 — Representation Act Amt. (B. 76, 1°) 454 (i); (prop. Res.) 1174; 2° of B. m., 1473; in Com., 1480.
 Oaths of Office. See "Administration."
 O'Donoghue, W. F., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 899 (ii).
 Order (Ques. of) deb. objected to, Orders of the Day having been called, 554 (i).
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 1371 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1598 (ii).
 Plumb, Hon. J. B., decease of (remarks) 124 (i).
 Printing and Stationery, Public, Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com. (remarks) re absence of Dep. Speaker, 1006 (ii).
 Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 90 (i).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Mitchell*) re Disallowance (remarks) 111 (i).
 — (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) Reciprocity deb., 345.
 Quarantine Service of Can., on M. (Mr. *Fiset*) for Sp. Com., 661 (i).
 Rys. in Can., Cost up to Jan., 1888 (Ans.) 141 (i).
 Rebellion (1885) Claims of Scouts, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to reconsider, 1243 (ii).
 — Total Cost (Ans.) 171 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on fixing day for discussion (remarks) 27 (i).
 — newspaper Cor. re entry of certain articles free of Duty, 490, 522 (i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- Repairs to Buildings, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1623; conc., 1688 (ii).
 Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 894 (ii).
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1671 (ii).
 Russell Representation, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) for Mr. Speaker to Issue Writ, 416, 455 (i).
 — Issue of Writ (Ans.) 499, 525, 554 (i).
 Schools, Indian (Man.) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (ii).
 Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
 Select Standing Committees (M.) 2 (i).
 — (M.) for Sp. Com. to prepare Lists, 17 (i).
 — Com. appointed, Rep. presented, 20 (i).
 — Lists presented, 25 (i).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1028, 1669 (ii).
 Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1684 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture, and Statistics* (Dom. Exhibition) 1149; (Health Statistics) 1153 (ii).
Canals—Income (Rideau) 1671 (ii).
Civil Government: (Agriculture) 96; (contingencies) 104; (High Commissioner's contingencies) 107 (i); (Indian Affairs) 1637 (ii); (Mounted Police) 93; (Privy Council) 90; (Sec. of State) 92 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Culling Timber) 1667, 1684; (Excise) 1667; (Slides and Booms, salaries, &c.) 1684 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Income (Mines) 1635 (ii).
Fisheries (David J. Adams) 1656 (ii).
Geological Survey, 1604 (ii).
Immigration (Gratuities) 1639 (ii).
Indians (B. C.) 1682; (Man., schools) 1681; (Man. and N.W.T.) 1605; (Ont. and Que.) 1605 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Members Indemnity) 1670; (Salaries, &c.) 1028; (Sessional Clerks) 1669. Miscellaneous (Franchise Act) 1642; (Library of Parlt.) 1638 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, conc., 1690 (ii).
Militia (Barracks, B. C.) 1644; (contingencies) 1644 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Springs, construction, &c.) 1666; (Can. Temp. Act) 1612; (Compensation for Injuries) 1612; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1613; (Govt. Expenses, N. W. T.) 1611; (Labor Commission) 1659; (Man. Asylum) 1666; (preparing Returns) 1615, 1637; conc., 1688 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1661, 1683 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 123 (i).
Pensions 1201, 1639, 1643 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1673; conc., 1688. Harbors and Rivers, 1562 (ii).
Quarantine (Oattle, Que.) 1201; (Medical Inspection) 1199 (ii).
 Terms of Union with P. E. I., carrying out (Ans.) 140 (i).
 Trade Combinations B. 138 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to introd., 1545 (ii).
 — M. to suspend Rule 78, as to number of Sel. Com., 36 (i).
 Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) on Ques. of Procedure, 1148 (ii).
 Veterans of 1812 (Pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1202 (ii).
 Wrecking Vessels in American Waters, on M. for papers, &c., 666 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., East Huron.

- Can. Temp. Act, on Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 76 (i).
 O'Donoghue, W. F., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 899 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 276–287 (i).
 SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 1155; (Health Statistics) 1153 (ii).

Madowall, Mr. D. H., Saskatchewan.

- Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert incorp. (B. 15, 1^o*) 62 (i).
 N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2^o, 1477; in Com., 1483 (ii).
 Rebellion (1885) Claims of Scouts, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to reconsider, 1242 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Mounted Police (expenses) 1611 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 1610 (ii).

Mackenzie, Hon. A., East York.

- Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 969 (ii).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1383 (ii).
 Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1242 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1435 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1262 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1144 (ii).
 Fisheries Treaty, production of Papers (remarks) 65 (i).
 Fraudulent Practices on Farmers, on Res. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sp. Com., 1241 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., on Mr. Speaker's ruling (remarks) 1301 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2^o, 1473; in Com., 1480 (ii).
 Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1512 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 832 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1177 (ii).
 Rebellion (1885) Claims of Scouts, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to reconsider, 1243 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1588 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Miscellaneous) 1646 (ii).
Civil Government (contingencies) 104 (i).
Militia (Barracks, B. C.) 1644 (ii).
Railways—Capital (I. C. R.) 1645, 1650 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. D., North Simcoe.

- Business of the House, on M. to take in Wednesdays, 1062 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. D.—Continued.

Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 6, 1°) 44; 2° m., 973; in Com., 980 (ii).
 Imperial Federation, on Res. (Mr. *Marshall*) 1069 (ii).
 Letters Patent (Defective) Act Amt. (B. 4, 1°) 44 (i).
 Ry. Employés Protection (B. 5, 1°) 44 (i); adjnd. deb. rsmd., 916 (ii).

McCulla, Mr. W. A., Peel.

York Farmers Colonisation Co.'s (B. 107, 1°*) 1031 (ii).

McDonald, Mr. J. A., Victoria, N.S.

Point Tupper Ry. Pier, Tenders (Ques.) 1299 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1252 (ii).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., Cape Breton.

Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 864 (ii).

McIntyre, Mr. P. A., King's, P.E.I.

Naufrage, P.E.I., Improvement of Navigation, Rep. of Engineer (M. for copy) 70 (i).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 487-489 (i).

McKay, Mr. A., Hamilton.

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1591 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 1215 (ii).

McKeen, Mr. D., Cape Breton.

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 547-553 (i).

McLelan, Hon. A. W., Colchester.

Arkona Postmaster, dismissal (Ans.) 712 (i).
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1019 (ii).
 Bexley Postmaster, appointment (Ans.) 59 (i).
 Civil Service List, typographical errors (Ans.) 966 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan, B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1266 (ii).
 Eight Island Lake Post Office (Ans.) 86 (i).
 Fort McLeod and Pincher Creek Mail Service (Ans.) 712 (i).
 Ingoldsby Station Post Office, on M. for Ret., 1244 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 912 (ii).
 Kingston Deputy Postmaster's irregularities (Ans.) 899 (ii).
 — defalcations, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1013 (ii).
 Lakes Huron and Superior Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
 Letter Carriers, Town of Barrie (Ans.) 1299 (ii).
 Lotbinière Mail Service (Ans.) 98 (i).

McLelan, Hon. A. W.—Continued.

Mégantic County Mail Service, Contract (Ans.) 825, 1232 (ii).
 Northumberland, N.B., Mail Service (remarks) 1382.
 Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 20 (i).
 Post Office and Finance Depts., computing Interest, in Com of Sup., 112 (i).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1633, 1638, 1684 (ii).
 P. E. I. Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 50, 52, 58 (i).
 Quebec and Dequen Mail Service (Ans.) 98 (i).
 Shannon, Wm., defalcations, payment of by Govt. (Ans.) 965 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Post Office and Finance, computing Interest) 112 (i); (Post Office) 1638 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 1684 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Lakes Huron and Superior) 1678 (ii).
 Victoria (B.C.) superannuation of Postmaster (Ans.) 826 (ii).
 Victoria County (Ont.) Postal Service (Ans.) 825 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1093-1101 (ii).
 Winkler, Mrs. Barbara, payment for loss of Registered Letter (Ans.) 750 (i).

McMillan, Mr. J., South Huron.

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1428 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amt., 194-199 (i).
 Privilege (Ques. of) Reciprocity deb., 345 (i).
 Weights and Measure Acts Amt. (Ques.) 97 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J., North Wellington.

Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1540, 1655 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1253 (ii).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1345 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1223 (ii).
 Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1241 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1435 (ii).
 — Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 135 (i).
 Colonisation and Homestead Inspectors, N.W.T., &c. (M. for Ret.*) 866 (ii).
 — in N.W.T. and Man. (M. for Ret.*) 498 (i).
 Contingencies, deptl., in Com. of Sup., 104 (i).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1272 (ii).
 Dom. Lands Agents Instructions, &c., 45 (i).
 — in Man. and N.W.T., Instructions (M. for Ret.) 36 (i).
 Experimental Farm in N.W., Rep of Prof. Saunders (M. for Ret.*) 498 (i).
 Fabre, Mr. (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).
 Fort McLeod and Pincher Creek Mail Service (Ques.) 712 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Govt. in N.W.T. (expenses) in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).
 Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1639 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1674 (ii).
 High Commissioner's contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 109 (i).
 — application of Civil Service Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1504 (ii).
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1225, 1645 (ii).
 Jones, Walter, and Haldimand Election, on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1532 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, dismissal of Laborers, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1648 (ii).
 Letter Carriers, Town of Barrie (Ques.) 1299 (ii).
 Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1032 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 1488 (ii).
 Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Carling) in Com., 1512 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1598 (ii).
 Post Office and Finance Depts., computing Interest, in Com. of Sup., 112 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1186 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 441-454 (i).
 Repairs, &c., to Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1542 (ii).
 Returns (enquiry) 1136 (ii).
 Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1675 (ii).
 St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co. vs. the Queen, Sums paid for Costs (M. for Ret.*) 20 (i).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 136.
 Sessional Clerks, number and amounts paid (Ques.) 1299. — in Com. of Sup., 1030, 1668 (ii).
 Smyth, Henry, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 495, 647. — (M. for Ret.*) 866 (ii).
 Strathroy Public Buildings, Site (M. for Ret.*) 498 (i). — (Ques.) 1174 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Civil Government* (contingencies) 104; (High Commissioner's contingencies) 109; (Post Office and Finance, computing Interest) 112; (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 135 (i).
Immigration (Gratuities) 1639.
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 1608 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1030; (Sessional Clerks) 1030, 1668 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1612; (Govt. in N.W.T.) 1611 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 1022 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 136 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1540, 1655; (Repairs, &c.) 1542. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1674. Roads and Bridges, 1675 (ii).
Railways—Capital (C. P. R.) 1223; (I. C. R.) 1225, 1645 (ii).
 Trade Combinations B. 138 (Mr. Wallace) on M. to introd., 1545 (ii).
 Victoria (B.C.) superannuation of Postmaster (Ques.) 826 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1128 (ii).
 Winkler, Mrs. Barbara, payment for loss of Registered Letter (Ques.) 750 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A., North Bruce.

- Behring's Sea Seizures; on M. for Cor., 972 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1436, 1470 (ii).
 Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1616 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. Laurier) 713 (i).
 Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1639 (ii).
 Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House, 928 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1569 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 906 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of (M. that Com. rise) in Com. of Sup., 1208 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1157 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1190, 1419, 1496; on M. for 3°, 1508 (ii).
 Rebellion of 1885 (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1207 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amt., 240-246 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice* (Miscellaneous) 117 (i).
Immigration (Gratuities) 1639; (Pauper) 1157 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) 1616 (ii).
Pensions (Rebellion of 1885) 1207 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1569 (ii).
 Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Sel. Com., 35 (i).
 Travis, ex-Judge, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 117 (i).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 757 (i).

Madill, Mr. F., North Ontario.

- Carriers by Water (Liability) Act Amt. (B. 49, 1°) 238 (i).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1272 (ii).
 Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House, 928 (ii).
 Mississauga Indians' Claims (M. for Cor.*) 866 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1430 (ii).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1027 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Legislation*: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1027 (ii).

Mara, Mr. J. A., Yale.

- County Court Judges (B. C.) additional appointment (Ques.) 66 (i).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1575 (ii).
 Parmalee, Mr., Rep. to Minister re Kamloops as an outport of entry (M. for copy*) 498 (ii).
 Sushwap and Okanagan Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 43, 1°*) 206 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 1575 (ii).
Indians (Ont. and Que.) 1607 (ii).

Marshall, Mr. J. H., East Middlesex.

- Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1241 (ii).
 Imperial Federation (prop. Res.) 1069 (ii).
 Privilege (Ques. of) Pairing of Members, 1403 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1431 (ii).

Masson, Mr. J., North Grey.

- Belleville and Lake Nipissing Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 90, 1^o*) 866 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1251 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1193 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 539-543 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1569 (ii).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 755 (i).

Mills, Hon. D., Bothwell.

- Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 95. (i).
 Bank of London, winding-up (B. 80, 1^o*) 459 (i).
 ——— Rep. of Com. on Banking, &c. (M. to ref. back) 963 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Seizures (Ques.) 778 (i).
 ——— on M. for Cor., 968 (ii).
 Boundaries of Ont. (Ques.) 822 (i).
 Brigade Majors, in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1655, 1673 (ii).
 Business of the Hse., on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Wednesdays, 1062 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2^o, 979; in Com., 980 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2^o, 990 (ii).
 ——— prop. Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 74; neg. (Y. 57; N. 109) 84 (i).
 Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 114, 134 (i).
 Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1213 (ii).
 Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1615 (ii).
 Criminal Law (England) application to Can. B. 100 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 1^o, 825 (ii).
 ——— Extension to Man. B. 41 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 1^o, 139 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 946 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1667 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on presentation of papers, 39 (i).
 ——— on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 717, 721 (i).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 944, 1140 (ii).
 Dom. Savings Banks, in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).
 Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1667 (ii).
 Fisheries Commission, Chart showing delimitation (remarks) 647 (i).
 ——— production of papers (remarks) 65, 101 (i).
 ——— omission of certain papers (remarks) 142 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued

- Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2^o, 833-841; in Com., 868 (ii).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1^o, 1063 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1642 (ii).
 Fraudulent Trade Marks on Merchandise Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1002 (ii).
 Free List, O. C.'s respecting (remarks) 649 (i).
 Govt. Measures (remarks) 138, 416, 456 (i).
 Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1639 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1655 (ii).
 High Commissioner's contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 105 (i).
 Hot Springs, Banff (roads, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1617.
 Imperial Federation, on Res. (Mr. *Marshall*) 1088 (ii).
 Indemnity (Members) in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
 Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com. 1008 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 911 (ii).
 Kent (Ont.) Controverted Election, on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to ref. Judge's Rep. to Sel. Com. on Priv. and Elec., 23 (i).
 ——— Representation (remarks) 270, 434 (i).
 ——— Issue of Writ (remarks) 380, 499 (i).
 ——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec. (remarks) 380 (i).
 Labor Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1660 (ii).
 Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 93 (i).
 Northern Light and Alert, Cor., Tels., &c., on M. for Ret., 827 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1^o, 454 (i); on Res., 1174 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1597 (ii).
 Post Office Irregularities, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1020 (ii).
 Printing and Stationery, Public, Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com. (remarks) *re* absence of Dep. Speaker, 1005 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1617 (ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *McMillan*) Reciprocity deb., 345 (i).
 Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 90 (i).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 829 (ii).
 ——— on member being checked (remarks) 867 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1176 (ii).
 Ry. Commission, copies of Rep. (Ques.) 646 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., newspaper Cor. *re* entry of certain articles free of Duty, 491, 516 (i).
 ——— on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 606-610 (i).
 ——— on M. to adjn. deb. (remarks) 822 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 890; in Com. on Res., 894, (ii).
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1671 (ii).
 Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1676 (ii).
 Russell Representation, Issue of Writ (Ques.) 554 (i).
 Schools, Indian (Man.) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (ii).
 Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1640 (ii).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1025, 1669 (ii).
 Speedy Trials Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1005 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 116 (i).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Dom. Exhibition) 1148; (Health Statistics) 1151 (ii).
Canals—Income (Miscellaneous) 1647; (Rideau) 1671 (ii).
Charges of Management (Dom. Savings Banks) 89 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 95; (Civil Service Examiners, salaries) 114, 134; (High Commissioner's contingencies) 105; (Mounted Police) 93; (Privy Council Office) 90 (i); (Sec. of State) 1640 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1667; (Excise) 1667 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Income (Extra Clerks) 1637 (ii).
Geological Survey, 1805 (i).
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1161; (Gratuities) 1639 (ii).
Indians (B. C.) 1683; (Man. and N. W. T.) 1608; (Man., schools) 1681; (Ont. and Que.) 1806 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Members Indemnity) 1670; (salaries, &c.) 1025; (Sessional Clerks) 1025, 1669. Miscellaneous (Franchise Act) 1642; (Library, salaries, &c.) 1030 (ii).
Militia (Brigade Majors salaries) 1209; (Clothing, &c.) 1213 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) 1615; (Franchise Act) 1642; (Hot Springs, Banff) 1617; (Labor Commission) 1660 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1662 (ii).
Pensions (N. W. T.) 1643 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1655, 1673. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1655. Roads and Bridges, 1676 (ii).
 Supreme Court Librarian, in Com. of Sup., 1030 (ii).
 Travis, ex-Judge, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 116 (i).
 Treason and Felony Forfeitures abolition B. 88 (Mr. Thompson) on M. for 2°, 1148 (ii).
 Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. White, Renfrew) in Com. (Ques. of procedure) 1148 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1122 (ii).
 Wrecking Vessels in American Waters, on M. for papers, &c., 667 (i).

Mills, Mr. John B., Annapolis.

Annapolis and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 82, 1°*) 489 (i).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 983 (ii).
 — B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 1255 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 910 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. Ives) paragraph in *Free Press*, 524 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 328–335 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1588 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 1466 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P., Northumberland, N. B.

Adams, David J., in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).
 Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
 Antwerp and Canada Mail Subsidy, conc., 1690 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 969 (ii).
 Bryanton, Albert and Allan, re Derby Branch Ry. (M. for Cor., &c.*) 866 (ii).
 Business of the House, on M. to meet at 10 a.m., 1625.
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 981 (ii).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1370; (Amt.) neg., 1371; in Com., 1381, 1388 (ii).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 938; on M. for 3°, 942 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1468 (ii).
 — Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 129 (i).
 Clancey, Patrick, damages re Derby Branch Ry. (M. for Ret.*) 866 (ii).
 Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1638.
 Combines and Tariff Changes (remarks) 24 (i).
 Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1615 (ii).
 Concurrence, 1687 (ii).
 Cornmeal, Flour, &c., removal of Duties (Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 44; N. 89) 1560 (ii).
 Cornwall Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
 Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1619, 1684 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Bowell) in Com., 953; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1472 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1631 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on presentation of papers, 40 (i).
 — on Amt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) to Res. (Mr. Laurier) 748 (i).
 — distribution to Press (remarks) 750 (i).
 — 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) 25 (i).
 — 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1298 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1269; in Com., 1278 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1146 (ii).
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1654 (ii).
 Estimates, The, remarks on presentation, 50 (i).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1154, 1575 (ii).
 Fabre, Mr. (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1613 (ii).
 Fisheries Treaty, papers respecting (remarks) 64, 100, 142 (i).
 — Ratification B. 65 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2° (remarks) 684; on M. for 2°, 793–813 (i); in Com., 867 (ii).
 — Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).
 — Bounty (expenses, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1604 (ii).
 — Overseers (salaries, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1601.
 — Steamers (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1603.

Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.

- Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., Gold as Legal Tender (Ques.) 171 (i).
 Gowanlock, Mrs., claim for compensation (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1562, 1674 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Davies) 1327 (ii).
 High Commissioner's contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 110 (i).
 — Office, application of Civil Service Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1502, 1505 (ii).
 Hot Springs, Banff (roads, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1617, 1666 (ii).
 Indemnity to Members (remarks) 1586 (ii).
 — on M. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 1681 (ii).
 Indian Affairs Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1637 (ii).
 I. C. R., Receipts and Expenditures, on Ques. (remarks) 66 (i).
 — Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1620, 1650 (ii).
 Interest on Public Debt, in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).
 Justice Dept., in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).
 Knight, John and Allen, claims for damages (Derby Branch Ry) (M. for Rets.*) 866 (ii).
 Labor Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, dismissal of Laborers (Ques. of Order) in Com. of Sup., 1648 (ii).
 Library of Parl., in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
 Magdalen Islands Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1678.
 Man. Lunatic Asylum, in Com. of Sup., 165 (i).
 Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
 Merchants Marine Insurance Co.'s B. 11 (Mr. Curran) on M. for 2°, 125; on M. to same. adjd. deb for 2°, 322 (i).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1281 (ii).
 Newfoundland and Confedn., on M. for Cor., 665 (i).
 Northumberland, N.B., Mail Service (remarks) 1382.
 N.W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 455 (i); in Com., 1488 (ii).
 Obstructions, &c., in Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1581 (ii).
 Ottawa, additional Building, in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).
 Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Carling) in Com., 1511 (ii).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1633, 1638 (ii).
 — Irregularities, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1020 (ii).
 Prince Edward Co. Election, on M. admitting Member on certificate (remarks) 380 (i).
 Printing Bureau, Plant, &c., conc. 1689 (ii).
 Printing and Stationery, Public, Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com. (remarks) re absence of Dep. Speaker, 1006 (ii).
 Privilege (Ques. of) Despatches re admission of Newfoundland into Confedn., 111 (i).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.

- Privilege (Ques. of) (Mr. McMillan, Huron) Reciprocity deb., 345 (i).
 — Disallowance, 110 (i).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1297 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1176, 1418 (ii).
 Rys. and Canals Dept., in Com. of Sup., 97 (i).
 Ry. Expenditure (remarks) 922 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., newspaper Cor. re entry of certain articles free of Duty, 439 (i).
 — (remarks) 516 (i).
 — proposals of Plenipotentiaries (remarks) 87 (i).
 — on M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) Res. First Order of the Day (remarks) 44 (i).
 Returns, on enquiry (remarks) 1136 (ii).
 Repairs to Buildings, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1544 (ii).
 Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1675 (ii).
 Royal Military College, conc., 1687 (ii).
 Russell, Saml., claim for damages (Derby Branch Ry.) (M. for Cor., &c.*) 866 (ii).
 St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s B. 137 (Mr. Boyle) in Com., 152 (i), 1522 (ii).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com., of Sup., 138 (i).
 Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com., of Sup., 1442 (ii).
 Schools, Indian (Man.) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (ii).
 Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1640 (ii).
 Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1620; (salaries) 1684 (ii).
 Statistical Diagrams, in Com. of Sup., 1664 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1588 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
 Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Census, &c.) 1155; (Colonial and Indian Exhibition) 1638; (Dom. Exhibition, &c.) 1149 (Experimental Farms) 1154 (ii).
 Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 1452; (Sault Ste Marie) 1442 (ii).
 Charges of Management (Interest on Public Debt) 89 (i).
 Civil Government (Agriculture) 95; (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 129; (High Commissioner's contingencies) 110 (i); (Indian Affairs) 1637 (ii); (Justice) 91; (Mounted Police) 94 (i); (Post Office) 1638 (ii); (Railways and Canals) 97 (i); (Secretary of State) 1640 (ii).
 Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1631; (Culling Timber) 1619, 1684; (I. C. R., Repairs, &c.) 1620, 1650; (Post Office) 1633; (Public Works, Agency, B.C.) 1633; (Slides and Booms, salaries, &c.) 1620, 1684 (ii).
 Fisheries (David J. Adams) 1656; (Overscers salaries, &c.) 1601; (Steamers, repairs, &c.) 1603 (ii).
 Geological Survey, 1604 (ii).
 Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1165 (ii).
 Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 1608; (Man., schools) 1681; (Ont. and Que.) 1607 (ii).
 Legislation: Miscellaneous (Library of Parl.) 1638; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1631 (ii).
 Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses) 1681 (ii).
 Mail Subsidies (Antwerp and Canada) conc., 1689; (U. S. and Victoria, B. C.) 1680 (ii).
 Militia (Royal Military College) conc., 1687 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) 1615; (Fishing Bounty) 1604; (Fishery Commission) 1663; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1613; (Govt. Printing Bureau, Plant, &c.) conc., 1689; (Hot Springs, Banff) 1617, 1666; (Labor Commission) 1658; (Man. Lunatic Asylum) 1665; (Statistical Diagrams) 1664 (ii).

Mounted Police (expenses) 94 (i); 1611, 1658 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Obstructions, &c., in Rivers) 1581; (Water Police) 1580 (ii).

Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 128 (i).

Pensions, 1640 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 1461. (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1654. *Income*: Buildings, 1540; (N.S.) 1465; (Ont.) 1461, 1540; (Repairs, &c.) 1461, 1544. *Experimental Farms*, 1575. *Harbors and Rivers* (N.B.) 1563, 1673; (Ont.) 1674; (P.E.I.) 1562. *Roads and Bridges*, 1675 (ii).

Quarantine (Medical Inspection) 1195 (ii).

Railways—Capital (I. O. R.) 1629, 1650. *Income* (Surveys, &c.) 1460 (ii).

Tobique Valley Ry., Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com., 1626 (ii).

Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Sel. Com., 34 (i).

U. S. and Victoria (B. C.) Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1630 (ii).

Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.'s, B. 20 (Mr. White, Renfrew) on for 2°, 322 (i).

Water Police, in Com. of Sup., 1580 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1121 (ii).

Wrecking Vessels in American Waters, on M. for papers, &c., 667 (i).

Moncrieff, Mr. G., East Lambton.

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 1258 (ii).

Personal explanation *re* newspaper paragraph, 392.

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 351-535 (i).

Stag Island (Ont.) Lighthouse (Ques.) 1174 (ii).

Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Sel. Com., 35 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1133 (ii).

Montague, Mr. W. H., Haldimand.

Address, The (moved) 2 (i).

Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 973 (ii).

Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 19, 1°*) 73 (i).

Jones, Walter, and Haldimand Electio., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1525.

Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1029 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1029 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Roads and Bridges, 1675 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W., North York.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1434, 1470 (ii).

— — — Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 128 (i).

Mulock, Mr. W.—Continued.

Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Bowell) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1472 (ii).

Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on printing papers (remarks) 41 (i).

— — — Ques. of Order, 719 (i).

— — — on Res. (Mr. Laurier) 725 (i).

Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1271 (ii).

Divorce, publication of Evidence (remarks) 1415 (ii).

Estimates, Suppl., papers *re* certain Items (remarks) 1433 (ii).

Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1154 (ii).

Fisheries Treaty, production of papers (Ques.) 64, 143.

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 119 (Mr. Chapleau) on M. for 2°, 1550 (ii).

Free List, O.C.'s respecting (remarks) 648 (i).

G. T. R. Co.'s Agreements B. 26 (Mr. Small) on M. to authorise Ry. Com. to divide Bill, 415 (i).

Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1563 (ii).

Lachine Canal, discharge of Laborers (Affidavit read) 1563 (ii).

Liquor License Act, amounts paid by Govt. (M. for Ret.*) 526 (i).

Neely, Private T., provision for Widow, &c. (M. for Ret.) 649 (i).

N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 1481 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1175, 1423, 1492; on M. for 3°, 1509 (ii).

Rebellion in N. W. T., Total Cost (Ques.) 171 (i).

— — — (M. for Ret.*) 493 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 626-632 (i).

Summary Convictions Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1417 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 1154 (ii).

Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 128 (i).

Immigration (Agents salaries) 1164 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1563 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal Commission, Cor. &c., on M. for Ret., 72 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1114, 1121 (ii).

York-Simcoe Battalion, Kit Allowance (M. for Ret.) 66, 69 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., Muskoka.

Antwerp and Canada Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1679 (ii).

Brigade Majors, in Com. of Sup., 1210 (ii).

Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1537 (ii).

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6 m. h., 989; withdn., 1000 (ii).

Central Railway Co.'s Pet. (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Standing Orders, 750 (i).

Children, care and reformation Provision (B. 109, 1°) 963 (ii).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E.—Continued.

- Clothing, &c. (Militia) in Com. of Sup., 1212 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1265 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1146 (ii).
 Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1213 (ii).
 Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
 Fishery Overseers (salaries, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1533 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1568 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1184, 1426 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 525-527 (i).
 SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 119 (i).
Fisheries (Overseers salaries, &c.) 1593 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 1582 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Antwerp and Canada) 1679 (ii).
Militia (Brigade Majors) 1210; (Clothing, &c.) 1212; (Drill Pay, &c.) 1213 (ii).
Pensions (N. W. T.) 1643 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1537. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1568 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1121 (ii).
 Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 777 (i).
 York-Simcoe Battalion, Kit Allowance, on M. for Ret., 69 (i).

Paterson, Mr. W., South Brant.

- Adulteration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 933 (ii).
 Bottles and Vessels Protection to Owners B. 3 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2°, 759 (i).
 Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s further Provision (B. 53, 1°*) 270 (i).
 Buildings (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1544, 1672 (ii).
 Business of the Hse., on M. to meet at 10 a.m., 1725 (ii).
 Can. and Michigan Tunnel Co.'s incorp. (B. 8, 1°*) 51 (i).
 Can. Temp. Act, on Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 80 (i).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1380 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 898, 946 (ii).
 Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1632, 1656 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1266 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1145 (ii).
 Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1667 (ii).
 Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 942; in Com., 944 (ii).
 Free List, O. C. respecting (remarks) 649 (i).

Paterson, Mr. W.—Continued.

- Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. Hse., 928 (ii).
 Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1007 (ii).
 Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1672 (ii).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1634, 1638 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1192, 1429 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., newspaper Cor. re entry of certain articles free of Duty, 494, 517 (i).
 ——— on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 401-415 (i).
 Repairs, &c., to Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1544, 1672 (ii).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
 Statistical Diagrams, in Com. of Sup., 1665 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Post Office) 1638 (ii).
Collection of Revenue (Customs) 1632, 1666; (Excise) 1667; (Post Office) 1634 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 1607; (Ont. and Que.) 1607 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1670 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Statistical Diagrams) 1665 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1662 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 1672. *Income*: Buildings (N. W. T.) 1672; (Repairs, &c.) 1544, 1672. Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1561 (ii).
 Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) for Sel. Com., 35 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1101-1113, 1121 (ii).

Patterson, Mr. J. C., North Essex.

- Chippawa and Ottawa Nation Indians Claims (M. for Ret.*) 498 (i).
 Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House, 930 (ii).
 Indemnity to Members (M.) 1681 (ii).
 Pelée Island and Mainland Cable (M. for Pets., &c.) 826 (ii).
 Sarnia and Port Huron Submarine Tunnel (Ques.) 1432.
 Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 778 (i), 918 (ii).

Perley, Mr. W. D., East Assiniboia.

- C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1367 (ii).
 ——— Lands, Taxes (Ques.) 494 (i).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1576 (ii).
 Chinook Belt and Peace River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 16, 1°*) 73 (i).
 N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1478; in Com., 1480 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 1576 (ii).
Immigration (Agents salaries) 1161 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 1609 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Experimental Farms, 1576 (ii).
 Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 63, 1°*) 380 (i).

Perley, Mr. W. G., Ottawa City.

Bronsons' and Weston Lumber Co.'s incorp. (B. 27, 1°*) 97 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 632-635 (i).

Perry, Mr. S. F., Prince, P. E. I.

Alberton Harbor, increasing Depth (Ques.) 712 (i).

Lobster Fisheries, Restrictions, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1555 (ii).

Northern Light, number of Trips and Passengers (M. for Ret.) 61, 672 (i).

Northumberland Straits Subway, Rep. of Engineers, &c. (M. for copy) 661 (i).

Pairing of Members (remarks) 1372 (ii).

P. E. I. Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 55 (i).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income : Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1561 (ii).

Terms of Confedn., P. E. I., compensation for non-fulfilment (Ques.) 86 (i).

—— Despatches, &c. (M. for copies) 61 (i).

Tignish and Miminegash Breakwaters (Ques.) 86, 712 (i).

Winter Communication with P. E. I. (Ques.) 712 (i).

Platt, Mr. J. M., Prince Edward Co.

Bay of Quintè Bridge at Belleville (M. for Cor.)* 922 (ii).

Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1539 (ii).

Debates, dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 746 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 945 (ii).

McCuaig, Mr. A. F., appointment as Exciseman at Picton (Ques.) 1432 (ii).

Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

Picton Public Buildings (M. for Cor., &c.)* 866 (ii).

Prince Edward County, construction of Public Works (Ques.) 1432 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 599-605 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Capital (Murray) 1453 (ii).

Fisheries (Overseers salaries, &c.) 1584 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Liteboat Service, Rewards, &c.) 1577.

Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ont.) 1539. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1567 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1128 (ii).

Wellbank, David, mail carrier, dismissal (remarks) 1383 (ii).

Wellington Harbor of Refuge (M. for Cor., &c.)* 866 (ii).

Pope, Hon. J. H., Compton.

Fenelon River Navigation (Ans.) 97 (i).

G. T. R. Crossings in Toronto and decision of Ry. Com. of Privy Council (Ans.) 59 (i).

I. C. R., Capital Acct., amount charged (Ans.) 59 (i).

—— Casualties, &c., Officials dismissed, on M. for Ret. 61 (i).

Pope, Hon. J. H.—Continued.

I. C. R., Expenditure on Capital Acct., on M. for Ret. 103 (i).

—— Receipts and Expenditure (Ans.) 27, 65, 112 (i).

—— Rolling Stock purchased, on M. for Ret., 61 (i).

—— St. Charles Branch, Expenditure (Ans.) 97 (i).

Onderdonk Arbitration, plant taken over by Govt. under Award (Ans.) 93, 111 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 24, 1°) 73 (i).

Railways and Canals, depl. Rep. (presented) 73 (i).

Railways, Rep. of Royal Commission (presented) 26 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Government (Railways and Canals) 96 (i).

Welland River, Bridge at Chippawa Village (Ans.) 65 (i).

Porter, Mr. R., West Huron.

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 199-203 (i).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ont.) 1540 (ii).

Préfontaine, Mr. R., Chambly.

Debates, Official, French Translation, delay (Ques.) 554 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 642-646 (i).

St. Lawrence River Floods (Ques.) 899 (ii).

South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. *Hall*) on Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) 6 m. h., to M. for 3°, 915 (ii).

Superior Court Judges, Montreal Dist. (Ques.) 647 (i).

Prior, Mr. E. G., Victoria, B. C.

Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 966 (ii).

Boundaries of Alaska and B.C. (Ques.) 495 (i).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (Overseers salaries, &c.) 1601 (ii).

Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 1215; (Permanent Forces) 1220 (ii).

Public Works—Capital (Esquimaux Graving Dock) 1653 (ii).

Purcell, Mr. P., Glengarry.

SUPPLY :

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1445 (ii).

Veterans of 1837, pensions (Ques.) 85 (i).

Reid, Mr. J., Cariboo.

Boundaries of Alaska and B. C. (Ques.) 495 (i).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., Lotbinière.

Criminal Laws, distribution to Members (Ques.) 86 (i).

Lotbinière Mail Service (Ques.) 98 (i).

Olivier, Geo., dismissal as Postmaster (M. for Cor.) 654 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 271-274 (i).

Robertson, Mr. J. E., King's, P. E. I.

Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).
 Naufage, P. E. I., Improvement of Navigation, Rep. of Engineer, on M. for copy, 70 (i).
 Northumberland Straits Subway, Engineers' Reps., &c., on M. for copy, 664 (i).
 P. E. I. Mail Service, on M. for Cor., &c., 55 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 377-380 (i).
 SUPPLY:
Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1463 (ii).

Roome, Mr. W. F., West Middlesex.

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com. 1246 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 1249 (ii).

Royal, Mr. J., Provencher.

Choquette, Mr., M. P., Pet. against Ret., 1332 (ii).

Rowand, Mr. J., West Bruce.

Kincairdine Harbor Tolls Authorisation (B. 30, 1°*) 97; 2° m., 220 (i).
 Kincairdine and Teeswater Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 74, 1°*) 454 (i).

Rykert, Mr. J. C., Lincoln and Niagara.

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 416-438 (i).
 St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 61, 1°*) 380 (i); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1345 (ii).
 Gowanlock, Mrs., claim for compensation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1015 (ii).

Scarth, Mr. W. B., Winnipeg.

Man. and N. W. Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 46, 1°*) 238.
 Merchants Marine Insurance Co.'s B. 11 (Mr. Curran) on M. for 2°, 125 (i).
 Young, Capt. Geo. H., and others, claim for services at Batoche (M. for Cor., &c.*) 866 (ii).
 G. N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Daly) 2° m., 128.

Scriver, Mr. J., Huntingdon.

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 1246 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 1255 (ii).
 ——— on Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 77 (i).
 Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1240 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 51 (i).
 ——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 824 (ii).
 Divorce, publication of Evidence (remarks) 1415 (ii).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1411 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 833 (ii).

Scriver, Mr. J.—Continued.

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1589 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues (Rys., I. O. R.) 1621 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1568 (ii).
Indians (Ont. and Que.) 1606 (ii).

Sample, Mr. A., Centre Wellington.

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 578-583 (i).
 Subsidies to Rys. since 1880, Amount voted (M. for Ret.*) 110 (i).

Shanly, Mr. W., South Grenville.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1438 (ii).
 Grenville International Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 62, 1°*) 380 (i).
 I. C. R. (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1621 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1291 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1138, 1418, 1494 (ii).
 Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. Denison) on M. for 2°, 765 (i).
 South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. Hall) on Amt. (Mr. Bergin) 6 m. h., to M. for 3°, 913 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1445; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 1455. *Income* (Rideau) 1671 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1653 (ii).
 Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for 2°, 772 (i).

Skinner, Mr. C. N., St. John, N. B., City and County.

Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 904 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 355-358 (i).

Small, Mr. J., East Toronto.

C. P. R. Co.'s (Bonds) Branch Lines (B. 44, 1°*) 206.
 Divorce, Bills 128, 129, 130 (M. to suspend Rule) 65 (i), 1468 (ii).
 ——— Irvine, Andrew Maxwell, Relief (B. 129, 1° on div.) 1345 (ii).
 ——— Morrison, Catherine, Relief (B. 130, 1° on div.) 1345 (ii).
 ——— Tudor, Eleonora Elizabeth, Relief (B. 128, 1° on div.) 1345 (ii).
 G. T. R. Co.'s confirmation of Agreements (B. 26, 1°*) 85; 2° m., 128 (i).
 ——— (M.) to authorise Ry. Com. to divide Bill, 415.
 Ont. and Que. Ry. Co.'s (B. 45, 1°*) 206 (i).
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 1371 (ii).
 Superior Courts (Law or Equity) retired Judges (M. for Ret.*) 62 (i).
 Toronto Board of Trade Acts, Amt. (B. 114, 1°*) 1031.

Smith, Sir Donald A., K.C.M.G., West Montreal.

- Prorogation (remarks) 1692 (ii).
 St. Lawrence River, Montreal and Quebec Channel (M. for Ret.*) 922 (ii).

Somerville, Mr. J., North Brant.

- Plattsburg Post Office, appointment of Postmaster, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1019 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., entry of certain articles free of Duty (remarks) 524 (i).
 — on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 618-624 (i).
 Six Nation Indians Claims for compensation (M. for copies*) 672 (i).
 Veterans of 1866-70, Medals (Ques.) 965 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. JOSEPH ALDRIC OUMET) Laval.

- Address, The, His Ex.'s reply (read) 172 (i).
 Beauharnois Controverted Election, Judge's Rep., 825.
 Bruce, West, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 Carleton (Ont.) Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 Charlevoix, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 Colchester, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 Controverted Elections, 1, 73, 309, 514, 554 (i).
 Cumberland, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, papers &c., respecting (presented) 38 (i).
 — on printing papers (remarks) 42 (i).
 — French Translation, delay (Ans.) 554 (i).
 Digby, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 Dorchester, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 Ellis, J. V. Esq., M. P., and Annexation, Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) ruled out of Order, 45 (i).
 Estimates, The, 1888-89, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 50 (i).
 — Suppl., 1887-88, 962 (ii).
 — Suppl., 1888-89, 1403 (ii).
 Fisheries Treaty, Mess. from His Ex. transmitting copy (read) 86 (i).
 — non-production of papers, Members' remarks checked, 143, 239 (i).
 Glengarry Controverted Election, Judgment of Supreme Court, 554 (i).
 Haldimand, Dep. Returning Officer (Ques.) 923 (ii).
 — Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 Halton, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 Hastings, West, vacancy in Representation, 85 (i).
 — Ret. of Member Elect, 238 (i).
 Hawke, John T., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1301 (ii).
 Indemnity to Members, on M. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 1681 (ii).
 Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 27 (i).
 Jubilee Address to the Queen, Mess. from His Ex., despatch from Colonial Sec. conveying thanks of Her Maj. through Sec. of State for the Colonies, 24 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—Continued.

- Kent (Ont.) Representation, Issue of Writ (explanation) 381 (i).
 — Ret. of Member Elect, 1544 (ii).
 L'Assomption Controverted Election, Judge's Rep., 73 (i).
 — Ret. of Member Elect, 866 (ii).
 Library of Parl., Rep. of Librarians (presented) 2 (i).
 Mess. from His Ex., 24, 27, 50, 86, 172 (i), 962, 1231, 1403 (ii).
 Middlesex, West, Ret. of Member Elect, 309 (i).
 Missisquoi Controverted Election, Judge's Rep., 309 (i).
 — Ret. of Member Elect, 646 (i).
 — Vacancy in Representation (announced) 124 (i).
 Montmagny Controverted Election, Judgment of Supreme Court, 309 (i).
 Montmorency Controverted Election, Judgment of Supreme Court, 73 (i).
 New Members, 1, 238, 309, 380, 646 (i), 866, 1522, 1544.
 Northumberland, East, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 Order, Ques. of, *re* Reciprocity deb., 523 (i).
 Parliament, Opening, Commons summoned to Senate, 1 (i); Prorogation, 1693 (ii).
 Prince Edward Co. Election, Ret. of Member on certificate, 380 (i).
 — notification of Ret. of Member Elect, 415 (i).
 Printing and Stationery, Public, Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com. (remarks) *re* absence of Dep. Speaker, 1006 (ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Davin*) ref. to previous deb. checked, 1093 (ii).
 — (Mr. *McMillan*) Reciprocity deb., 345 (i).
 Procedure, Ques. standing in Member's name, party asking same must state authority for so doing, otherwise irregular, 750 (i).
 Prohibition, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Jamieson*) remarks of Member checked, 867 (ii).
 Prorogation, Letter from Gov. Genl. Sec. (read) 1686 (ii).
 Quebec County, Controverted Election, Judgment of Supreme Court, 309 (i).
 Quebec, West, Controverted Election, Supreme Court Judgment, 309 (i).
 Queen's, N. B., Election, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 Ry. Commission, deb. on Ques. checked, 867 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) on personal explanation (Mr. *Davies*) 239 (i).
 — newspaper Cor. *re* entry of certain articles free of Duty, 491 (i).
 — Member checked in deb., 554 (i).
 Renfrew, South, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 Royal Assent to Bills, 1195, 1692 (ii).
 Russell Representation, Ret. of Member Elect, 1522 (ii).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1025, 1668 (ii).
 Shelburne, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. *Hall*) time having expired, ruled further discussion out of Order, 916 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—Continued.

South-Western Ry. Co.'s B., on Ques. of Order, 954 (ii).
Speech from the Throne (reported) 2 (i).

Stanstead Controverted Election, Judge's Rep., 514 (i).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1025; (Sessional Clerks) 1688 (ii).

Vacancies, 1, 85, 124 (i).

Victoria, B.C., Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

—— N. S., Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Writs issued for new Elections, 1 (i).

Yarmouth, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. C. C. COLBY) Stanstead.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1437 (ii).

Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, Member checked in remarks, 719, 721 (i).

Russell Election, Return of Member on certificate of Returning Officer, 1415 (ii).

Sproule Mr. T., East Grey.

Cheese Branding, Legislation (prop. Res.) 1236 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1438, 1471 (ii).

Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 740 (i).

—— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M to conc., 1298 (ii).

—— distribution to Press (remarks) 751 (i).

Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1216 (ii).

Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1406 (ii).

Govt. Savings Banks (Interest on Deposits) B. 127 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1491 (ii).

Lakes Huron and Superior Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).

Lard, Rendered, Legislation respecting, Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for Com. of Whole, 59 (i).

Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1199 (ii).

Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1596 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1431, 1492 (ii).

Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2°, 769 (i).

Rebellion of 1885 (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1204 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 362-371 (i).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Overseers salaries, &c.) 1584.

Mail Subsidies (Lakes Huron and Superior) 1678 (ii).

Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 1216 (ii).

Pensions (Rebellion of 1885) 1204 (ii).

Quarantine (Medical Inspection) 1199 (ii).

Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) for Sel. Com., 32 (i).

Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 755 (i).

Sutherland, Mr. J., North Oxford.

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 1246 (ii).

York-Simcoe Battalion, Kit Allowance, on M. for Ret., 70, (i).

Taylor, Mr. G., South Leeds.

Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1239 (ii).

Lard, Rendered, Legislation respecting (M. for Com. of Whole) 59 (i).

Pairing of Members (remarks) 1372 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 438-441 (ii).

Thousand Island Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 84, 1°*) 489 (i).
Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 758 (i).

Temple, Mr. T., York, N. B.

Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2°, 768 (i).

Thérien, Mr. O., Montcalm.

Tobacco, Canadian Leaf, Purchase and Sale (Ques.) 66 (i).

Thompson, Hon. J. S. D., Antigonish.

Adams, David J., in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).

Adulteration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 933 (ii).

Bank Acts Amt. (B. 119, 1°) 1135 (ii)

Bottles and Vessels Protection to Owners B. 3 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2°, 759 (i).

Bresaylor Half-breeds Grievances, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1518 (ii).

B. C. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1024 (ii).

Buildings (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1655 (ii).

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 983 (ii).

—— B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1253 (ii).

C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1374, 1391; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1587 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1224 (ii).

—— Mortgage for Guaranteed Bonds (remarks) 1506.
—— on enquiry for papers, 1586 (ii).

Civil Service Act. Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1434, 1472 (ii).

Concurrence, 1685 (ii).

Consolidation of Statutes, in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).

Controverted Elections Act (Ans.) 516, 752 (i).

Copyright Act Amt. (B. 124, 1°) 1173 (ii).

—— Legislation respecting (Ans.) 98 (i).

Counterfeit Money, Advertising (B. 108, 1°) 963; 2° m., 1137 (ii).

County Judges (B. C.) additional appointment (Ans.) 66 (i).

—— (Ont.) salaries, increase (Ans.) 899 (ii).

Criminal Laws, distribution to Members (Ans.) 86 (i).

Thompson, Hon. J. S. D.—Continued.

- Criminal Law (England) application to Can. (B. 100, 1°) 825 (ii).
 ——— Extension to Man. (B. 41, 1°) 139 (i); in Com., 1402 (ii).
 Criminal Procedure Act Amt. (B. 123, 1°) 1173; in Com., 1513 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 947, 1002 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Ques. of Order, 720 (i).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 89, 1°) 514 (i); 2° m., 941; in Com., 944, 1138; 3° m., 1403 (ii).
 Dorchester Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1021 (ii).
 Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
 Fisheries Treaty Ratification (B. 65, 1°) 380; on M. for 2°, 704-711 (i); in Com., 872 (ii).
 Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise Act Amt. (B. 91, 1°) 515 (i); 2° m., 942, in Com.; 943, 1002 (ii).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c. (B. 95, 1°*) 750 (i); in Com., 1404 (ii).
 Govt. Measures (remarks) 457 (i).
 Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer (Ans.) 648 (i); M. to adjn. House, 924, 930 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1561 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Davies*) 1301-1307 (ii).
 Hay Duties by U. S., Refund (Ans.) 712 (i).
 Indian Act Amt. (B. 106, 1°) 922; 2° and in Com., 1007 (ii).
 I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1226 (ii).
 Justice Dept., in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).
 Kent Controverted Election, on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to ref. Judge's Rep. to Sel. Com. on Priv. and Elec., 21 (i).
 Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).
 Labor Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1661 (ii).
 Libel, Law of, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 141 (i).
 Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1021 (ii).
 Merchants Marine Ins. Co.'s B. 11 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 127 (i).
 Muskoka and Parry Sound Judicial Dist. (Ans.) 1232 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. (B. 125, 1°*) 1231; 2° m., 1551; in Com., 1485 (ii).
 Orders in Council, collecting, in Com. of Sup., 1618 (ii).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1231 (ii).
 Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 18 (i).
 Prescott and Russell Judicial Dist., Vacancy (Ans.) 27 (i).
 Procedure in Criminal Cases further Act Amt. (B. 48, 1°) 238 (i); 2°, 942 (ii).
 Provincial Courts Judges, increase of salaries (prop. Res.) 866 (ii).
 ——— Act Amt. (B. 14, 1°*) and in Com., 1690 (ii).
 Punishments, Pardons, &c. (B. 90, 1°) 515; 2° and in Com., 942 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. J. S. D.—Continued.

- Ry. Act Amt. (B. 24) in Com., 1175, 1417, 1492; 3° m., 1507 (ii).
 Real Property (Territories) further Act Amt. (B. 104, 1°) 899; in Com., 1412 (ii).
 ——— Inspector of Land Titles (prop. Res.) 1259; in Com., 1416 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., newspaper Cor. re entry of certain articles free of Duty, 492 (i).
 Regina Jail, in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).
 Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 892; on M. to conc. in Res., 931 (ii).
 Revised Statutes of Can. Act Amt. (B. 12, 1°*) 62 (i).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 136 (i).
 Securities to the Crown, &c., Discharge B. 4 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 3°, 916 (ii).
 Speedy Trials Act Amt. (B. 93, 1°) 598 (i); 2° m., 942; in Com., 1005 (ii).
 Stenographer, Exchequer Court, in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
 Submarine Cables, Preservation (B. 98, 1°*) 726 (i); 2° m., 942 (ii).
 Summary Convictions Act Amt. (B. 113, 1°) 1001; in Com., 1417; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1629 (ii).
 Superior Court Judges, Montreal Dist. (Ans.) 647 (i).
 SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Exchequer Court) 119; (Miscellaneous) 114, 119 (i); conc., 1685 (ii).
Civil Government (Justice) 91 (i).
Fisheries (David J. Adams) 1656 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Consolidation of Statutes) 1663; (Labor Commission) 1661; (Orders in Council, collecting) 1618 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Water Police) 1579 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 1024; (Dorchester) 1021 (ii); (Kingston) 121 (i); (Man.) 1021; conc., 1686; (Regina Jail) 1025 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 136 (i); conc., 1686 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Repairs, &c.) 1655. Harbors and Rivers (N. S.) 1561 (ii).
Railways—Capital (O.P.R.) 1224; (I.O.B.) 1226; (Oxford and New Glasgow Ry.) 1231 (ii).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. (B. 110, 1°) 964; withdn., 1402 (ii).
 ——— (B. 120, 1°) 1135; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1549 (ii).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts (Ans.) 1011 (ii).
 Travis, ex-Judge, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 114 (i).
 Treason and Felony Forfeitures Abolition (B. 88, 1°) 514; 2° m., 1147 (ii).
 Tobique Valley Ry. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1626 (ii).
 Water Police, in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1130 (ii).
- Tisdale, Mr. D., South Norfolk.**
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 980; (Amt.) 980; M. to recom., 1245; in Com., 1246 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1248 (ii).
 Man. and North-Western Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Scarth*) on M. to recom., 252 (ii).

Tisdale, Mr. D.—Continued.

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1175.
Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. *Denison*) on M
for 2°, 767 (i).

South Norfolk Ry. Co.'s (B. 34, 1°*) 110 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia (Clothing, &c.) 1213 (ii).

Treason and Felony Forfeitures Abolition B. 68 (Mr.
Thompson) on M. for 2°, 1148 (ii).

Trew, Mr. J., South Perth.

Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1541 (ii).

Debates, Official, distribution of extra copies of Reci-
procity deb. (remarks) 238 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) on
M. for 1°, 515 (i).

Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1667 (ii).

Fishery Reps., re superannuation of Valiquette
(remarks) 1507 (ii).

High Commissioner's Office, application of Civil Service
Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res.
1504 (ii).

Hot Springs, Banff (roads, &c) in Com. of Sup. 1618 (ii)

Indemnity to Members (remarks) 1536 (i).

Library, in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).

Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1022 (ii).

Merrick, Richard, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 647 (i).

Pairing of Members (remarks) 1371, 1403 (ii).

Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks)
1596 (ii).

Peace and Athabasca Rivers, Treaty with Indians
(Ques.) 825 (ii).

Penetanguishne, &c., Public Works (Ques.) 647 (i).

Prorogation (remarks) 1691 (ii).

Rys. and Canals Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1637 (ii).

Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).

Snetsinger, Mr., employment and dismissal by
Govt. (Ques.) 825 (ii).

Strathroy Public Building, selection of Site (Ques.)
66 (i).

Superior Court Judges, Montreal District (Ques.) 647.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, (Archives, payment to C. O.
Chipman) 1150; (Health Statistics) 1154 (ii).

Civil Government (Rys. and Canals) 1637 (ii).

Collection of Revenues (Excise) 1667 (ii).

Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1170; (Pauper) 1158 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1670. Mis-
cellaneous (Library) 1638 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Hot Springs, Banff) 1618 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Man.) 1022 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1541 (ii).

Victoria County (Ont.) Postal Services (Ques.) 825 (ii).

Voters' Lists, Suspension of Revision (Ques.) 965 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1114 (ii).

Tupper, Mr. C. H., Pictou.

Cape Breton Steam Dredge Substitute (Ques.) 1432.

Exchequer Court, contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).

Tupper, Mr. C. H.—Continued.

Imperial Federation, on Res. (Mr. *Marshall*) 1086 (ii).
King, James, claim against Govt. (M. for Sel. Com.)
865 (ii).

N. S. Telephone Co.'s (B. 59, 1°*) 344 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cart-
wright*) and Amts., 257-270 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 122 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, G.C.M.G., Cumberland.

Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).

Antwerp and Canada Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup.,
1679; conc., 1689 (ii).

Auditor Gen.'s Office, in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).

—— increase of Salary (prop. Res.) 498 (i).

Banking Act (General) Amt. (Ans.) 19 (i).

Banks, Supervision by Govt. (Ans.) 19 (i).

Behring's Sea, navigation by Canadian Vessels (Ans.)
44 (i).

—— Seizures, on M. for Cor., 969 (ii).

Boundaries of Ont., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks)
1629 (ii).

BUDGET, The (Ans.) 97, 822 (i); (Annual Statement)
1031-1048 (ii).

Can. Temp. Act (remarks) 922 (ii).

C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) (B. 123) prop. Res., 1001;
M. for Com. on Res., 1332; in Com., 1372; M. for
Com. on B., 1388; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1587.

—— in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).

—— Mortgage for Guaranteed Bonds (Ans.) 1195,
1506 (ii).

—— on enquiry for papers, 1586 (ii).

Campbellton and Gaspé Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup.,
1678 (ii).

Cape Breton Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1230 (ii).

Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).

Chambly Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s (B. 101) in
Com. on Res., 896; 2° m., 935; agreed to (Y. 84;
N. 52) 941; 3° m., 943 (ii).

Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1615 (ii).

Canada and Antwerp Mail Subsidy, 1679; conc. 1689.
Concurrence, 1687 (ii).

Contingencies, deptl., in Com. of Sup., 104 (i).

Cornwall Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452; conc., 1687 (ii).

Culbute Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).

Culling (contingencies) in Com. of Sup., 1668 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 957 (ii).
—— (B. 121, 1°) 1137; in Com., 1400 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1629 (ii).

Debt, Public, Loan (B. 133) prop. Res., 1136; M. for
Com., 1263, in Com., 1278; M. to conc. in Res., 1368;
1° of B., 1387 (ii).

Dom. Notes, Printing, &c., in Com., of Sup., 90 (i).

Dom. Savings Banks, in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).

Eastern Extension Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1231 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles—Continued.

- Estimates, The, for 1888-89 (presented) 50 (i).
 ——— Suppl. for 1887-88 (presented) 962 (ii).
 ——— Suppl. for 1888-89 (presented) 1403 (ii).
 Fabre, Mr. (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1613 (ii).
 Finance and Treasury Board, in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
 Fisheries Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1662 (ii).
 ——— Treaty, papers respecting (remarks) 62, 98 (i).
 ——— Letter to Mr. Bayard and Ans. (presented) 110 (i).
 ——— Mess. from His Ex. transmitting copy (presented) 86 (i).
 ——— Ratification (B. 65, 1°) 380; 2° m., 673, 692 (i); in Com., 870 (ii).
 Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1639, 1646 (ii).
 Grenville Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
 Govt. Savings Banks, Interest on Deposits (B. 127, 1°) 1332; 2° m., 1401 (ii).
 Half-breeds Claims, in Com. of Sup., 1666 (ii).
 Halifax and St. John Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1562 (ii).
 High Commissioner's Office, application of Civil Service Act, &c. (B. 136) in Com on Res, 1502; 1°* of B., 1505; 3° m., 1547 (ii).
 ——— contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 105 (i).
 Indian Affairs, in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
 Indemnities (Members) in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
 Inland Rev. Dept., in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
 Insurance Act Amt. (B. 126, 1°) 1332; 2° m., 1400 (ii).
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1224, 1620, 1629, 1644, 1650.
 Interest on Public Debt, in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).
 Interior Dept., in Com. of Sup., 93 (i).
 Justice Dept., in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).
 Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).
 ——— dismissal of Laborers, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1648 (ii).
 Lake St. Louis, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
 Lévis Graving Dock, Expenditure (Ans.) 1136 (ii).
 Magdalen Islands Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1678.
 Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 50, 86 (i), 962, 1403.
 Militia and Defence Dept., in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release (B. 134) prop. Res., 1031; M. for Com., 1280; in Com., 1295; in Com. on B., 1391 (ii).
 Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 93 (i), 1658 (ii).
 Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1646 (ii).
 Ques. of Order (Mr. McNeill) in Com. of Sup., 1208.
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry, in Com. of Sup., 1230.
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 1371 (ii).
 Post Office and Finance Depts., computing Interest, in Com. of Sup., 112 (i), 1634 (ii).
 Printing and Stationery Dept., in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
 Printing Bureau, in Com. of Sup., 1616 (ii).
 Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 90 (i).
 Public Accounts of Canada (presented) 18 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles—Continued.

- Public Works Dept., in Com. of Sup., 96 (i).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners, Amount advanced by Govt. (Ans.) 1232 (ii).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) (B. 135) prop. Res., 1031; M. for Com. on Res., 1296; in Com., 1296; M. to conc. in Res., 1391; 1°* of B., 1400 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1186, 1418, 1492 (ii).
 Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 769 (i), 916 (ii).
 Ry. Expenditure (remarks) 922 (ii).
 Rys. and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1637 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) Res. First Order of the Day (remarks) 43 (i).
 ——— protocols (remarks) 74 (i).
 ——— proposals of Plenipotentiaries, 87 (i).
 ——— entry of certain articles free of Duty (explanation) 516 (i).
 ——— on M. to adjn. deb. (remarks) 822 (i).
 Revenue and Audit Act (Consolidated) Amt. (B. 87, 1°) and prop. Res., 498 (i); 2° m., 889; in Com. on Res., 891; in Com., on B., 931, 943 (ii).
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1646, 1671 (ii).
 Ste. Anne's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
 St. Lawrence River and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
 St. Lawrence River Improvements, Montreal and Lake St. Peter (Ans.) 1135 (ii).
 St. Ours Locks, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
 Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1442, 1624 (ii).
 Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1669 (ii).
 Sinking Fund, in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).
 Statistical Diagrams, in Com. of Sup., 1664 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. (B. 140) Res. prop. and M. for Com., 1546; in Com. on Res., 1587 (i).
 SUPPLY—Ms. for Com., 17, 74 (i), 1524, 1551, 1595, 1629 (ii):
 Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives, payment to C. O. Chipman) 1149; (Dom. Exhibition) 1148, 1151; (Health Statistics) 1152 (ii).
 Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 1452; conc., 1687; (Oulbute) 1460; (Gratuities) 1646; (Grenville) 1459; (Lachine) 1452; (Lake St. Louis) 1453; (Murray) 1646; (Ste. Anne's) 1459; (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 1453; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1442, 1624; (Tay) 1459; (Trent River Nav.) 1454; (Welland) 1453; conc., 1688. Income (Chambly) 1460; (Miscellaneous) 1646; (Rideau) 1646, 1671; (St. Ours Locks) 1460; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 1460; (Welland) 1460, 1671 (ii).
 Charges of Management (Auditor and Asst. Rec. Gen., Winnipeg) 88; (Dom. Savings Banks) 89; (Interest on Public Debt) 89; (Printing Dom. Notes) 90; (Rec. Gen., Halifax) 88; (Sinking Fund) 89 (i).
 Civil Government (Agriculture) 95; (Auditor General's Office) 95; (contingencies) 104; (Finance and Treasury Board) 95; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 85; (High Commissioner's contingencies) 105; (Indian Affairs) 95; (Interior) 93; (Inland Revenue) 95; (Justice) 91; (Militia and Defence) 92; (Mounted Police) 93; (Post Office and Finance, computing Interest) 112; (Privy Council Office) 90; Printing

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

and Stationery) 92; (Public Works) 96 (i); (Rys. and
and Canals) 1637 (ii); (Sec. of State) 92 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Calling, contingencies) 1668; (Cus-
toms) 1629; (Post Office) 1634. Rys. (I. C. R.) 1620;
(Repairs, &c.) 1668; (Windsor Branch Ry.) 1623 (ii).
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1160; (Gratuities) 1639 (ii).
Indians (Ont. and Que.) 1605 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Indemnities) 1670; (Ses-
sional Clerks) 1669. Miscellaneous (Library, catalogue)
1630 (ii).
Ocean and River Services (Maintenance, &c.) 1577 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Antwerp and Canada) 1679; Campbellton
and Gaspé) 1678; (Halifax and St. John) 1678; (Magdalen
Islands) 1678 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1613;
(Commercial Agencies) 1615; (Fishery Commission) 1662;
(Half-Breeds' Claims) 1666; (Printing Bureau, Plant, &c.)
1616; (Statistical Diagrams) 1664 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1858 (ii).
Pensions (N.W.T.) 1642; (P.E.I.) 1671 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1463. *In-
come*: Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1563.
Railways—Capital (C.P.R.) 1221; (Cape Breton Ry.) 1230;
(Eastern Extension Ry.) 1231; (I.C.R.) 1224, 1629, 1644,
1650; (Oxford and New Glasgow Ry.) 1230; (Surveys, &c.)
1460 (ii).
Subsidies to Provinces, 1604 (ii).
Supply (B. 141) Res. in Com., and 1°*, 2°* and
3°*, 1690 (ii).
Surveys, &c., Railways, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
Tariff Changes (remarks) 24 (i).
Tay Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1454, 1460 (ii).
Tobique Valley Ry. (prop. Res.) M. for Com. and in
Com., 1626; wthdn., 1627 (ii).
Ways and Means (Res. for Com.) 17 (i).
—— The Budget, 1031–1048 (ii).
—— The Tariff, in Com., 1121 (ii).
Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453, 1460, 1671;
conc., 1688 (ii).
Windsor Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1623 (ii).
Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for
2°, 770 (i), 917 (ii).

Turcot, Mr. G., Megantic.

Megantic County Mail Service (Ques.) 825 (ii).
—— Contract (Ques.) 1232 (ii).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., South Simcoe.

SUPPLY:

Militia (Clothing, &c.) 1212 (ii).
York-Simcoe Battalion, Kit Allowance, on M. for Ret.,
69 (i).

Vanasse, Mr. F., Yamaska.

St. John's and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing
Co's. (B. 71, 1°*) 454 (i).

Wallace Mr. N. C., West York.

Debates, Official, 1st. Rep. of Com., on M. to conc.,
51 (i).
Trade Combinations (M.) for Sel. Com., 28, 32, 33 (i).
—— Prevention (B. 138) M. to introd., 1554 (ii).

Ward, Mr. H. A., East Durham.

Ont. Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 14, 1°*) 62 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1569 (ii).

Watson, Mr. R., Marquette.

Assiniboine River Bridges Authorisation (B. 86, 1°*)
489 (i).
C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles
Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1348; in Com.,
1381 (ii).
—— Lands held by Govt. west of Man. (Ques.) 1174.
Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 948 (ii).
Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).
Dom. Lands Agents in Man. and N. W. T., Instructions,
on M. for Ret., 37, 46 (i).
Emerson and North-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 85,
1°*) 489 (i).
Experimental Farms in Man. (Ques.) 495 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1576 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1655 (ii).
Homestead Inspectors in Man. and N. W. T., Reps.
(M. for Ret.) 71 (i).
Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1007.
Man. and N.W.T. Ry. Legislation (remarks) 1403 (ii),
Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1023 (ii).
N. W. T. Representation Act. Amt. B. 76 (Sir *John A.
Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1479 in Com., 1480;
on M. for 3°, (Amt.) 1551; neg (Y 62; N. 89)
1551 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1189.
1427 (ii).
Rebellion of 1885 (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1206 (ii).
South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. *Hall*) on
Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) 6 m. h., to M. for 3°, 915 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*)
on Res., 1591 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Penitentiaries (Man.) 1023 (ii).
Pensions (Rebellion of 1885) 1206 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging, 1571. Experimental Farms,
1576. Harbors and Rivers (N.W.T.) 1655 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1125 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. R. C., Albert.

Exchequer Court, contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 120.
Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*)
on M. for 2°, 841, 844 (ii).
Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, on Ques.
of Priv. (Mr. *Davies*) 1322 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. R. C.—*Continued.*

Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 908 (ii).

Kent (Ont.) Representation, Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec. (M. to conc.) 380 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 576-578 (i).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 120 (i).

Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1167 (ii).

Treason and Felony Forfeitures Abolition B. 88 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1148 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. C. W., *St. John, N.B., City and County.*

Antwerp and Canada Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1679 (ii).

Bridges, &c. (Ottawa) in Com. of Sup., 1573 (ii).

Can. Temp. Act Amt B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1248 (ii).

C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1372; in Com. on B., 1359.

—— Lands, Stmt. of Sales (Ques.) 496 (i).

Campbellton and Gaspé Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).

Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).

Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 69, 1°*) 454 (i)

Chatham Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 64, 1°*) 380 (i).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 940 (ii).

Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1615 (ii).

Compensation for Injuries, in Com. of Sup., 1612.

Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 948 (ii).

Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1279 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1144 (ii).

Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1570 (ii).

Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1634 (ii).

Fishery Overseers (salaries, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1583 (ii).

Fisheries Treaty, on non-production of papers (remarks) 143 (i).

—— Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 883 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1°, 1065; on M. for 2°, 1151 (ii).

Fraudulent Practices on Farmers, on Res. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sp. Com., 1244 (ii).

Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1404 (ii).

Grand Falls and Edmundston Mail Service (remarks) 1382 (ii).

Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1639 (ii).

Grazing Leases in the N. W. T. (Ques.) 495 (i).

Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1673 (ii).

Hawke, John T. impugning Judge's decision, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Davies*) 1318 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—*Continued.*

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1402 (ii).

Insolvency, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 495 (i).

I. C. R., Capital Account, amount charged (Ques.) 59.

—— Casualties, &c., Officials dismissed (M. for Ret.) 61 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1224, 1621, 1645 (ii).

—— Inquest on body of W. L. Duncan (M. for Ret.)* 493 (i).

—— Rolling Stock purchased (M. for Ret.) 61 (i).

Keystone Fire Ins. Co.'s (B. 78, 1°*) 489 (i).

King, James, Claim against Govt., on M. for Sel. Com., 865 (ii).

Labor Commission, composition and amounts paid (Ques.) 1468 (ii).

—— Cost (Ques.) 494 (i).

Logs, Shingle-bolts, &c., Duties collected (Ques.) 86 (i).

Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1283 (ii).

N. W. T. Representation Act. Amt. B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1486 (ii).

Onderdonk Arbitration, Plant taken over by Govt. under Award (Ques.) 98 (i).

Ottawa, additional Building, in Com. of Sup., 1462 (ii).

Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1634 (ii).

Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. to conc. in Res., 1397.

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1176, 1417, 1492; on M. for 3°, 1510 (ii).

Ry. Commission, Cost (Ques.) 494 (i).

Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1621, 1645 (ii).

Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 890; in Com. on Res., 891 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1450 (ii).

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1593 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 117 (i).

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1450 (ii).

Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 1634; (Rys., I. C. R.) 1621.

Fisheries (Overseers, salaries, &c.) 1583, 1601 (ii).

Immigration (Gratuities) 1639 (ii).

Mail Subsidies (Canada and Germany) 1679; (Campbellton and Gaspé) 1678 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) 1615; (Compensation for Injuries) 1612 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Water Police) 1579 (ii).

Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1463; (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1634. Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 1642. Income: Dredging, 1570. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1673; (Ont.) 1674. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 1572 (ii).

Railways—Capital (I. C. R.) 1224, 1645 (ii).

Travis, ex-Judge, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 117 (i).

Tobique Valley Ry. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com., 1626 (ii).

Voters' Lists, Suspension of Revision (Ques.) 965 (ii).

Water Police, in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1133 (ii).

Welland Canal, Section "A" (Ques.) 496 (i).

Welsh, Mr. W., Queen's, P.E.I.

- Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1462 (ii).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co's B. 101 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2^o, 935 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1471 (ii).
 Debatee, Official, distribution to Press (remarks) 750 (i).
 Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 120 (i).
 Fraudulent Practices on Farmers, on Res. (Mr. Brown) for Sp. Com., 1244 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1566 (ii).
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1227 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with on M. for Cor., 908 (ii).
 Lobster Fisheries, Restrictions, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1556 (ii).
 Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1023 (ii).
 Merchants Marine Insurance Co's B. 11 (Mr. Curran) on M. for 2^o, 126 (i).
 Mail Service, P.E.I., on M. for Cor., &c., 55 (i).
 Northern Light and Alert, Cor., Tols., &c. (M. for Ret.) 827 (ii).
 ——— Captain's Salary, &c. (M. for Ret.) 37 (i).
 ——— (Ques.) 416, 456 (i).
 ——— Employés, papers (Ques.) 1001 (ii).
 ——— Capt. Finlayson's salary, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1558 (ii).
 Pinette Harbor, Dredging of Bar (Ques.) 140 (i).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. to conc. in Res., 1399 (ii).
 Rebellion (1885) Claims of Scouts, &c., on Res. (Mr. Davin) to reconsider, 1243 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 317-321 (i).
 Surveys, &c., Railways, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 120 (i).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 1023 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1462. *Income*: Harbors and Rivers (Ques.) 1566 (ii).
Railways—Capital (I. C. R.) 1227. *Income* (Surveys, &c.) 1460 (ii).
 Wood Island Harbor, dredging (Ques.) 140 (i).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 756 (i).

White, Mr. P., North Renfrew.

- Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1684 (ii).
 Govt. Savings Banks (Interest on Deposits) B. 127 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1401 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1597 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1181, 1188, 1425, 1492 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 624-626 (i).

White, Mr. P.—Continued.

- Slides and Booms (salaries) in Com. of Sup., 1684 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1590 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Collection of Revenues (Culling Timber) 1684; (Slides and Booms, salaries, &c.) 1684 (ii).
 Upper Ottawa Improvement Co's (B. 20, 1^o*) 73; 2^o m., 322, 496; (M. for Com.) 1148 (ii).

White, Hon. Thos., Cardwell.

- Boundaries of Alaska and B. C. (Ans.) 495 (i).
 Brant and Haldimand Indian Reserves, appointment of doctor (Ans.) 647 (i).
 C. P. R. Lands, Stmt. of Sales (Ans.) 496 (i).
 Caughnawaga Indian Reserve Survey (Ans.) 495 (i).
 Cayuga, Indian lands near, appointment of Commissioners (Ans.) 27 (i).
 Dom. Lands Agents in Man. and N.W.T., Instructions, on M. for Ret., 36, 45 (i).
 Dom. Lands in Man. and N.W.T., Receipts from Sales (Ans.) 44 (i).
 Geological Survey of Ottawa County (Ans.) 495 (i).
 Gowanlock, Mrs., pension to (Ans.) 58 (i).
 Grazing Leases in the N.W.T. (Ans.) 495 (i).
 Homestead Inspectors in Man. and N.W.T., Reps., on M. for Ret., 71 (i).
 Indian Affairs, depl. Rep. (presented) 38 (i).
 Interior, depl. Rep. (presented) 18 (i).
 Rebellion (N.W.T.) Rep. of Royal Commission (presented) 97 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 161-170 (i).

Wilson, Mr. J. C., Argenteuil.

- Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 613-618 (i).
 South-Western Ry. Co's incorp. B. 54 (Mr. Hall) on Amt. (Mr. Bergin) 6 m. h., to M. for 3^o, 913 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. J. H., East Elgin.

- Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 1619 (ii).
 Bridges, &c. (Ottawa) in Com. of Sup., 1573 (ii).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1537 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act, on Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 79 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Bowell) in Com., 955 (ii).
 Fabre, Mr. (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1614 (ii).
 Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
 Kingston Post Office defalcations, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1013 (ii).
 Man. and N.W.T. Ry. Bills, on M. (Sir Hector Langevin) to withdr. 1585 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. J. H.—Continued.

- Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1198 (ii).
 N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 1481 (ii).
 Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Carling) in Com., 1512; on M. for 3^o, 1547; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 60; N. 93) 1548 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1598 (ii).
 Rys. and Canals Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1188, 1424, 1492; on M. for 3^o, 1508 (ii).
 Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. Denison) on M. for 2^o, 763 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts, 588-593 (i).
 Regina Gaol, in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 136 (i)
 Scrip issued in Man. and N.W.T. (M. for Ret.*) 866 (ii).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, payment to C. O. Chipman) 1149; (Health Statistics) 1151 (ii).
Civil Government (Rys. and Canals) 1638 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Adulteration of Food) 1619; (Weights and Measures) 1618 (ii).
Immigration (Gratuities) 1638; (Pauper) 1156 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1025 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1614 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 1022; (Regina Jail) 1025 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 136 (i).
Pensions (Vets. of 1812) 1201 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1637. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 1573 (ii).
Quarantine (Medical Inspection) 1198 (ii).
 Veterans of 1812 (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 Weights and Measures (salaries, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1618 (ii).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 757 (i).

Wilson, Mr. U., Lennox.

- Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1022 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 511-514 (i).

Wood, Mr. J. F., Brockville.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 1246 (ii).
 Central Ont. Ry. Co.'s (B. 102, 1^o*) 899 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1434 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 905 (ii).
 N. Y., St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 72, 1^o*) 454 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., entry of certain articles free of Duty, 520 (i).
 Private Bills Petitions (M.) to extend time, 50 (i).

Wood, Mr. J., Westmoreland.

- Moncton Harbor Improvement Act Amt. (B. 83, 1^o*) 489 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 298-303 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Administration of Justice* (Miscellaneous) 118 (i).
 Travis, ex-Judge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 118 (i).

Wright, Mr. A., Ottawa County.

- Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Bowell) in Com., 898 (ii).
 Geological Survey of Ottawa Co. (Ques.) 495 (i).
 Gowanlock, Mrs., claim for compensation (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1015, 1020 (ii).
 Papineauville Harbor, dredging (Ques.) 495 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1187 (ii).
 Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2^o, 891 (ii).

INDEX.-PART II.

SUBJECTS.

- ACCIDENTS, RY., REPORTED TO GOVT. AND ACTIONS PENDING :
M. for Ret.* (Mr. Denison) 62 (i).
- ADDRESS, FAREWELL, TO HIS EX.: Mess. from Senate, 1561 ;
agreed to, 1586 ; presented, 1691 (ii).
- IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. Montague) 2 ; seconded (Mr. Joncas) 7 (i).
- His Ex.'s reply, 172 (i).
- TO HER MAJESTY ON JUBILEE : Her Majesty's reply, 24 (i).
- ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER : Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 344 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 415 (i).
- M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 494 (i).
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 114 (i) ;
conc., 1685 (ii).
- Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°*, 2 (pro forma) (i).
- Adulteration Act (Chap. 107, Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 47 (Mr. Costigan). 1°, 238 (i) ; 2°*, 898 ; in Com., 932 ; 3°*, 935 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 24.)
- ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 1619 (ii).
- Advertising Counterfeit Money. See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- AGRICULTURE, IMMIGRATION, &c. :
- AGENTS' TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1167 (ii).
- AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES IN N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 1155 (ii).
- AGRICULTURE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 96 (i).
- DEPTL. REP. : Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 26 (i).
- presented (Mr. Carling) 455 (i).
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1148, 1638 (ii)
- ARCHIVES, CARE OF: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (ii).
- BAKER, MR., IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 1161, 1169 (ii).
- BARNARDO, DR. : in Com. of Sup., 1167 (ii).
- BUTTER-MAKING, PAMPHLET, GERMAN TRANSLATION: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 496 (i).
- FRENCH EDITION: Ques. (Mr. Couture) 98 (i).
- CATTLE QUARANTINE, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
- CENSUS AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (ii).
- CINCINNATI CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION, CAN. REPRESENTATION: Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 1136 (ii).
- CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION OF 1876, PAPERS, &c., re G. J. MACDONALD: M. for copies* (Mr. Landerkin) 866 (ii).
- CHIPMAN, C. C., PAYMENTS TO: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (ii).
- COLUMB, MR. : in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
- COLONIAL AND INDIAN EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
- CRIMINAL STATISTICS: Rep. presented (Mr. Carling) 1551 (ii).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARM FOR MAN. : Ques. (Mr. Watson) 495 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 1154, 1574 (ii).
- IN N. W. T., LOCATION, PAPERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Landerkin) 866 (i).
- AGRICULTURE, IMMIGRATION, &c.—Continued.
- EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN N. W. T., PROF SAUNDERS' REP. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Mc Mullen) 498 (i).
- HEALTH STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1151 (ii).
- HORSE BREEDING IN CANADA, PAMPHLET, TRANSLATION: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 85 (i).
- IMMIGRANTS, ACCOMMODATION AT REGINA: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 712 (i).
- FROM DAKOTA FOR MANITOBA, PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 495 (i).
- IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 1155, 1638 ; conc., 1686 (ii).
- JOHNSON, GEO. : in Com. of Sup., 1001 (ii).
- MC EACHERN MR. : in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
- MEDICAL INSPECTION, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
- MORIN, DR. J. A., CLAIM FOR MEDICAL SERVICES: M. for copy (Mr. Amyot) 655 (i).
- PAMPHLETS, &c, TRANSLATION: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 85 (i).
- IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 1158, 1165 (ii).
- PATENTS, APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER: in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
- "PATENT RECORD," EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (ii).
- PAUPER IMMIGRATION: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 964 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 1155, 1168 (ii).
- REMARKS (Sir Richard Cartwright, &c.) ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP., 1595 (ii).
- PLAYTHER, DR., SUBSIDY TO "HEALTH JOURNAL": in Com. of Sup., 1198 (ii).
- QUARANTINE SERVICE OF CANADA: M. (Mr. Fiset) for Sp. Com. 657 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
- SAUNDERS, PROFESSOR, REP. ON EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN N. W. T. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 498 (i).
- STATISTICAL DIAGRAMS, LITHOGRAPHING: in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).
- VACCINE, GRANT FOR PREPARING: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 140 (i).
- WATHELET, P., FOREIGN EMIGRATION AGENT, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. : Ques., 966 (ii).
- ALASKA AND B. C. BOUNDARY COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 495 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 171 (i).
- ALBERTA CATTLE RANCHES. See "GRAZING LEASES."
- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 68 (Mr. Davis). 1°*, 454 ; 2°*, 612 (i) ; withdn., 1585 (ii).
- ALBERTON HARBOR, DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 712 (i).
- ALBERT RY. CO.'S LOAN ACCOUNT: Ques. (Mr. Ellis) 826 (ii).
- ALBERT RY. CO.'S (N.B.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546 ; in Com., 1594 (ii).
- "ALERT," COR. RESPECTING CONDITION: M. for Ret. (Mr. Welsh) 827 (i).
- ALLEN, WARREN, CLAIM FOR ICE BOAT: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 833 (ii).
- AMERICA, WORKS ON: in Com. of Sup., 1030 (ii).
- AMERICAN HISTORY (PRINTING CATALOGUE): in Com. of Sup., 1030 (ii).
- American Vessels, Aid. See "WRECKED VESSELS."

- AMMUNITION, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 1211 (ii).
- Annapolis and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 82** (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*). 1°*, 489; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 978 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- Animals, Cruelty to.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- ARCHIVES, CARE OF:** in Com. of Sup., 1149 (ii).
- ARKONA POSTMASTER:** Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1018 (ii).
- DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 712 (i).
- ARTILLERY PRACTICE ON ISLAND OF ORLEANS:** M. for Copies of Pets, &c. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 672 (i).
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:** in Com. of Sup., 1148, 1638 (ii).
- Assiniboine River Bridges (construction) B. No. 86** (Mr. *Watson*). 1°*, 489; 2°*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 978 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 92)
- ATLANTIC OCEAN, OBSTRUCTIONS TO SHIPPING:** Ques. (Gen. *Laurie*) 1433 (ii).
- AUBRY, REV. M., SERVICES AS MILITARY CHAPLAIN:** M for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Amyot*) 654 (i).
- AUDETTE, ANTOINE, NORTH STUKELY POSTMASTER:** M. for copies of O.C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1092 (ii).
- AUDET, LIEUT. COL., AND FRENCH TRANSLATION OF FIELD EXERCISES:** M. for Cor. (Mr. *Amyot*) 655 (i).
- Audit Act.** See "REVENUE AND AUDIT."
- AUDITOR AND RECEIVER GENERAL, WINNIPEG:** in Com. of Sup., 88 (i).
- AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE:** in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
- INCREASE OF SALARY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 493 (i).
- APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS: presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 18 (i).
- BAKER, MR., IMMIGRATION AGENT AT QU'APPELLE:** in Com. of Sup., 1151, 1169 (ii).
- BANKS AND BANKING:**
- BANK OF LONDON IN CANADA.** See B. 80.
- BANKS SUPERVISION BY GOVT.:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 668 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 18 (i).
- FEDERAL BANK OF CANADA.** See B. 51.
- GENERAL BANKING ACT AMT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 19 (i).
- GOLD, REDEMPTION OF LEGAL TENDER NOTES:** Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 171 (i).
- LA BANQUE NATIONALE.** See B. 23.
- LEGISLATION:** Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 415 (i).
- [See "FINANCE."]
- Bank Act (Chap. 120, Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 119** (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 1135; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1402 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 27.)
- Bank of London winding-up B. No. 80** (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*). 1°*, 489; 2°*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1313 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- BARRACKS (B. C.):** in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).
- BAY FORTUNE, P. E. I., BREAKWATER, REP. OF ENGINEER:** M. for Copy (Mr. *McIntyre*) 656 (i).
- BAY OF QUINTE, BRIDGE AT BELLEVILLE:** M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. *Platt*) 922 (ii).
- BEAUHARNOIS CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judge's Rep. 825 (ii).
- BEHRING'S SEA, CLEARANCES TO VESSELS:** Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 44 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 778 (i).
- NAVIGATION BY CANADIAN VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 44 (i).
- M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gordon*) 966 (ii).
- Deb. (Mr. *Prior*) 966; (Mr. *Foster*) 968; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 968; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 969; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 969; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 970; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 971; (Mr. *Davies*) 971; (Mr. *McNeill*) 972; (Mr. *Edgar*) 973; (Mr. *Montague*) 973; (Mr. *Baker*) 973 (ii).
- BELFAST IMMIGRATION AGENCY (GRATUITY TO LATE AGENT):** in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
- Belleville and Lake Nipissing Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 96** (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°*, 866; 2°*, 954; in Com. and 3°*, 1067 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- Benevolent Societies B. No. 115** (Mr. *Dickinson*) 1°, 1062 (i).
- BEXLEY POSTMASTER:** Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 58 (i).
- BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.**—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*)
- 1°*, 2, *pro forma* (i).
- BILL (No. 2) To amend "The Dominion Controverted Elections Act."**—(Mr. *Amyot*.)
- 1°, 18 (i).
- BILL (No. 3) To protect the owners of certain bottles and vessels therein mentioned.**—(Mr. *Denison*.)
- 1°*, 27; 2° m., 759 (i).
- BILL (No. 4) To amend the Act respecting Defective Letters Patent and the Discharge of Securities to the Crown.**—(Mr. *McCarthy*)
- 1°, 44; 2°, 761 (i); in Com. and 3°, 916 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- BILL (No. 5) For the protection of Railway Employés**—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)
- 1°, 44; 2° m., 762; deb. adjd., 770 (i); *rsmd.*, 916; 2°, 917; Order dischgd. and ref. to Com. on B. 24, 1247 (ii).
- BILL (No. 6) To amend the "The Canada Temperance Act."**—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)
- 1°, 44 (i); 2° m., 978; 2° and in Com., 980; *recom.*, 1245; 3°*, 1259 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 7) To permit American vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters.**—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick*.)
- 1°, 44; 2° m., 770; deb. adjd., 778 (i); *rsmd.*, 917; 2° neg. (Y. 61, N. 84) 921 (ii).
- BILL (No. 8) To incorporate the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company.**—(Mr. *Patterson, Essex*.)
- 1°*, 51; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 392 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
- BILL (No. 9) Respecting the Canada Southern and the Erie and Niagara Railway Companies.**—(Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*.)
- 1°*, 51; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 392 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

- BILL (No. 10) To amend "The Canada Temperance Act."
—(Mr. Jamieson.)
1° 52 (i); 2° m., 985; Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) 6 m. h., 989; neg. (Y. 44, N. 88) and 2°, 1000; in Com., 1247; 3°*, 1259 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 35.)
- BILL (No. 11) To empower the Merchants Marine Insurance Company of Canada to relinquish its Charter and to provide for the winding-up of its affairs.—(Mr. Curran.)
1°*, 62; 2°, 322; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 98.)
- BILL (No. 12) To amend Chapter one hundred and twenty-seven of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled: "An Act respecting Interest."—(Mr. Landry.)
1°*, 62 (i).
- BILL (No. 13) To amend the Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.—(Mr. McNeill.)
1°, 62 (i).
- BILL (No. 14) To incorporate the Ontario Central Railway Company (name changed to Western Ontario).—(Mr. Ward.)
1°*, 62; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 496 (i). (51 Vic., c. 69.)
- BILL (No. 15) To incorporate the Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert.—(Mr. Macdowall.)
1°*, 62; 2°*, 219 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 954 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 108.)
- BILL (No. 16) To incorporate the Chinook Belt and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Perley, Assiniboia.)
1°*, 73; 2°*, 219; in Com. and 3°*, 647 (i). (51 Vic., c. 74.)
- BILL (No. 17) Respecting the River St. Clair Railway, Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)
1°*, 73; 2°*, 219; in Com. and 3°*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 94.)
- BILL (No. 18) To amend the Acts relating to the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)
1°*, 73; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 392 (i). (51 Vic., c. 56.)
- BILL (No. 19) To incorporate the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Montague.)
1°*, 73; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 496 (i). (51 Vic., c. 70.)
- BILL (No. 20) Relating to the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company.—(Mr. White, Ilenfrew.)
1°*, 73; 2° m., 322; 2°, 496 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1148 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 102.)
- BILL (No. 21) Respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)
1°*, 73; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 392 (i). (51 Vic., c. 84.)
- BILL (No. 22) To incorporate the Eastern Assurance Company.—(Mr. McDougald.)
1°*, 73; 2°*, 219; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 96.)
- BILL (No. 23) To reduce the capital stock of La Banque Nationale.—(Mr. Bryson.)
1°*, 73; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 24) To consolidate and amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Pope.)
1°, 73 (i); 2°*, 941; in Com., 1175, 1417, 1492; 3° m. and M. to recom., 1507; Amt. (Mr. Edgar) 1508; neg. (Y. 54, N. 93) 1510; 3°*, 1511 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 25) To confirm the Charter of incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)
1°*, 85; 2° m., 128; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 85.)
- BILL (No. 26) To confirm a certain agreement made between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Canada Southern Railway Company and the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)
1°*, 85; 2°, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 647 (i). (51 Vic., c. 59.)
- BILL (No. 27) To incorporate the Bronsons and Weston Lumber Company.—(Mr. Perley, Ottawa.)
1°*, 97; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 612 (i). (51 Vic., c. 103.)
- BILL (No. 28) To repeal an Act intituled: "An Act for facilitating navigation of the River St. Lawrence, in and near the Harbor of Québec."—(Mr. Guay.)
1°*, 97 (i).
- BILL (No. 29) To make further provision as to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.—(Mr. Brown.)
1°, 97 (i).
- BILL (No. 30) To authorise the Town of Kincardine, in the County of Bruce, to impose and collect certain Tolls at the Harbor in the said Town.—(Mr. Rowand.)
1°*, 97; 2°, 220 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1049 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 104.)
- BILL (No. 31) To incorporate the Detroit River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)
1°*, 110; 2°*, 497 (i); in Com., 912; 3°*, 953 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 91.)
- BILL (No. 32) To incorporate the Dominion Plate Glass Insurance Company.—(Mr. Holton.)
1°*, 110; 2°*, 322 (i); in Com., 946; 3°*, 978 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 95.)
- BILL (No. 33) To amend the Act incorporating the Hereford Branch Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Hereford Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)
1°*, 110; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 81.)
- BILL (No. 34) Respecting the South Norfolk Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)
1°*, 110; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 496 (i). (51 Vic., c. 57.)

- BILL (No. 35)** To enable the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to run a ferry between Beecher Bay, in British Columbia, to a point in the Straits of Fuca within the United States of America.—(Mr. Baker.)
1°*, 124; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 493 (i). (51 Vic., c. 89.)
- BILL (No. 36)** Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)
1°*, 124; 2°*, 220; in Com., 496; 3°*, 493 (i). (51 Vic., c. 58.)
- BILL (No. 37)** Respecting the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)
1°*, 124; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 38)** To amend the Acts respecting Patents of Invention.—(Mr. Carling.)
1°*, 124 (i); prop. Res., 125; conc. in, 1513; 2°* and in Com., 1511; 3° m., 1547; Amt. (Mr. Wilson, *Elgin*) neg. (Y. 60, N. 93) and 3°, 1548 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 39)** To amend the Act respecting Ferries, Chapter ninety-seven of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1°, 124 (i); 2°* and in Com., 895; 3°*, 896 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 40)** To extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.—(Mr. Charlton.)
1°*, 244 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1549 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 41)** Respecting the application of certain laws, therein mentioned, to the Province of Manitoba.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 139 (i); 2°*, 941; in Com. and 3°*, 1402 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 42)** To incorporate the Pontiac and Renfrew Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 322; in Com. and 3°*, 611 (i). (51 Vic., c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 43)** To amend the Act incorporating the Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 322; in Com. and 3°*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 44)** Respecting Bonds on Branch Lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 322; in Com. and 3°*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 45)** Respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1207 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 46)** To amend the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Scarth.)
1°*, 238; 2°*, 497; in Com., 612 (i); reconsid. in Com. and 3°*, 953 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 86.)
- BILL (No. 47)** To amend "The Adulteration Act," Chapter one hundred and seven of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1°, 238 (i); 2°*, 898; in Com., 932; 3°*, 935 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 48)** Further to amend the Law respecting Procedure in Criminal Cases.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 238 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 942 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 49)** To amend an Act respecting the Liability of Carriers by Water.—(Mr. Madill.)
1°, 238 (i).
- BILL (No. 50)** To incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)
1°*, 270; 2°*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 954 (ii).
- BILL (No. 51)** Respecting the Federal Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Cockburn.)
1°*, 270; 2°*, 497; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 52)** To amend the Act to incorporate the Mas-kinongé and Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. Coulombe.)
1°*, 270; 2°*, 497; in Com. and 3°*, 647 (i). (51 Vic., c. 82.)
- BILL (No. 53)** To make further provision respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Paterson, *Brant*.)
1°*, 270; 2°*, 497; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 62.)
- BILL (No. 54)** To incorporate the South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)
1°*, 270; 2°*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3° m., 912; Amt. (Mr. Bergin) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 57, N. 86) 953; 3°, 954 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 52.)
- BILL (No. 55)** To amend "The Representation Act" as respects certain Constituencies in British Columbia.—(Mr. Baker.)
1°, 309 (i).
- BILL (No. 56)** To amend the Act respecting Elections of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Baker.)
1°, 309 (i).
- BILL (No. 57)** Further to amend "The Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act," Chapter one hundred and thirty-five of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Baker.)
1°, 309 (i).
- BILL (No. 58)** To make further provision respecting Fisheries and Fishing.—(Mr. Kirk.)
1°, 309 (i).
- BILL (No. 59)** To confer certain powers on the Nova Scotia Telephone Company, limited.—(Mr. Tupper.)
1°*, 344; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 954 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 100.)
- BILL (No. 60)** To amend Chapter twenty-seven of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. Chapleau.)
1°*, 344 (i); 2° and in Com., 1005; 3°*, 1137 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 61)** Respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1049; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1345 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 78.)

- BILL (No. 62) To incorporate the Grenville International Bridge Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 954 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 63) To amend the Acts relating to the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Perley, Assiniboia.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°*, 612 (i). (51 Vic., c. 87.)
- BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the Chatham Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°*, 612 (i). (51 Vic., c. 72.)
- BILL (No. 65) Respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 380; 2° m., 673; deb. adjd., 711; rsmd., 779 (i), 833; 2°, 865; in Com., 867; 3°*, 889 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 66) To incorporate the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°* 612 (i). (51 Vic., c. 64.)
- BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Buffalo, Chippawa and Niagara Falls Steamboat and Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)
1°*, 415; 2°*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 978 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 101.)
- BILL (No. 68) To incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Davis.)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 612 (i); withdn., 1585 (ii).
- BILL (No. 69) To confirm a Mortgage given by the Central Railway Company to the Central Trust Company of New York to secure an issue of debentures.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1067 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 83.)
- BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the Montreal Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 63.)
- BILL (No. 71) To grant certain powers to the St. John's and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Vanasse.)
1°*, 454; 2°, 530; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i).
- BILL (No. 72) To incorporate the New York, St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1049 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 67.)
- BILL (No. 73) Respecting the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company.—(Mr. Fisher.)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 726 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1207 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 54.)
- BILL (No. 74) To amend the Act to incorporate the Kincardine and Teeswater Railway Company.—(Mr. Rowand.)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 493; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 75) To incorporate the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Renfrew.)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 65.)
- BILL (No. 76) To amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter fifty, respecting the North-West Territories.—(Sir John A Macdonald.)
1°, 454 (i); prop. Res., 1174; in Com., 1491; 2°*, 1473; in Com. on B., 1480; 3°*, 1547 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 77) To confirm a certain agreement made between the London and South-Eastern Railway Company and the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)
1°*, 85; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 647 (i). (51 Vic., c. 60.)
- BILL (No. 78) To incorporate the Keystone Insurance Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 978 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 97.)
- BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Tobique Gypsum Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. Burns.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 530; in Com. and 3°*, 790 (i). (51 Vic., c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 80) To wind up the Bank of London in Canada.—(Mr. Mills, Bothwell.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1313 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 50.)
- BILL (No. 81) To incorporate the Ontario, Manitoba and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 498 (i); withdn., 1585 (ii).
- BILL (No. 82) To incorporate the Annapolis and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 978 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 83) To amend the Act to incorporate the Moncton Harbor Improvements Company.—(Mr. Wood, Westmoreland.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 954 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 105.)
- BILL (No. 84) To incorporate the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1067 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Emerson and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Watson.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 612 (i); withdn., 1585 (ii).
- BILL (No. 86) To authorise the construction of Bridges over the Assiniboine River at Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie, for railway and passenger purposes.—(Mr. Watson.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 978 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 92.)
- BILL (No. 87) To amend "The Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act," Chapter twenty-nine of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
Res. prop. and 1° of B., 493 (i); 2°, 899; Res. in Com., 891; conc. in, 931; B. in Com., 931, 943; 3°*, 943 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 7.)

- BILL (No. 88) To abolish Forfeitures for Treason and Felony, and to otherwise amend the Law relating thereto.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1° 514 (i); 2°, 1147; withdn., 1629 (ii).
- BILL (No. 89) To amend "The Dominion Elections Act," Chapter eight, Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 514 (i); 2°, 941; in Com., 944, 1138; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. Barron), 1403; neg. (Y. 59, N. 83) and 3°, 1404 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 11.)
- BILL (No. 90) To amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter one hundred and eighty-one, respecting Punishments, Pardons and the Commutation of Sentences.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 515 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°, 942 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 91) To amend the Law relating to Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 515 (i); 2°, 942; in Com., 943, 1002; 3°, 1005 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 92) To amend Chapter thirty-two of the Revised Statutes respecting the Customs.—(Mr. Bowell.)
Res. prop., 499; 1°, 598 (i); 2°, 897; in Com., 898, 954, 1001; 3°, 1002; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1472 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 93) Further to amend "The Speedy Trials Act," Chapter one hundred and seventy-five of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 598 (i); 2°, 942; in Com. and 3°, 1005 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 94) To amend "The Railway Act."—(Mr. Cook.)
1°, 598 (i).
- BILL (No. 95) Respecting Gaming in Stocks and Merchandise—(G) from the Senate.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 750 (i); 2°, 1195; in Com., 1404; 3°, 1412 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 42.)
- BILL (No. 96) To incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company—(E) from the Senate.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 866; 2°, 954; in Com. and 3°, 1067 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 97) To amend the Act to incorporate the Board of Management of the Church and Manse Building Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada for Manitoba and the North-West.—(Mr. Daly.)
1°, 711; 2°, 790 (i); in Com. and 3°, 1313 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 107.)
- BILL (No. 98) Respecting the International Convention for the Preservation of Submarine Cables—(C) from the Senate.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 726 (i); 2°, 942; in Com. and 3°, 944 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 31.)
- BILL (No. 99) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—(Mr. Foster.)
1°, 750 (i); 2° and in Com., 1402; 3°, 1404 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 26.)
- BILL (No. 100) Respecting the application to Canada of the Criminal Law of England.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 825 (ii).
- BILL (No. 101) To make further provision respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, limited.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
Res. prop. and in Com., 896; 1° of B., 897; 2° m., 935; agreed to (Y. 84, N. 52) 941; 3°, 943 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 4.)
- BILL (No. 102) Respecting the Central Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. O'Brien.)
1°, 899; 2°, 954; in Com. and 3°, 1148 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 76.)
- BILL (No. 103) To provide for the examination and licensing of persons employed as engineers elsewhere than on steamboats.—(Mr. Cook.)
1°, 899 (ii).
- BILL (No. 104) Further to amend Chapter fifty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, "The Territories Real Property Act."—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 899; 2°, 1195; prop. Res., 1259; in Com., 1416; in Com. on B., 1412, 1415; 3°, 1433 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 105) To prevent the practice of fraud by tree peddlers and commission men in the sale of nursery stock.—(Mr. Boyle.)
1°, 899 (ii).
- BILL (No. 106) Further to amend "The Indian Act," Chapter forty-three of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)
1°, 922; 2° (Mr. Thompson) and in Com., 1007; 3°, 1011 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 107) Respecting the York Farmers Colonisation Company—(A) from the Senate.—(Mr. McCulla.)
1°, 1031; 2°, 1067; in Com. and 3°, 1313 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 106.)
- BILL (No. 108) Respecting the Advertising of Counterfeit Money.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 963; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1137 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 109) To provide for the care and reformation of children neglected or ill-treated by parents or guardians.—(Mr. O'Brien.)
1°, 963 (ii).
- BILL (No. 110) Further to amend "The Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act," Chapter one hundred and thirty-five of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 964; Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 1402 (ii).
- BILL (No. 111) To provide for the crossing of Railways by Street Drains and Water Mains.—(Mr. Lister.)
1°, 964 (ii).
- BILL (112) To amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter seventy-seven respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. Foster.)
1°, 1000; Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 1473 (ii).
- BILL (No. 113) To amend Chapter one hundred and seventy-eight of the Revised Statutes of Canada, "The Summary Convictions Act."—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 1001; 2°, 1402; in Com. and 3°, 1417; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1629 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 45.)

- BILL (No. 114) To amend the several Acts relating to the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto—(D) from the Senate.—(Mr. Small.)
1°*, 1031; 2°*, 1067; in Com. and 3°*, 1313 (ii). (51 Vic. c. 99.)
- BILL (No. 115) Respecting Benevolent Societies.—(Mr. Dickinson.)
1°, 1062 (ii).
- BILL (No. 116) To amend "The Civil Service Act," Chapter seventeen of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Chapleau.)
1°, 1062; 2°* and in Com., 1433, 1468; 3°*, 1472 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 117) To amend the "Electoral Franchise Act," Chapter five of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Chapleau.)
1°, 1062; 2°, 1549; in Com., 1551; 3° m., 1586; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to recom., neg. (Y. 53, N. 74) and 3°*, 1587 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 9.)
- BILL (No. 118) To amend the "Weights and Measures Act," as respects the contents of packages of Salt.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1°, 1093; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1402 (ii) (51 Vic., c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 119) To amend the "Bank Act," Chapter one hundred and twenty of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 1135; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1402 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 27.)
- BILL (No. 120) Further to amend "The Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act," Chapter one hundred and thirty-five of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 1135; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1402; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1549 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 121) To amend Chapter thirty-three of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting the duties of Customs.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
1°*, 1137; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1400 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 122) To amend Chapter thirty-four of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Inland Revenue.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1°*, 1137; 2°* and in Com., 1401; 3°*, 1402 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 16.)
- BILL (No. 123) To amend "The Criminal Procedure Act," Chapter one hundred and seventy-four of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 1173; 2°* and in Com.; 1513; 3°*, 1514 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 44.)
- BILL (No. 124) To amend the "Copyright Act," Chapter sixty-two of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 1173; withdn., 1629 (ii).
- BILL (No. 125) To amend "The North-West Territories Representation Act."—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 1231; 2°*, in Com., 3° m., Amt. (Mr. Watson) to recom. neg. (Y. 62, N. 89) and 3°*, 1551 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 126) To amend Chapter one hundred and twenty-four of the Revised Statutes, respecting Insurance.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
1°, 1332; 2°, 1400; M. for Com., 1416; in Com., 1417; 3°*, 1433 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 127) Relating to the Interest payable on Deposits in the Post Office and Government Savings Banks.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
1°, 1332; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1401 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 128) For the relief of Eleonora Elizabeth Tudor—(F) from the Senate.—(Mr. Small.)
1° on a div., 1345; 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1413; M. for special order for Com., 1468; 3° on a div., 1522 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 111.)
- BILL (No. 129) For the relief of Andrew Maxwell Irving—(J) from the Senate.—(Mr. Small.)
1° on a div., 1345; 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1414; M. for special order for Com., 1468; 3° on a div., 1522 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 109.)
- BILL (No. 130) For the relief of Catharine Morrison—(H) from the Senate.—(Mr. Small.)
1° on a div., 1345; 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1414; M. for special order for Com., 1468; 3° on a div., 1522 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 110.)
- BILL (No. 131) Further to amend "The Dominion Lands Act"—(L) from the Senate.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)
1°*, 1382; 2° and in Com., 1514; 3°, 1549 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 132) Respecting a certain agreement between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
Res. prop., 1001; M. for Com., 1332; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 1354; neg. (Y. 63, N. 111) 1371; Amt. (Mr. Mitchell) neg., 1371; M. for Com. agreed to (Y. 112, N. 60) 1371; in Com., 1372; 1° of B., 1382; 2°*, 1388; in Com., 1388; 3°*, 1391; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1587 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 32.)
- BILL (No. 133) To authorise the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the Public Service.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
Res. prop., 1136; M. for Com., 1259; in Com., 1278; 1°* and 2°* of B., 1387; in Com. and 3°*, 1388 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 2.)
- BILL (No. 134) To make further provision respecting the construction of the Ship Channel between Montreal and Quebec.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
Res. prop., 1031; M. for Com., 1280; in Com., 1294; 1°* and 2°* of B., in Com. and 3°*, 1391 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 135) Relating to certain Advances made to the Quebec Harbor Commissioners.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
Res. prop., 1031; in Com., 1296; M. to conc., 1383, 1391; conc. in, 1°*, 2°* of B. and in Com., 1400; 3°*, 1404 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 6.)

- BILL (No. 136)** To amend Chapter sixteen of the Revised Statutes, respecting the High Commissioner for Canada in the United Kingdom.—(Sir *Charles Tupper*.)
 Res. prop., 1502; conc. in, 1°*, 2°* of B. and in Com., 1505; 3° m., 1506; 3°, 1547 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 137)** Respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Boyle*.)
 Rule suspended, 1°*, 2°* and in Com., 1522; 3°*, 1524 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 79.)
- BILL (No. 138)** For the prevention and suppression of Combinations formed in restraint of trade.—(Mr. *Wallace*.)
 1°, 1544; Notice of M., B. to take effect on 22nd May, 1691 (ii).
- BILL (No. 139)** Respecting the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)
 Rule suspended, 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1563 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- BILL (No. 140)** To authorise the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Sir *Charles Tupper*.)
 Res. prop., 1546; in Com., 1587; conc. in, 1°*, 2°* and in Com., 1595; 3°*, 1629 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- BILL (No. 141)** For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the years ending respectively the 30th June, 1888, and the 30th June, 1889, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Sir *Charles Tupper*.)
 Res. conc. in, 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1690 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- BILL (No. 142)** To amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts, Chapter one hundred and thirty-eight of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Thompson*.)
 Res. prop., 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 1690 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- BILLS ASSENTED TO**, 1196, 1692 (ii).
- BILLS WITHDRAWN**, 1585, 1629 (ii).
- Board of Trade.** See "Toronto."
- BOBCAYGEON, DAM AT**: in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- BONILLA POINT AND VICTORIA (B.C.) TELEGRAPH**: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
- Bottles and Vessels Protection to Owners B. No. 3** (Mr. *Denison*). 1°*, 27; 2° m., 759 (i).
- BOUNDARIES OF ONT.**: Remarks (Mr. *Dawson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1629 (ii).
- BOUNDARY BETWEEN ALASKA AND CAN.**: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 171 (i).
 — ALASKA AND B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 498 (i).
- BOOKS ON THE MILITIA FORCE OF CAN., TRANSLATION**: Ques (Mr. *Amyot*) 85 (i).
 — REMOVAL OF DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 899 (ii).
- BRANT AND HALDIMAND INDIAN RESERVE, DOCTOR**: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 647 (i).
- Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s further provision B. No. 53** (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*). 1°*, 270; 2°*, 497; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS**: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1514 (ii).
- BRIDGE AT CHIPPAWA VILLAGE**: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 65 (i).
 — AT QUEBEC, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1625 (ii).
- BRIDGES, OTTAWA CITY AND RIVER**: in Com. of Sup., 1571.
- BRIGADE MAJORS SALARIES, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA**:
 ALASKA AND B. C. BOUNDARY COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 495 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 171 (i).
 BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).
 BEERING'S SEA FISHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 778 (i).
 — NAVIGATION BY CAN. VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 44 (i).
 — SEIZURES, COR. RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gordon*) 986 (ii).
 BONILLA POINT AND VICTORIA TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
 COUNTY COURT JUDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 66 (i).
 ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1632, 1653 (ii).
 IMMIGRATION AGENT, VICTORIA: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (ii).
 INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 1682 (ii).
 KAMLOOPS AS AN OUTPORT OF ENTRY, MR. PARMELIN'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Mara*) 498 (i).
 ONDERDONK ARBITRATION, PLANT TAKEN OVER BY GOVT.: Details (Mr. *Pope*) 111 (i).
 — Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 98 (i).
 PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).
 PUB. WORKS AGENCY: in Com. of Sup., 1633 (ii).
 VICTORIA, POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 826 (ii).
 — Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
- BROME CONTROVERTED ELECTION**: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).
- Bronsons and Weston Lumber Co.'s incorp. B. No. 27** (Mr. *Perley, Ottawa*). 1°*, 97; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 612 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 103.)
- BRUCE, WEST, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT**: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- BYRANTON, ALBERT AND ALLAN, COR. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY.**: M. for copy* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 866 (ii).
- Buffalo, Chippawa and Niagara Falls Steamboat and Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 67** (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*). 1°*, 415; 2°*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 978 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 101.)
- BUOYS IN RIVER SAGUENAY**: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1433 (ii).
 — ST. LAWRENCE, MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1582 (ii).
- BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**: Remarks, 26, 125, 416, 456 (i).
 — M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to change hour of meeting 1500 (ii).
 — notification (Sir *John A Macdonald*) of Prorogation 1625 (ii).
 — M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Thursdays, 711 (i); Wednesdays, 1061; Saturdays, 1259; Mondays, 1332 (ii)
- BUTTER-MAKING, PAMPHLET ON, FRENCH TRANSLATION**: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 98 (i).
 — GERMAN TRANSLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 496 (i).
- CAB HIRE**: in Com. of Sup., 104 (i).
- CABLE, PELEE ISLAND AND MAINLAND**: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Brien*) 1011 (ii).

- CABLE, PELEE ISLAND, PETITIONS, &C.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 826 (i).
- CABLES (SUBMARINE).** See "INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION."
- CADETS, MILITARY COLLEGE:** in Com. of Sup., 123 (i).
- CAMPBELL, ARCH. D., ESQ., M. P. FOR KENT, ONT.:** introduced, 1648 (ii).
- CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ, &C., MAIL SUBSIDY:** in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
- CAN. AND ANTWERP OR GERMANY MAIL SUBSIDY:** in Com. of Sup., 1679; conc., 1689 (ii).
- "CANADA GAZETTE:" in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii)
- Can. and Michigan Tunnel Co.'s incorp. B. No. 8** (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1°*, 51; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 392 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
- Can. Southern and Erie and Niagara Ry. Co.'s B. No. 9** (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*). 1°*, 51; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 392 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- Can. Southern Ry. Co.** See B. 26, and "LONDON AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO."
- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. No. 6** (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 44 (i); 2° m, 978; 2° and in Com., 980; reoom., 1245; 3°*, 1259 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. No. 10** (Mr. *Jamieson*). 1°. 52 (i); 2° m., 985; Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 6 m. h., 989; neg. (Y. 44, N. 88) and 2°, 1000; in Com., 1247; 3°*, 1259 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- Deb. on M. for 2° (Mr. *Jamieson*) 985; (Mr. *Fisher*) 988; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 989; Amt., 6 m. h., 990 (ii).
- Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 990; (Mr. *Freeman*) 992; (Mr. *Jamieson*) 994; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 995; (Mr. *Fisher*) 998; (Mr. *Casey*) 999 (ii).
- CAN. TEMP. ACT, LEGISLATION: Res.** (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 74; neg. (Y. 57, N. 109) 84 (i).
- Deb (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 75; (Mr. *Laurier*) 75; (Mr. *Jamieson*) 75; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 76; (Mr. *Freeman*) 77; (Mr. *Servier*) 77; (Mr. *Fisher*) 78; (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 79; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 80; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 81; (Mr. *Foster*) 82; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 83; (Mr. *Haggart*) 84 (i).
- EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).
- CANADIAN FISHING VESSELS, REPORTING, &C.:** Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 24 (i).
- C. P. R. (Bonds on Branch Lines) B. No. 44** (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 206; 2°*, 322; in Com. and 3°*, 498 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. No. 132** (Sir *Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 100 (i); M. for Com., 1332; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1345; neg. (Y. 63, N. 111) 1371; Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) neg., 1371; M. for Com. agreed to (Y. 112, N. 60) 1371; in Com., 1372; 1° of B., 1382; 2°*, 1383; in Com., 1388; 3°*, 1391; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1587 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- Deb. on Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1332; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1339; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1338; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1345 (ii).
- Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1345; (Mr. *Amyot*) 1347; (Mr. *Watson*) 1348; (Mr. *Daly*) 1352; (Mr. *Dawson*) 1357 (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1358; (Mr. *Davin*) 1363; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1366; (Mr. *Perley, Assiniboia*) 1367.
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.:**
- CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
- LANDS LIABLE TO TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Perley, Assiniboia*) 494 (i).
- LAND SALES IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 44, 496 (i).
- LANDS UNSOLD, ACREAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1195 (ii).
- MORTGAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1195 (ii).
- Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1586 (ii).
- ORDERDUNK ARBITRATION, PLANT TAKEN OVER BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St John*) 98 (i).
- DETAILS: presented (Mr. *Pope*) 111 (i).
- SECTIONS IN B. O.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 86 (i).
- CANALS:**
- CHAMBLY: in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- CORNWALL: in Com. of Sup., 1452; conc., 1687 (ii).
- CULBUTE: in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- DAM AT BOBAYGHEON: in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- FARRAN'S POINT DIVISION: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
- FENSLON RIVER NAVIGATION, DEPTH OF WATER: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 97 (i).
- GREENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
- LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL OF LABORERS: in Com. of Sup., 1170, 1563 (ii).
- Ref. to in Reciprocity deb., 631 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
- WATER POWER, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: presented (Mr. *Pope*) 52 (i).
- LAKEFIELD AND BALSAM LAKE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).
- LAKE ST. LOUIS: in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).
- MURRAY (TOWARDS COMPLETION): in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
- REPAIRS AND WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1624, 1688 (ii).
- RIDEAU BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 1646, 1671 (ii).
- ST. ANNE'S: in Com. of Sup., 1459, 1648 (ii).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 1453, 1646 (ii).
- SAULT STE. MARIE: in Com. of Sup., 1446, 1624 (ii).
- ST. OURS LOCKS: in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- TAX: in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
- THOROLD CANAL WATER POWER: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 647 (i).
- TRENT RIVER NAV.: in Com. of Sup., 1454, 1460 (ii).
- TRENT VALLEY CANAL COMMISSION, COR., &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 71 (ii).
- WELLAND: in Com. of Sup., 1453, 1460, 1671; conc., 1688 (ii).
- SECTION "A": Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 496 (i).
- WILLIAMSBURG: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
- CANADIAN VESSELS LOST ON GREAT LAKES:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 19, 752 (i).
- WRECKING VESSELS IN U.S. WATERS: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Edgar*) 665 (i).
- CAPE BRETON:**
- ISBSTER AND REID'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Victoria*) 1299 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1067 (ii).
- NORTH SYDNEY PILOTAGE RETURNS UNDER ACT OF 1873: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 1067 (ii).
- POINT TUPPER RY. PIER, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Victoria*) 1299 (ii).
- RY. CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1230 (ii).
- SHERWOOD, A. P., AND CAPE BRETON RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 965 (ii).
- SIMMS & SLATER'S SUBRENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1067 (ii).
- CONTRACTORS CAPE BRETON RY., COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Flynn*) 1259 (ii).
- CAP CHAT AND GRAND VALLÉE FISHERIES, REPS.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Joncas*) 1232 (ii).
- CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOR:** in Com. of Sup., 1462 (ii).
- CAPITAL ACCOUNT.** See "I. C. R."

- Carriers by Water Liability Act Amt. B. No. 49** (Mr. Madill) 1^o, 238 (i).
- CARLETON (ONT.) RET. OF MEMBER ELECT**: notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- CARTRIDGE FACTORY, &C. (QUE.) WATER SUPPLY, COB.**: M. for copies* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1092 (ii).
- CARTRIDGES, REP. OF COMMISSION ON MANUFACTURE**: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 1232 (ii).
- CASUALTIES, &C., ON I.C.R.**: M. for Ret. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 61 (i).
- CATTLE QUARANTINE, EXPENSES**: in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
- CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS**. See "INDIANS."
- CAYUGA INDIAN LANDS**. See "INDIANS."
- CAYUGA P. O. SITE**: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 28 (i).
- CENSUS AND STATISTICS**: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (ii).
- CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION OF 1876, PAPERS, &C, re G. J. MACDONALD**: M. for copies* (Mr. Landerkin) 866 (i).
- Central Ont. Ry. Co.** See "WESTERN ONTARIO."
- Central Ont. Ry. Co.'s B. No. 102** (Mr. O'Brien). 1^o*, 899; 2^o*, 954; in Com. and 3^o*, 1148 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 76)
- PETITION: M. (Mr. O'Brien) to ref. back to Standing Com., 750 (i).
- Central Ry. (N. B.) Co.'s (confirmation of mortgage) B. No. 69** (Mr. Weldon, St. John). 1^o*, 404; 2^o*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 1067 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 83.)
- SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546; in Com., 1593 (ii).
- Central Trust Co. of N. Y.** See "CENTRAL RY. CO."
- CHAMBLY CANAL**: in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT**: in Com. of Sup., 88 (i).
- CHARLEVOIX, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT**: notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- CHATHAM BRANCH RY. (N. B.) Co.'s. SUBSIDY**: prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546; in Com., 1594 (ii).
- Chatham Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 64** (Mr. Weldon, St. John). 1^o*, 380; 2^o*, 498; in Com. and 3^o*, 612 (i). (51 Vic., c. 72.)
- Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s (Subsidy) B. No. 101** (Sir Charles Tupper). Res. prop. and in Com., 896; 1^o* of B., 897; 2^o m., 935; agreed to (Y. 84, N. 52) 941; 3^o, 943 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 4.)
- Children, care and Reformation, &c., Provision B. No. 109** (Mr. O'Brien). 1^o, 963 (ii).
- Chinook Belt and Peace River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 16** (Mr. Perley, Assiniboia). 1^o*, 73; 2^o*, 219; in Com. and 3^o*, 647 (i). (51 Vic., c. 74.)
- CHIPMAN, C. C., PAYMENTS TO**: in Com. of Sup., 1149, 1165.
- CHIPPAWA AND OTTAWA NATION INDIANS' CLAIMS**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 498 (i).
- CHOQUETTE, MR., M.P., PETITION AGAINST RETURN**: objection (Mr. Laurier) 1334, 1458 (ii).
- CHOUNARD, H. J. J. B., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR DORCHESTER**: introduced, 2 (ii).
- CIEMON, S, ESQ, MEMBER ELECT FOR CHARLEVOIX**: introduced, 1 (i).
- CINCINNATI CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION, CAN. REPRESENTATION**: Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 1136 (ii).
- CIVIL GOVERNMENT**: in Com. of Sup., 90 (i), 1637, 1668 (ii).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 13** (Mr. McNeill). 1^o, 62 (i).
- Civil Service Act (Chap. 17 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 116** (Mr. Chapleau). 1^o, 1062; 2^o* and in Com., 1433, 1468; 3^o*, 1472 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 12.)
- BOARD OF EXAMINERS: in Com. of Sup., 113, 128 (i).
- LIST OF CANADA: presented (Mr. Chapleau) 172 (i).
- TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 965 (ii).
- NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 495 (i).
- CLANCEY, PATRICK, COB. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY**: M. for copies* (Mr. Mitchell) 866 (i).
- CLAYES, MR., LATE M.P.**: Remarks (Mr. Laurier) on decease, 62 (i).
- CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY**: Ref. to, 93, 95 (i), 1511 (ii).
- CLOTHING AND GREAT COATS**: in Com. of Sup., 1212, 1215 (ii).
- CLOTHING FOR MILITIA, TENDERS AND CONTRACT**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bowman) 866 (i).
- COAL SUPPLY, GOVT. TENDERS AND CONTRACTS**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Guillet) 866 (i).
- COCHRANE, E., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR NORTHUMBERLAND**: introduced, 2 (i).
- COLCHESTER, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT**: notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- COLLECTION OF REVENUES**: in Com. of Sup., 1619, 1632, 1667, 1684 (ii).
- Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 19** (Mr. Montague). 1^o*, 73; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 496 (i). (51 Vic., c. 70.)
- COLLISIONS ON HIGH SEAS, LEGISLATION**: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 826 (ii).
- COLMER, MR.**: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
- COLONIAL AND INDIAN EXHIBITION**: in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
- COLONISATION Co.'s in MAN. AND N.W.T.**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 498 (i).
- INSPECTOR, MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Watson) 71 (i).
- M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 866 (i).
- Combinations**. See "TRADE."
- COMMERCIAL AGENCIES**: in Com. of Sup., 1615 (ii)
- COMMERCIAL RELATIONS**. See "RECIPROCIETY."
- COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS**: in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
- COMMITTEES**:
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL: M. (Mr. Bowell) for Sel. Com. to supervise, 18(i)
- FARMERS, FRAUDULENT PRACTICES ON: M. (Mr. Brown) for Sp. Com., 1244 (ii).
- KING, JAMES, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: M. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) for Sel. Com., 865 (ii).
- QUARANTINE SERVICE OF CANADA: M. (Mr. Fiset) for Sp. Com., 657 (i).

COMMITTEES—Continued.

- SELECT STANDING:** M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 2 (i).
 — M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) for Com. to prepare Lists, 20 (i).
 — Lists presented, 25 (i)
 — M. (Sir Hector Langevin) to add names, 598 (i), 823 (ii).
TELEGRAPH LINES, ASSUMPTION BY GOVT.: M. (Mr. Denison) for Sel. Com., 101 (i).
TRADE COMBINATIONS: M. (Mr. Wallace) for Sel. Com., 28 (i).
 — M. (Mr. Wallace) to employ shorthand writers, 51 (i).
 — M. (Mr. Edgar) for Sel. Com., withdn, 60 (i).

Commutation of Sentences. See "CRIMINAL LAW."
COMPANIES. See

- BRONSONS AND WESTON LUMBER CO.
 DOM. PLATE GLASS CO.
 EASTERN ASSURANCE CO.
 GREENVILLE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE CO.
 KEYSTONE FIRE INSURANCE CO.
 MERCHANTS MARINE INSURANCE CO.
 MONCTON HARBOR IMPROVEMENT CO.
 NOVA SCOTIA TELEPHONE CO.
 ST. JOHN'S AND ISSEVILLE HYDRAULIC AND MANUFACTURING CO.
 UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT CO.
 YORK FARMERS COLONISATION CO.

[See also "RAILWAYS" and "SUBSIDIES."]

- CONCURRENCE:** 1685 (ii).
CONFEDERATION, ADMISSION OF NEWFOUNDLAND: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Laurier) 664 (i).
CONFEDERATION TERMS WITH P. E. I. See "TERMS."
CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: M. for Ret.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 38 (i).
CONTINGENCIES & C: in Com. of Sup., 104, 119 (i), 1218 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. See "DOMINION."
 — See "ELECTIONS."
Copyright Act (Chap. 62 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 124 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 1173; withdn., 1629 (ii).
COPYRIGHT, PROP. LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 98 (i).
CORBY, HENRY, ESQ., M.P. FOR WEST HASTINGS: introduced, 270 (i).
CORNWALL CANAL, 1452; conc., 1687 (ii).
COST OF CANADIAN RYS: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 141, 170 (i).
COSTS, &C., re ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBERING CO.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 20 (i).
COUNTY COURT JUDGES (B.C.) ADDITIONAL: Ques. (Mr. Mara) 66 (i).
 — (ONT.) SALARIES: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 899 (ii).
 — SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
Counterfeit Money. See "CRIMINAL LAW."
COURSOL, C. J., INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
COURT OF APPEAL, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 647 (i)
Criminal Law (advertising counterfeit money) B. No. 108 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 963; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1137 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 40.)
Criminal Law (cruelty to animals, Chap. 172 Rev. Statutes) further Provision B. No. 29 (Mr. Brown). 1°, 97 (i).
Criminal Law (English) application to Canada B. No. 100 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 825 (ii).
Criminal Law (forfeitures for treason, &c.) B. No. 88 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 514 (i); 2°, 1147; withdn, 1629 (ii).

- Criminal Law (fraudulent marks on merchandise) B. No. 91** (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 515 (i); 2°, 942; in Com., 943, 1002; 3°, 1005 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 41.)
Criminal Law (gaming in stocks and merchandise) B. No. 95 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 750 (i); 2°, 1195; in Com., 1404; 3°, 1412 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 42.)
Criminal Law (procedure Chap. 174 Rev. Statutes) B. No. 123 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 1173; 2°* and in Com., 1513; 3°*, 1514 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 44.)
Criminal Law (procedure in criminal cases) B. No. 48 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 238 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°, 942 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 43.)
Criminal Law (punishments, pardons, &c., Chap. 181 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 90 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 515 (i); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 942 (ii) (51 Vic., c. 47.)
Criminal Law (speedy trials, Chap. 175 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 93 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 598 (i); 2°, 942; in Com. and 3°*, 1005 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 46.)
Criminal Law (summary convictions, Chap. 178 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 113 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 1001; 2°*, 1402; in Com. and 3°*, 1417; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1629 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 45.)
CRIMINAL LAWS, DISTRIBUTION TO JUSTICES: Ques. (Mr. Bernier) 59 (i).
 — DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 86 (i).
CRIMINAL STATISTICS: presented (Mr. Carling) 1551 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1151 (ii).
CULBERTSON, ARCHIBALD, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. Burdett) 977 (ii).
CULBUTE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
CULLING TIMBER: in Com. of Sup., 1619, 1667, 1684 (ii).
CUMBERLAND, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Customs Act (Chap. 32 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 92 (Mr. Bowell). Res. prop., 499; 1°, 598 (i); 2°, 897; in Com., 898, 954, 1001; 3°*, 1002; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1472 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 14.)
Customs Act (Chap. 33 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 121 (Sir Charles Tupper). 1°, 1137; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1400 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 15.)
CUSTOMS AND EXCISE:
 BEHRING'S SEA, CLEARANCES TO VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 44 (i).
 BOOKS, REMOVAL OF DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 899 (ii).
 CAN. FISHING VESSELS, REPORTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 24 (i).
 CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 95 (i), 1639, 1666 (ii).
 DIAMONDS, &C, SEIZED AT QUEBEC, COR., O, U.'s, &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. Langlet, Quebec) 1088, 1092 (ii).
 DUTIES ON FLOUR, CORNMEAL, &C., Res. (Mr. Mitchell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1564 (ii).
 DUTIES ON LOGS, &C, AMOUNT COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 86 (i).
 EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 23 (i).
 EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 1618, 1667 (ii).
 FREE LIST AND U. S. TARIFF, REP. OF MIN. OF CUSTOMS: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 647 (i).
 — O. C. PLACING CERTAIN ARTICLES ON: Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 648 (i).
 HAY DUTIES REFUND BY U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Lavergne) 712 (i).

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE—Continued.

- INLAND REVENUE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
 INTERNATIONAL REGULATIONS *re* TRADING VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 828 (ii).
 KAMLOOPS AS AN OUTPORT OF ENTRY, MR. PARMELLE'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. Mara) 498 (i).
 LOGS, SHINGLEBOLTS, &C., DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 86 (i).
 PICTON, EXCISEMAN, REVENUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Platt) 1432 (ii).
 RECIPROCITY WITH U. S., REDUCTION OF DUTIES: Remarks (Mr. Landerkin) 554 (i).
 RIMOUSKI CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1087 (ii).
 SALT IN BARRELS, BAGS, &C., WEIGHT: Ques. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 97 (i).
 TARIFF CHANGES AND NEWSPAPER CORRESPONDENTS: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 24 (i).
 TOBACCO, LEAF, PURCHASE AND SALE: Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 66 (i).
 WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 97 (i).

DAIRY PRACTICE. See "BUTTERMAKING."

DALHOUSIE BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1226 (ii).

DEBATS DU CONSEIL LEGISLATIF, QUÉBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).

"DEBATES, OFFICIAL," DISMISSAL OF TRANSLATORS:

- Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Laurier) 20, 128 (i).
 ——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Speaker) 38 (i).
 ——— Res. (Mr. Laurier) 713 (i).

Deb (Sir Richard Cartwright) 721, 713; (Mr. Casey) 731; (Mr. Chapleau) 716, 745; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 693; (Mr. Davin) 725; 721; (Mr. Desjardins) 744; (Mr. Edgar) 721; (Mr. Fisher) 742; (Mr. Ives) 722; (Mr. Landerkin) 738; (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 728; (Mr. Laurier) 747; (Sir John A. Macdonald) 720; (Mr. McNeill) 742; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 717; (Mr. Mitchell) 748; (Mr. Mulock) 725; (Mr. Platt) 746; (Mr. Sproule) 740; (Mr. Thompson) 704 (i).

——— DISTRIBUTION TO PRESS: Remarks, (Sir Richard Cartwright) 730 (i).

——— FRENCH TRANSLATION, DELAY: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 554 (i).

——— M. (Mr. Desjardins) to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 25, 51 (i).

——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. to conc. (Mr. Desjardins) 489 (i), 823; (Mr. Davin) 1298 (ii).

——— 3rd Rep. of Com. (Translators) M. to conc. (Mr. Desjardins) 1501 (ii).

——— RECIPROCITY DEB, DISTRIBUTION OF EXTRA COPIES: Remarks (Mr. Trow) 238 (i).

DEBT OF THE DOM.: Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1061 (ii).

——— See "LOAN."

Defective Letters Patent. See "LETTERS PATENT."

DELANEY, MRS., PENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).

DEPUTY ADJUTANTS GENERAL, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).

DERBY BRANCH RY. AND JNO. KNIGHT, &C., COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. Mitchell) 866 (i).

DETROIT RIVER BRIDGE CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 31 (Mr. Ferguson, Welland). 1°*, 110; 2°*, 497 (i); in Com., 912; 3°*, 953 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 91).

DIAMONDS, &C., SEIZED AT QUÉBEC, COR. O. C., &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1068, 1092 (ii).

DICKINSON, G. L., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR CARLETON (ONT.): introduced 1 (i).

DIGBY, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT, notification: (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. RY. CHARTERS COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.: M. for copies* (Mr. Laurier) 672 (i).

——— PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 1136.

DISLOYALTY: personal explanation (Mr. Amyot) 598 (i).

DIVISIONS:

O. P. R.: Prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1001; 2° m., 1332; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 1345; neg. (Y. 63, N. 111) 1370; Amt. (Mr. Mitchell) neg., 1371; M. for Com. agreed to (Y. 112, N. 60) 1371 (ii).

CAN. TEMP. ACT AMT. B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson): 2° m., 985; Amt. 6 m h (Mr. O'Brien) 990; M. to adjn. deb. (Mr. Haggart) 995; neg. (Y. 44, N. 88) 1000 (ii).

CAN. TEMP. ACT: Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 57, N. 109) 94 (i).

CHICAGO MARINE TRANSPORT RY. CO.'S B. 101 (Sir Charles Tupper): 2° m., 935; agreed to (Y. 84, N. 52) 941 (ii).

DEBATS, OFFICIAL, DISMISSAL OF TRANSLATORS: Res. (Mr. Laurier) 716; Amt. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 722; Amt. to Amt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 747; agreed to (Y. 113, N. 61) 749 (i).

DEBT, PUBLIC, OF THE DOM.: prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Ways and Means, 1081; neg. (Y. 66, N. 117) 1120 (ii).

DOM. ELECTIONS ACT (Chan. 8, Rev. Statutes) AMT. B. 89 (Mr. Thompson): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. Barron) to recom., 1403; neg. (Y. 59, N. 83) 1404 (ii).

FLOUR, CORNMEAL, &C., DUTIES: Res. (Mr. Mitchell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 44, N. 89) 1560 (ii).

FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, ACT AMT. B. 117 (Mr. Chapleau): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to recom., neg. (Y. 53, N. 74) 1587 (ii).

HALDIMAND (JONES, WALTER) DEP. RMT. OFFICER: Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1524; neg. (Y. 58, N. 98) 1533 (ii).

IRVING, ANDREW MAXWELL, RELIEF B. 129 (Mr. Small): 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1414 (ii).

MORRISON, CATHERINE, RELIEF B. 130 (Mr. Small): 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1414 (ii).

PATENTS OF INVENTION ACT AMT. B. 38 (Mr. Corling): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) neg. (Y. 60, N. 93) 1548 (ii).

RY. ACT AMT. (CONSOLIDATED) B. 24 (Mr. Thompson): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. Lister) neg. on div., 1507; Amt. (Mr. Edgar) to recom., 1508; neg. (Y. 54, N. 98) 1510 (ii).

RECIPROCITY WITH U. S.: Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 144; Amt. (Mr. Foster) 194; agreed to (Y. 124, N. 67) 646; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 257; neg. (Y. 67, N. 124) 616 (i).

REPRESENTATION ACT (N.W.T.) Amt. B. 125 (Mr. Thompson): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. Watson) to recom., neg. (Y. 62, N. 89) 1651 (ii).

SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.'S B. 54 (Mr. Hall): on consdn. of B., Amt. (Mr. Bergin) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 57, N. 86) 933 (ii).

TUDOR, E. E., RELIEF B. 128 (Mr. Small): 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1413 (ii).

WRECKED VESSELS ACT B. 7 (Mr. Kirkpatrick): 2° m., 770 (i), 917; neg. (Y. 61, N. 84) 921 (ii).

DIVORCE BILLS: M. (Mr. Small) to suspend Rule 65, 1468 (ii).

Divorce, Irving, Andrew Maxwell, Relief B. No. 129 (Mr. Small). 1° on div., 1345; 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1414; M. for special Order for Com., 1468; 3° on div., 1523 (ii) (51 Vic., c. 109)

Divorce, Morrison, Catherine, Relief B. No. 130 (Mr. Small). 1° on div., 1345; 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1414; M. for special Order for Com., 1468; 3° on div., 1422 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 110.)

Divorce, Tudor, Eleonora Eliz., Relief B. No. 128 (Mr. *Small*). 1° on div., 1345; 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1413; M. for special Order for Com., 1468; 3° on div., 1522 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 111.)

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. *Amyot*). 1°, 18 (i).

Dom. Elections Act (Chap. 8 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 514 (i); 2°, 941; in Com., 944, 1138; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) 1402; neg. (Y. 59; N. 83) and 3°, 1404 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 11.)

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 131 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 1382; 2° and in Com., 1514; 3°, 1549 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 21.)

DOM. LAND AGENTS' INSTRUCTIONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 36, 45 (i).

DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 1635, 1637 (ii).

DOM. NOTES, CONTRACT FOR PRINTING: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 649 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).

Dom. Plate Glass Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. *Holton*). 1°, 110; 2°, 322 (i); in Com., 946, 978; 3°, 978 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 95.)

DOM. SCRIP ISSUED IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 866 (i).

DORCHESTER ELECTION, DELAY IN ISSUING WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 27, 59 (i).

— **RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification** (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 1021 (i).

DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1569, 1656 (ii).

DRILL PAY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1213 (ii).

DRILL SHED, QUEBEC, WATER SUPPLY COR.: M. for copy (Mr. *Amyot*) 654 (i).

— **Ques.** (Mr. *Amyot*) 85 (i).

DUART POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).

DUBLIN AGENCY: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).

DUNCAN, WM. L., KILLED ON I.C.R., PROCEEDINGS OF INQUEST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 498 (i).

DUTIES ON BOOKS, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 899 (ii).

— **ON FLOUR, &C.** See "FLOUR."

— **CORNMEAL, &C.: Res.** (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1560 (ii).

— **LOGS, &C., AMOUNT COLLECTED: Ques.** (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 86 (i).

DYKE, MR., IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).

Eastern Assurance Co. of Can. incorp. B. No. 22 (Mr. *McDougald*). 1°, 73; 2°, 219; in Com. and 3°, 726 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 96.)

EASTERN EXTENSION RY. AND I. C. R., TENDERS, &C., FOR FENCING: M. for copies* (Mr. *Kirk*) 866 (i).

— **CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup.**, 1231 (ii).

— **COR. re RIGHT OF WAY: M. for Papers** (Mr. *Kirk*) 902 (ii).

EASTER HOLIDAYS. See "ADJOURNMENT."

EDWARDS, WM. C., ESQ., M. P. FOR RUSSELL: introduced and took Seat, 1416 (ii).

EIGHT-ISLAND LAKE (N.S.) POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 86 (i).

ELECTIONS:

BEAUHARNOIS CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep., 825 (ii)

BROME CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 753 (i).

— **Ques.** (Mr. *Casgrain*) 516 (i).

DORCHESTER, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 27 (i).

— **DELAY IN ISSUING WRIT: Ques.** (Mr. *Amyot*) 59 (i).

ELGIN, EAST, CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).

GLENGARRY CONTROVERTED: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 554 (i).

HALDIMAND ELECTION, CASE OF WALTER JONES: AMT. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1524; neg. (Y. 58, N. 98) 1533 (ii).

KENT, ONT., CONTROVERTED: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to ref. Judge's Rep. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 18 (i).

— **Adjnd. deb. rmd.** 20 (i).

— **M.** (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 380 (i).

— **ISSUE OF WRIT: remarks** (Mr. *Mills*) 270, 380, 494 (i).

— **PRINTING OF PAPERS: Ques.** (Mr. *Girouard*) 309 (i).

L'ASSOMPTION CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 73 (i).

— **ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques.** (Mr. *Laurier*) 110 (i).

MISSISSQUOI CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).

QUEBEC COUNTY, CONTROVERTED: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).

QUEBEC, WEST, CONTROVERTED: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).

RUSSELL CONTROVERTED: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) for Speaker to issue Writ, 416 (i).

— **Ques.** (Mr. *Laurier*) 455, 516, 525 (i).

— **Ques.** (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 554 (i).

SHEFFORD CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).

STANSTEAD CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 514 (i).

VOTERS LISTS, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 27 (i).

— **SUSPENSION OF REVISION: Ques.** (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 935 (ii).

ELECTIONS, CONTROVERTED, 1, 18, 73, 309 (i). 825 (ii).

Electoral Franchise Act. See "FRANCHISE."

ELECTRIC LIGHT, MONTREAL POST OFFICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1625 (ii).

ELECTORAL VOTING LISTS, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 27 (i).

ELGIN, EAST, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).

ELGIN, PETITODIAO AND HAVELOCK RY. Co.'s (N.B.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com. 1593 (ii).

ELLIS, MR. J. V., M. P., AND ANNEXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Gullet*) 44 (i).

Emerson and North-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 85 (Mr. *Watson*). 1°, 4c9; 2°, 612 (i); w'hdd., 1585 (ii).

EMPEROR OF GERMANY. See "GERMANY."

Engineers, Examination and Licensing Provision B. No. 103 (Mr. *Cook*). 1°, 8c9 (ii).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (Ferry) B. No. 35 (Mr. *Baker*). 1°, 124; 2°, 220; in Com. and 3°, 498 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 89.)

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1632, 1653 (ii).

ESTIMATES, THE: Mess. from His Ex., 50 (i).

— **SUPPL., 1887-88**: Mess. from His Ex., 962 (ii).

— **SUPPL., 1888-89**: Mess. from His Ex., 1403 (ii).

EVEREST, GEO. M., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 712 (i).

EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 1618, 1667 (ii).

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 1574 (ii).

— **MAN.**: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 495 (i).

— **N. W. T., LOCATION, PAPERS, &c.**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 866 (i).

— **PROF. SAUNDERS' REP.**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 28 (i).

FABRE, MR., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).

FARMERS, FRAUDULENT PRACTICES ON: M. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sp. Com., 1244 (ii).

— **M. (Mr. *Brown*)** to empower Com. to examine witnesses on Oath, 1582 (ii).

FARMS. See "EXPERIMENTAL."

FARRAN'S POINT NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

Federal Bank of Canada B. No. 51 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1°*, 270; 2°*, 497; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 49.)

FENELON RIVER NAVIGATION, DEPTH OF WATER: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 97 (i).

FENIAN RAID, PENSIONS ON ACCOUNT OF: in Com. of Sup., 1201, 1639 (ii).

FERGUSON, J., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR SOUTH RENFREW: introduced, 1 (i).

Ferries Act (Chap. 97, Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 39. (Mr. *Ostigan*). 1°, 124 (i); 2°*, and in Com., 895; 3°*, 896 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 23.)

FIELD EXERCISES, FRENCH TRANSLATION, COR.: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 655 (i).

FINANCE:

AUDITOR GENERAL, APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS: presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 18 (i).

— **INCREASE OF SALARY**: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 498 (i).

— **OFFICE**: in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).

AUDITOR AND RECEIVER GENERAL (WINNIPEG): in Com. of Sup., 88 (i).

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 88 (i).

CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 38 (i).

DOM. NOTES, PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).

— **CONTRACT FOR PRINTING**: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 649 (i).

ESTIMATES, THE: Mess. from His Ex., 50 (i).

— **SUPPL., 1887-8**: Mess. from His Ex., 962 (ii).

— **SUPPL., 1888-9**: Mess. from His Ex., 1403 (ii).

FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).

GOLD, REDEMPTION OF LEGAL TENDER NOTES: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 171 (i).

MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION, AMOUNT ADVANCED: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1155 (ii).

QUEBEC HARBOR COMMISSIONERS (LEVIS GRAVING DOCK) AMOUNT ADVANCED: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1136 (ii).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 18 (i).

RECEIVER GENERAL (HALIFAX): in Com. of Sup., 83 (i).

Fisheries and Fishing, further Provision B, No. 58 (Mr. *Kirk*). 1°, 309 (i).

FISHERIES:

BEHRING'S SEA FISHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 778 (i).

BOUNTY CHECKS, DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Flynn*) 825 (ii).

— **DISTRIBUTION**: in Com. of Sup., 1603 (ii).

CANADIAN FISHING VESSELS, REPORTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 24.

CAP CHAT AND GRAND VALLÉE FISHERIES, REFS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Joncas*) 1232 (ii).

COMMISSION (WASHINGTON) EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1662 (ii).

— **DATE OF PROPOSAL re TRADE MATTERS**: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 112 (i).

GOVT. POLICY RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1433 (ii).

HUDSON BAY WHALE FISHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826 (ii).

LOBSTER FISHERIES, REMARKS (Mr. *Kirk*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1551 (ii).

— **COMMISSION, REFS, &c.**: M. for copies (Mr. *Flynn*) 86 (i).

— **QUES.** (Mr. *Davies*) 139 (i).

PROTECTION, APPOINTMENT OF MAGISTRATES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826.

— **REMARKS ON ADJUNT.**, 1403 (ii).

— **COR. RESPECTING**: M. for copies* (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 866.

— **STREAMERS**: in Com. of Sup., 1603 (ii).

SALMON AND WHALE FISHERIES OF HUDSON BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826 (ii).

FISHERIES TREATY, PAPERS RESPECTING: REMARKS, 20, 62, 74 (i).

— **Message from His Ex.**: presented, 86 (i).

— **Papers laid on Table** (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 110 (i).

— **REMARKS** (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 646 (i) 1506 (ii).

— **QUES.** (Mr. *Laurier*) 93 (i).

— **OMISSION**: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 141 (i).

— **REMARKS** (Mr. *Edgar*) 238 (i). 270 (i).

Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. No. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*). 1°, 380; 2° m., 673; deb. adjd., 711; resmd., 779 (i), 883; 2°, 865; in Com., 867; 3°*, 889 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 30.)

Deb. on M. for 2° (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 673 (i); (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 693; (Mr. *Thompson*) 704; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 779; (Mr. *Kenny*) 786; (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 788; (Gen. *Laurie*) 790; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 793; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 796; (Mr. *Foster*) 813; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 820 (i); (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 833; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 841; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 844; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 849; (Mr. *Laurier*) 851; (Mr. *Joncas*) 854; (Mr. *Ellis*) 857; (Mr. *Landry*) 860; (Mr. *Edgar*) 861; (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 864 (ii).

FISHING VESSELS. See "CANADIAN."

FLOODS. See "ST. LAWRENCE RIVER."

Forfeitures for Treason, &c. See "CRIMINAL LAW."

FLOUR, CORNMEAL, &c., DUTIES: Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 44, N. 89) 1560 (ii).

FORTIN, HON. MR., SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).

FORTIN, NOEL, COR. re. ACCIDENT AND DAMAGES: M. for copy (Mr. *Fiset*) 902 (ii).

FORT McLEOD AND PINOCHER CREEK MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 712 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT: in Com. of Sup., 1641 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act (Chap. 5 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 117 (Mr. *Chapleau*). 1°, 1062; 2°, 1549; in Com., 1553; 3° m., 1586; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to recom., neg. (Y. 53, N. 71) and 3°*, 1587 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 9.)

FRASER, MR. JUSTICE, AND WESTMORELAND ELECTION: Remarks, in Com., of Sup., 115 (i).

- Fraud by Tree Peddlers, &c.** See "PEDDLERS."
- Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- FREE LIST AND U. S. TARIFF, REP. OF MIN. OF CUSTOMS:** Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 647 (i).
- O. C. PLACING CERTAIN ARTICLES ON: Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 648 (i).
- FREIGHT RATES:** in Com. of Sup., 1650 (ii).
- Gambling in Stocks, &c.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- GAUTHIER, JOSEPH, ESQ., M.P. FOR L'ASSOMPTION:** introduced, 882 (ii).
- GAUVREAU, DR. EDMOND, GRANT FOR PREPARING VACCINE:** Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 140 (i).
- GENERAL BANKING ACT AMT.:** Ques. (Mr. Innes) 19 (i).
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY:** in Com. of Sup., 1604 (ii)
- OTTAWA COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).
- GERMANY, DEATH OF EMPEROR:** Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 110 (i).
- GERMANY, CROWN PRINCE'S RUMORED DEATH:** Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 206 (i).
- GLASGOW IMMIGRATION AGENCY:** in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
- GLENGARY ELECTION:** Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. Speaker) 554 (i).
- GOLD, REDEMPTION OF LEGAL TENDER NOTES:** Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 171 (i).
- GORDON, COMMANDER, COR. re FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE:** M. for copies* (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 866 (i).
- GOVT. BUSINESS.** See "BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE."
- GOVT. MEASURES:** Remarks (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 138 (i).
- GOVT. OF N.W.T., EXPENSES:** in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).
- GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS:** in Com. of Sup., 1577 (ii).
- SALARIES OF CAPTAINS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Welsh) 37
- GOV. GEN.'S SECRETARY:** Letter from, 1195 (ii).
- OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 85 (i).
- GOWANLOCK, MRS., CLAIM:** Remarks (Mr. Rykert) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1015 (ii).
- PENSION: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 58 (i).
- GRAND RIVER BRIDGES, HALDIMAND:** in Com. of Sup., 1675.
- G. T. R. Co.'s B. No. 36** (Mr. Curran). 1^o*, 124; 2^o*, 220; in Com., 496; 3^o*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 58.)
- G. T. R. confirmation of Agreements B. No. 26** (Mr. Small). 1^o*, 85; 2^o, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 647 (i). (51 Vic., c. 59.)
- G. T. R. CROSSING IN TORONTO:** Ques. (Mr. Denison) 59 (i).
- DOUBLE TRACK, GOVT. ASSISTANCE: Ques. (Mr. Girouard) 1432 (ii).
- GRAZING LANDS LEASES:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davis) 866 (i).
- Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 495 (i)
- GREAT BRITAIN AND COLONIES.** See "TRADE RELATIONS."
- Great North-West Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 25** (Mr. Daly). 1^o*, 85; 2^o m., 128; 2^o*, 220; in Com. and 3^o*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 85)
- APPLICANTS FOR CHARTER: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 141.
- PAPERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Edgar) 653 (i).
- Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 18** (Mr. Ferguson, Wel'and). 1^o*, 73; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 392 (i). (51 Vic., c. 56.)
- GREENWAY AND MARTIN, MESSRS, VISIT re DISALLOWANCE:** Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) 110 (i).
- GRENVILLE CANAL:** in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
- Grenville International Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 62** (Mr. Shanly). 1^o*, 380; 2^o*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 954 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 90.)
- GRENFELL (N. W. T.) EXPERIMENTAL FARM LOCATION, PAPERS:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Landerkin) 866 (i).
- GROSSE ISLE, &c., QUARANTINE:** in Com. of Sup., 1196 (ii).
- GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE FISHERIES PROTECTION:** Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 826 (ii).
- HADLOW COVE PIER EXTENSION:** Ques. (Mr. Guay) 140 (i).
- HALDIMAND, DEPUTY RETURNING OFFICER, AND LATE ELECTION:** Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 922 (ii).
- Deb on M for adjmt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 913; (Mr. Thompson) 924; (Mr. Laurier) 925; (Sir John A. Macdonald) 929; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 927; (Mr. McNeill) 938; (Mr. Desjardins) 928; (Mr. Madill) 928; (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 928; (Mr. Freeman) 929; (Mr. Thompson) 930; (Mr. Edgar) 930; (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 930; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 930; M. withdn., 931 (ii).
- Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 648 (i).
- CASE OF WALTER JONES: Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1524; neg. (Y. 58, N. 98) 1533 (ii).
- RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- HALF-BREEDS CLAIMS COMMISSION, EXPENSES:** in Com. of Sup., 1666 (ii).
- HALIFAX AND ST. JOHN via YARMOUTH AND PORT MEDWAY MAIL SUBSIDY:** in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
- HALIFAX COTTON Co.'s (N.S.) SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546; in Com., 1593 (ii).
- HALTON, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT:** notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- "HANSAARD." See "DEBATES."
- HARBORS AND RIVERS:** in Com. of Sup., 1462, 1561, 1635, 1673 (ii).
- HARBOR COMMISSIONERS.** See "MONTREAL" AND "QUEBEC."
- HASTINGS, WEST, ELECTORAL DISTRICT:** notification of Vacancy (Mr. Speaker) 85 (i).
- Ret. of Member Elect, 238 (i).
- HAWKE, J. T., CASE OF:** Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Davies P.E.I.) 1299 (ii).
- Deb. on M. for adjmt. (Mr. Thompson) 1307; (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 1318; (Mr. Weldon, Albert) 1322; (Mr. Lister) 1324; (Mr. Davin) 1328; (Mr. Mitchell) 1347; (Mr. Casey) 1329; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1329 (ii).
- HAY DUTIES, REFUND BY U.S.:** Ques. (Mr. Lapergne) 712.
- HEALTH STATISTICS:** in Com. of Sup., 1154 (ii).
- HEATING AND ELECTRICITY IN CARS, I. C. R.:** in Com. of Sup., 1227 (ii).
- HENDERSON, D., MEMBER ELECT. FOR HALTON:** introduced, 2 (i).
- Hereford Branch Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 33** (Mr. Hall). 1^o*, 110; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 81.)

- HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE** : in Com. of Sup., 105 (i), 1158, 1165 (ii).
- High Commissioner's Office** (application of **C. S. Act, Chap. 16 Rev. Statutes**) **Act Amt. B. No. 136** (Sir Charles Tupper). Res. prop., 1502; conc. in and 1°*, 2°* and in Com., 1505; 3° m., 1506; 3°, 1547 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 13.)
- HODGSON, SIR ROBT., PENSION** (PAYMENT TO GOVT. OF P.E.I.) : in Com. of Sup., 1671 (ii).
- HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS, MAN. AND N.W.T.** : M. for Ret. (Mr. Watson) 71 (i); (Mr. McMullen*) 866 (ii).
- HORSE-BREEDING IN CANADA, PAMPHLET, TRANSLATION** : Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 85 (i).
- HOT SPRINGS, BANFF, ROADS, BRIDGES, &c.** : in Com. of Sup., 1617, 1666 (ii).
- HOUSE OF COMMONS** :
- ADDRESS (FAREWELL) TO HIS EX.: Mess. from the Senate, 1561; conc. in, 1585; presented, 1691 (ii).
- ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH : moved (Mr. Montague) 2; sec. (Mr. Joncas) 7; agreed to, 17; His Ex.'s Reply, 172 (i).
- BILLS ASSENTED TO, 1196, 1692 (ii).
- CLAYES, MR., LATE M.P. : Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 62 (i).
- CHOQUETTE, MR., M.P., PETITION AGAINST RETURN : Objection (Mr. Laurier) 1332, 1468 (ii).
- CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY : in Com. of Sup., 80, 95 (i).
- CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS, LIST, IV (after title vol. i.)
- CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS. See "ELECTIONS."
- COURSOL, MR., INDEMNITY : in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
- DEBATES COM. See "COMMITTEES" and "DEBATES."
- ELLIS, MR. J. V., M.P., AND ANNEXATION : Ques. (Mr. Guillet) 44 (i)
- GOVERNMENT, LIST OF MEMBERS, III (after title vol. i.)
- GOV. GEN'L'S SECRETARY : Letter from, 1195 (ii).
- INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION : Appointment by Mess., 27 (i).
- LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT. See general heading.
- MEMBERS INDEMNITY : M. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 1681 (ii).
— Remarks (Mr. Trow) 1586 (ii).
- MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 1, 18, 25, 270, 380, 665 (i); 882, 1416, 1548.
- MESSAGES FROM HIS EX., 24, 27, 50, 86, 172 (i); 962, 1231, 1403 (ii).
- NEW MEMBERS, 1, 238, 309, 646 (i); 866, 1414, 1544 (ii)
- OPENING OF PARLIAMENT, 1 (i).
- PAISES DURING SESSION, LIST, VII (after title vol. i.)
- PRIVATE BILLS, PETITIONS, EXTENSION OF TIME : M. (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 50 (i).
- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE : M. (Sir Hector Langevin) TO EXTEND TIME, 514 (i), 1031 (ii).
- PROROGATION, NOTIFICATION OF (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1625, 1693 (ii).
— (Mr. Speaker) 1686 (ii); Mess. from His Ex., by Black Rod, 1692 (ii).
- ROBERTSON, ALEX., LATE M.P. : Remarks (Sir Hector Langevin) 1 (i).
- SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1025, 1668 (ii).
- SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. See "COMMITTEES."
- SENATE, SUMMONED TO BY MESS. : 1 (i), 1196, 1692 (ii).
- SESSIONAL CLERKS, NUMBER AND AMOUNTS PAID : Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1289 (ii).
— in Com. of Sup., 1025, 1668 (ii).
- SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE, 2 (i), 1693 (ii).
- VACANCIES, NOTIFICATION (Mr. Speaker) 1, 85, 124 (i)
- VENTILATION OF HOUSE : Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 171 (i).
- WHITE, HON. THOMAS, DECEASE OF : Remarks (Sir Hector Langevin) 962 (ii).
- [See "ELECTIONS."]
- HUDSON BAY SALMON FISHERIES** : Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 826 (ii).
- **WHALE FISHERIES** : Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 826 (ii).
- ICE BREAKERS, COUNTY OF BERTHIER** : Ques. (Mr. Beausoleil) 45 (i).
- IMMIGRATION** : in Com. of Sup., 1155; conc, 1686 (ii).
— See "AGRICULTURE," &c.
- IMPERIAL FEDERATION.** See "TRADE RELATIONS."
- IMPORTS AND EXPORTS** : M. for Ret. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 28 (i).
- Indian Act** (Chap. 43 Rev. Statutes) **Amt. B. No. 106** (Mr. White, Cardwell). 1°, 922; 2° (Mr. Thompson) and in Com., 1'007; 3°*, 1011 (i.) (51 Vic., c. 22.)
- INDIANS** :
- BRANT AND HALDIMAND, DOCTOR ON RESERVE : Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 647 (i).
- BRESBAYLOR HALF-BREEDS : Remarks (Mr. Edgar) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1514 (ii).
- CAUGHENAWAGA, ELECTION OF CHIEFS : M. (Mr. Doyon) for copies of Cor., 899 (ii).
— RESERVE : Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 1680 (ii).
— SURVEY : Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 495 (i).
- CAYUGA INDIAN LANDS COMMISSIONERS : Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 27 (i).
- CHIPPAWA AND OTTAWA NATION INDIANS' CLAIMS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 498 (i).
- HALF BREEDS CLAIMS COMMISSION, EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 1666 (ii).
- IN COM. OF SUP., 1605; Dept., 1637 (ii).
- MISSISSAUGA INDIANS, CLAIMS TO UNCEDED LANDS, COR. : M. for copy* (Mr. Madill) 366 (i).
- MOHAWK INDIANS, COR. re DISMISSAL OF COUNCILLOR CULBERTSON : M. for copies (Mr. Burdett) 977 (ii).
- MOULIN, REV. FATHER, COR. re RESERVE AT BATOCHÉ : M. for copy (Mr. Scarth) 866 (ii).
- PEACE RIVER AND ATHABASCA INDIAN TREATIES : Ques. (Mr. Barron) 825 (ii)
- SIX NATION INDIANS, CLAIM FOR FLOODING LANDS, COR. : M. for copies* (Mr. Somerville) 672 (i).
- STONE POINT AND KETTLE RESERVES, COMPLAINT AGAINST INDIANS : M. for copies* (Mr. Lister) 1259 (ii).
- SUPPLIES, CONTRACTS FOR FURNISHING : Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) in Com. of Sup., 94 (i).
- [See "SUPPLY," &c.]
- INDIANTOWN BRANCH, I.C.R.** : in Com. of Sup., 1646 (ii).
- INDEMNITIES.** See "MEMBERS"
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS, INDIAN** : in Com. of Sup., 1681 (ii).
- INGOLDSBY STATION, POST OFFICE, PETITION, &c.** : M. for Ret. (Mr. Barron) 1243 (ii).
- INLAND REVENUE.** See "CUSTOMS AND EXCISE"
- Inland Revenue Act** (Chap. 34 Rev. Statutes) **Amt. B. No. 122** (Mr. Costigan). 1°*, 1137; 2°* and in Com., 1401; 3°*, 1402 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 16.)
- Insurance Act** (Chap. 124 Rev. Statutes) **Amt. B. No. 126** (Sir Charles Tupper). 1°, 1332; 2°, 1400; M. for Com., 1416; in Com., 1417; 3°*, 1433 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 28.)
- INSURANCE COMPANIES, ABSTRACT** : presented (Sir Charles Tupper) 1207 (ii).
- INSURANCE, FIRE RISKS, PETITIONS, &c.** : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bowman) 866 (ii).
- INSURANCE, GENERAL VOTE** : in Com., of Sup., 1604 (ii).

INSOLVENCY, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 495 (i).

INSTRUCTIONS TO DOM. LAND AGENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 36, 45 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:

CAPITAL ACCOUNT, AMOUNT CHARGED: Ques. (Mr. W. L. Jones, St. John) 59 (i).

— EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 103 (i).

CASUALTIES, &c., AND OFFICIALS DISMISSED: M. for Ret. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 61 (i).

FORTIN, NOEL, COR. *re* ACCIDENT AND DAMAGES: M. for copy (Mr. Fiset) 903 (ii).

FREIGHT RATES: in Com. of Sup., 1650 (ii).

HEATING AND ELECTRICITY IN CARS: in Com. of Sup., 1227 (ii).

INDIANTOWN BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 1646 (ii).

DALHOUSIE BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 1226 (ii).

DUNCAN, WM. L., KILLED ON I. O. R., PROCEEDINGS AT INQUEST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 498 (i).

MACCAN STATION, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1225 (ii).

MATANE, SUBSIDY TO BRANCH LINE: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1:99 (ii).

MONCTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).

PICTOU TOWN BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 1226, 1645 (ii).

PION & CO., CLAIM FOR GOODS DAMAGED: M. for copies* (Mr. Lan-gelier, Quebec) 1092 (ii).

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 27 (i).

— Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 65, 112 (i).

ROLLING STOCK PURCHASE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Weldon St. John) 61 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 1645 (ii).

ST. CHARLES BRANCH, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 97 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 1225, 1645 (ii).

ST. JOHN, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1224 (ii).

SALE TO SYNDICATE: Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) in Com. of Sup., 1621 (ii).

SNOW SEEDS: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (ii).

SPRING HILL, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1225 (ii).

WORKING EXPENSES AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1620, 1650, 1668 (ii).

Interest (Chap. 127 Rev. Statutes) Act Amt. B. No. 12 (Mr. Landry) 1**, 62 (i).

INTERIOR:

ALASKA AND B. C. BOUNDARY COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 495 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 171 (i)

BOUNDARIES OF ONT.: Remarks (Mr. Dawson) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1629 (ii).

COLONISATION CO.'S IN MAN AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 498 (i).

— INSPECTOR IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 866 (ii).

— MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Watson) 71 (i).

DOM. LAND AGENTS' INSTRUCTIONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 36, 45 (ii).

DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 1635, 1637 (ii).

DOM. SCRIP ISSUED IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 866 (i).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1604 (ii).

— OTTAWA COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).

GOVT. OF N.W.T. EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).

GRAZING LANDS, LEASES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davis) 866 (i).

— Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 495 (i).

HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS COMMISSION, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).

HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Watson) 71 (i); (Mr. McMullen) 866 (ii).

INTERIOR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 93 (i).

INTERIOR DEPT. REP.: presented (Mr. White, Cardwell) 18 (i).

LAND SALES IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 44 (i)

LEASEHOLDERS IN ALBERTA DISTRICT, N.W.T., CATTLE, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 498 (i).

INTERIOR—Continued.

LEASES, OLD UNOCCUPIED LANDS: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 826 (ii).

LEGISLATION FOR N. W. T.: Mess. from His Ex., 1231 (ii).

MOUNTED POLICE, COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 1612.

— HEADQUARTERS, EDMONTON: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 965 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 93 (i), 1610, 1658, 1683 (ii).

— REP.: presented (Sir John A. Macdonald) 499 (i).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: in Com. of Sup., 1655, 1672 (ii).

RANCHERS, DUTIES OF INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 965 (ii).

REBELLION IN N. W. T., REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: presented (Mr. White, Cardwell) 97 (i).

— LOSSES COMMISSION, REPS., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Laurier) 73 (i).

SCRIP ISSUED IN MAN AND N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 866 (ii).

SQUATTERS CLAIM IN N. W. T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 656 (i).

SURVEY (GEOLOGICAL) OTTAWA COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).

YOUNG, CAPT., COR., &c., RESPECTING CLAIM: M. for copy* (Mr. Scarth) 866 (i).

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: appointment by Mess., 27.

International Convention for Preservation of Submarine Cables B. No. 98 (Mr. Thompson).

1*+, 726 (i); 2*+, 942; in Com. and 3*+, 944 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 31.)

INTERNATIONAL REGULATIONS *re* TRADING VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 826 (ii).

INTOXICATING LIQUORS, ANALYSIS UNDER FOOD ADULTERATION ACT: Ques. (Mr. Curran) 965 (ii).

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 1232 (ii).

Irving, Andrew Maxwell. See "DIVORCE."

ISBESTER AND REID'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 1067.

— Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, Victoria) 1299 (ii).

ISLE-AU NOIX WHEAT EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 965 (ii).

JACKSON, COL.: in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).

JAMAICA. See "WEST INDIES."

JOHNSON, GEO.: in Com. of Sup., 1664 (ii).

JONES, H. L., ELQ, MEMBER ELECT FOR DIGBY: introduced, 2 (ii).

JONES, WALTER, APPOINTMENT: Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1524 (ii).

JUDGES OF SUPERIOR COURT RETIRED, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Small) 62 (i).

JUDGES' SALARIES (ONT.) INCREASE: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 899 (ii).

Judges' Salaries. See "PROVINCIAL COURTS."

JUDICIARY, QUEBEC: conc., 1686 (ii).

JURY, MR., AND PAUPER IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 1597 (ii).

JUSTICE:

COLLISIONS ON THE HIGH SEAS, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 826.

COURT OF APPEAL QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. Prefontaine) 647 (i).

COUNTY COURT JUDGES (B. C.) ADDITIONAL: Ques. (Mr. Mara) 66 (i)

— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).

— ONTARIO, SALARIES: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 899 (ii)

CRIMINAL LAWS, DISTRIBUTION TO JUSTICES: Ques. (Mr. Bernier) 59.

— DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 86 (i).

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1151 (ii).

"DAVID J. ADAMS," COST OF LITIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).

FRAZER, MR. JUSTICE, WESTMORELAND ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 115 (i).

JUSTICE—Continued.

- HAWKE, J. T., CASE OF: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1299 (ii).
 JUSTICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).
 INSOLVENCY, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 495 (i).
 LIBEL LAW, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 141 (i).
 MONTREAL DISTRICT, SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 647 (i).
 MUSKOKA AND PARRY SOUND JUDICIAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1232 (ii).
 PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 91 (i), 1021 (ii).
 ——— REP: presented (Mr. *Thompson*) 18 (i).
 PRESCOTT AND RUSSELL JUDICIAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Labrosse*) 27.
 QUEBEC JUDICIARY: conc., 1685 (ii).
 SAILORS' PROTECTION, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 966 (ii).
 SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RETIRED, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Small*) 62 (i).
 TRADE UNIONS, COPIES OF RULES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 46 (i).
 ——— REGULATIONS re REGISTRY, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 50 (i).
 ——— UNDER 35 VIC., CAP. 36, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Amyot*) 50.
 TRAVIS, EX-JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
 STENOGRAPHER, SUPREME COURT: in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
 [See "CRIMINAL LAW."]
 KAMLOOPS AS AN OUTPORT OF ENTRY, MR. PARMELEE'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Mara*) 498 (i).
 KENT (N.B.) NORTHERN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1593 (ii).
 KENT (ONT) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to ref. Judge's Rep. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 18; adjd. deb. rsmd., 20 (i).
 ——— ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 270, 380, 494 (i).
 ——— notification of Return of Member (Mr. *Speaker*) 1544 (ii).
 ——— PRINTING OF PAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard*) 309 (i).
 ——— M. (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 380 (i).
 KETTLE AND STONEY POINT RESERVES, COMPLAINTS AGAINST INDIANS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 1259 (i).
 Keystone Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 78 (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*). 1^o*, 459; 2^o*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 978 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 97.)
 Kincardine and Teeswater Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 74 (Mr. *Roxand*). 1^o*, 454; 2^o*, 493; in Com. and 3^o*, 7.6 (i). (51 Vic., c. 77.)
 Kincardine Harbor Tolls authorisation B. No. 30 (Mr. *Rowand*). 1^o*, 97; 2^o, 220 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 1049 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 104.)
 KING, JAMES, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: M. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) for Sel. Com., 865 (ii).
 ——— M. to substitute name on Com. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1245 (ii).
 KINGSTON, DEP. POSTMASTER'S IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 899 (ii).
 ——— GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1671 (ii).
 ——— PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).
 ——— POST OFFICE DEFALCATIONS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright, &c.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1012 (ii).
 ——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1017 (ii).

- KIT ALLOWANCE, YORK-SIMCOON BATT.: M. for Ref. (Mr. *Mulock*) 66 (i).
 KNIGHT, JNO. AND ALLAN, COR. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 866 (ii).
 KNIGHTS OF LABOR. See "JURY, MR."
 La Banque Nationale, Capital Stock Reduction B. No. 23 (Mr. *Bryson*). 1^o*, 73; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 48.)
 LABOR COMMISSION, CERTIFIED COPIES OF DEPOSITIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 171 (i).
 ——— COMPLAINTS AGAINST CHAIRMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 171 (i).
 ——— COST: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 494 (i).
 ——— INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 672 (i).
 ——— NUMBER AND SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1468 (ii).
 ——— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 98 (i).
 LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL OF LABORERS: in Com. of Sup., 1170, 1563, 1647 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
 ——— WATER POWER, ROYAL COMMISSION: Rep. presented (Mr. *Pope*) 52 (i).
 LAKEFIELD AND BALSAM LAKE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).
 Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 37 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1^o*, 124; 2^o*, 220; in Com. and 3^o*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 80.)
 LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
 LAKE ST. LOUIS: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
 LAKE ST PETER IMPROVEMENT, EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 71 (i).
 LAKES SUPERIOR AND HURON SURVEYS: conc., 1683 (ii).
 LAND AGENTS INSTRUCTIONS IN MAN AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 36, 45 (i).
 LAND SALES IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 44 (i).
 LAND VILLA POST OFFICE, PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Choquette*) 102 (i).
 LARD, RENDERED, MANUFACTURE AND SALE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 59 (i).
 L'ASSOMPTION CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 73 (i).
 ——— ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 110 (i).
 LAURIE, GEN. J. W.: introduced, 18 (i).
 LEAF TOBACCO. See "TOBACCO."
 LEASEHOLDERS IN ALBERTA DISTRICT, N.W.T., CATTLE, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 498 (i).
 LEASES (GRAZING) N.W.T.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 495 (i).
 ——— OLD UNOCCUPIED LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 825 (ii).
 LEDUC, CHAS., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 140 (i).
 LEGAL TENDER AND GOLD: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 171 (i).

LEGER, CAPT., REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE RIVER FLOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 899 (ii).
 LEGISLATION FOR N.W.T.: Mess. from His Ex., 1231 (ii).
 LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).
Letters Patent, Defective, &c., B. No. 4. (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 44; 2°, 761 (i); in Com. and 3°, 916 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 36.*)
 LEVI, DAVID, SEIZURE OF DIAMONDS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1092 (ii).
 LEVIS GRAVING DOCK. See "QUEBEC HARBOR COMMISSIONERS."
 LIBEL LAW, LEGISLATION: Ques (Mr. *Innes*) 141 (i).
 LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, REP. OF JOINT LIBRARIANS: presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
 ——— PRINTING AMERICAN CATALOGUE: in Com. of Sup., 1030 (ii).
 ——— WORKS ON AMERICA: in Com. of Sup., 1030 (ii).
 ——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1030, 1638 (ii).
Licensing Engineers. See "ENGINEERS."
 LIFE-SAVING AND LIFE-BOAT SERVICE: Remarks, 1577 (ii).
 LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1581 (ii).
 LITIGATION (COST) *re* "DAVID J. ADAMS": in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).
 LIVERPOOL IMMIGRATION AGENCY: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
 LIVES LOST THROUGH WRECKS ON GREAT LAKES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 19 (i).
 LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, TOTAL AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 498 (i).
Loan for Public Service, authorisation B. No. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 1136; M. for Com., 1259; in Com., 1278; 1°* and 2°* of B, 1387; in Com. and 3°*, 1388 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 2*)
 LOBSTER COMMISSION, REPS. & C: M. for copies (Mr. *Flynn*) 86 (i).
 ——— Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 139 (i).
 ——— FISHERIES: Remarks (Mr. *Kirk, &c.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1551 (ii).
 LOGS, SHINGLE BOLTS, &c., DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 86 (i).
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co. See B. 26.
London and South-Eastern Ry. Co. and Can. Southern (confirmation of Agreement) B. No. 77 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 85; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 647. (51 *Vic., c. 60.*)
 LONDON (ENG.) IMMIGRATION AGENCY: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
 LONDON *Free Press*, PAYMENTS TO: in Com. of Sup., 1160.
 LOTBINIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 98 (i).
 LOVITT, J., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR YARMOUTH: introduced, 2 (i).
 MACCAN STATION, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1225 (ii).
 MCCUAIG, A. F., APPOINTMENT AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 1432.
 MACDONALD, GEO. J., PAPERS, &c., *re* CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 866 (ii).

McDONALD, JOHN A., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR VICTORIA (N. S.): introduced, 2 (i).
 MCEACHRAN, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
 MCLELAN, HON. A. W., MEMBER ELECT FOR COLCHESTER: introduced, 1 (i).
 MAGDALEN ISLANDS MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
 MAIL SERVICE IN P.E.I.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 47, 52 (i).
 MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
Manitoba, application of certain Laws B. No. 41 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 139 (i); 2°*, 941; in Com. and 3°*, 1402 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 33.*)
Manitoba and North-Western Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 46 (Mr. *Scarth*). 1°*, 238; 2°*, 497; in Com., 612 (i); recom. and 3°*, 953 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 86.*)
MANITOBA:
 AUDITOR AND RECEIVER GENERAL, WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 88.
 COLONISATION CO.'S IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).
 DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. RY. CHARTERS, COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 672 (i).
 ——— PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1136 (ii).
 EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 495 (i).
 GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., APPLICANTS FOR CHARTER: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 141 (i).
 ——— PAPERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Edgar*) 653 (i).
 GREENWAY AND MARTIN, MESSRS., VISIT *re* DISALLOWANCE: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 110 (i).
 HOMESTEAD AND COLONISATION INSPECTORS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Watson*) 71 (i); (Mr. *McMullen**) 866 (ii).
 IMMIGRANTS FROM DAKOTA FOR MAN., PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 495 (i).
 INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 1607, 1681 (ii).
 LAND AGENTS INSTRUCTIONS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 36, 45 (i).
 MAN. AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO., PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 653 (i).
 PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 1021; conc., 1686 (ii).
 PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1542 (ii).
 RAILWAY LEGISLATION, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Watson*) 1403 (ii).
 SCRIP ISSUED IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 866 (i).
 SOURIS AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN RY. CO., PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 653 (i).
 [See DEPARTMENTS, "N.W.T.," &c.]
MARINE:
 "ALBERT," COR. RESPECTING CONDITION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Welsh*) 827 (i).
 ALLEN, WARREN, CLAIM FOR ICE-BOAT: M. for Papers, Ret., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 833 (i).
 ATLANTIC OCEAN, OBSTRUCTIONS TO SHIPPING: Ques. (Gen. *Laurie*) 1433 (ii).
 BEHRING'S SEA, NAVIGATION BY CANADIAN VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 44 (i).
 ——— SEIZURES, COR. RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gordon*) 986.
 BUOYS IN RIVER SAGUENAY: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1433 (ii).
 CAN. WRECKING VESSELS IN U. S. WATERS: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Edgar*) 665 (i).
 COLLISIONS OF THE HIGH SEAS, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826.
 LITIGATION (COST) *re* "DAVID J. ADAMS": in Com. of Sup., 1656.
 GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1577.

MARINE—Continued.

GOVT. STEAMERS, SALARIES OF CAPTAINS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Walsh*) 37.
 INTERNATIONAL REGULATION re TRADING VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826 (ii).
 LIFE-SAVING AND LIFE-BOAT SERVICE: Remarks, 1577 (ii).
 LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1581 (ii).
 MARINE AND FISHERIES REP.: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 138 (i).
 MONTREAL AND QUEBEC RIVER POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
 P.E.I. NAVIGATION AT NAUFRAGE, REP. OF ENGINEER: M. for copy (Mr. *McIntyre*) 70 (i).
 "NORTHERN LIGHT." See general heading.
 NORTH SYDNEY PILOTAGE RETURNS, UNDER ACT OF 1873: Ques. (Mr. *Davis, P. E.I.*) 1067 (ii).
 OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1581 (ii).
 OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1577.
 "ORIENTAL," LOSS OF BARGE, REP. OF INSPECTOR: Ques (Mr. *Edgar*) 966 (ii).
 SIGNAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1582, 1633 (ii).
 STAG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RIVER ST. OLAIK, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 1259 (ii).
 STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I. See "P.E.I."
 SURVEYS, LAKES SUPERIOR AND HURON: in Com. of Sup., 1688 (ii).
 TRAVERSE RIVER, LOWER: in Com. of Sup., 1631 (ii).
 UNITED STATES WRECKING VESSELS IN CAN. WATERS, COR.: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 665 (i).
 VESSELS, OVERLOADING, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 140 (i).
 WRECKS, &C., INVESTIGATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1578 (ii).
 WRECKING VESSELS (CANADIAN) IN U. S. WATERS, COR.: M. for copies (Mr. *Platt*) 866 (ii).
 WRECKS ON GREAT LAKES AND LOSS OF LIFE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 19, 752 (i).
Maritime Court of Ontario (extension of Jurisdiction) B. No. 40 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 244 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1549 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 39.*)
MARTIN, J. A., COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, RIMOUSEKI: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1067 (ii).
MASSAWIPPI VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546 (ii).
Maskinongé and Nipissing Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 52 (Mr. *Coulombe*). 1°*, 270; 2°*, 497; in Com. and 3°*, 647 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 82*)
MATANE AND RIVER BLANCHE WHARVES, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1067 (ii).
MECHANICS' INSTITUTE BOOKS, REMOVAL OF DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 899 (ii).
MEDICAL INSPECTION, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
MEGANTIC COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 825, 1232 (ii).
MEIGS, DAVID B., ESQ., M. P.: introduced, 665 (i).
MEMBERS' INDEMNITY: Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 158; (ii).
 — — M. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 168; (ii).
MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 1, 18, 25, 270, 380, 665 (i), 882, 1416, 1548 (ii).
MEMBERS, LIST OF, [IV.]
Merchandise (fraudulent marks). See "CRIMINAL LAW."
Merchants Marine Insurance Co. of Canada winding-up B. No. 11 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 62; 2°*, 322; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 93.*)
MERRICK, RICHARD, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 647 (i).

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:

ADDRESS, JUBILEE: Dispatch from Colonial Secretary conveying Her Majesty's Thanks, 24 (ii).
 ADDRESS, THE: His Excellency's Reply, 172 (i).
 ESTIMATES, THE, 50 (i), 932, 1403 (ii).
 FISHERIES TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND U.S., 86 (i).
 INTERNAL ECONOMY (HOUSE OF COMMONS) COMMISSION, 27 (i).
 LEGISLATION FOR N. W. T., NEW METHOD, 1231 (ii).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: conc., 1688 (ii).
MIDLAND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Cook*) 1259 (ii).
MIDLAND, ORILLIA, &C., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 647 (i).
MIDDLESEX, WEST: Ret. of Member Elect, 309 (i).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE:
 AMMUNITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1211 (ii).
 ARTILLERY PRACTICE ON ISLAND OF ORLEANS: M. for copies of Pets, &C.* (Mr. *Jangelier, Montmorency*) 672 (i).
 AUBRY, REV. M., SERVICES AS MILITARY CHAPLAIN: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Amyot*) 654 (i).
 AUDET, LT.-COL., AND FRENCH TRANSLATION OF FIELD EXERCISES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Amyot*) 655 (i).
 AYLMER, COL.: in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
 BARBACKS, B.O.: in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).
 BOOKS ON THE MILITIA FORCE OF CANADA, TRANSLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 85 (i).
 BRIGADE MAJORS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
 CADETS, MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 128 (i).
 CARTRIDGE FACTORY, &C. (QUEBEC) WATER SUPPLY, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1092 (ii).
 CARTRIDGES, REP. OF COMMISSION ON MANUFACTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1232 (ii).
 CLOTHING AND GREAT-COATS: in Com. of Sup., 1212, 1215 (ii).
 CLOTHING FOR MILITIA, TENDERS AND CONTRACT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bowman*) 868 (ii).
 DEPUTY ADJUTANTS GENERAL, RETIRING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).
 DRILL PAY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1213 (ii).
 DRILL SHED, QUEBEC, WATER SUPPLY, COR.: M. for copy (Mr. *Amyot*) 654 (i), 1092 (ii).
 — — Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 85 (i).
 FIELD EXERCISES, FRENCH TRANSLATION, COR.: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 655 (i).
 JACKSON, COL.: in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
 KIT ALLOWANCE, YORK-SIMCOE BATT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 66 (i).
 MILITARY BRANCH AND DISTRICT STAFF, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1209 (i).
 MILITARY PROPERTIES: in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
 MILITARY SCHOOL, ST. JOHN, QUE., SERVICE OF CHAPLAIN, COR.: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 654 (i).
 MILITIA AND DEFENCE, DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 18 (i).
 — — DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
 NEELY, PRIVATE THOS., DEATH OF, COR. re COMPENSATION TO FAMILY: M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 649 (i).
 PERMANENT FORCES: in Com. of Sup., 1219 (ii).
 REBELLION OF 1885, CLAIMS OF SCOUTS, &C.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1242 (ii).
 — — LOSSES COMMISSION, REP.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 73 (i).
 — — MILITIAMEN, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1202, 1642 (ii).
 — — COST: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 171 (i).
 — — TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 498 (i).
 ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 1218; conc., 1687 (i).
 STRANGE, GEN., REP. re REBELLION: Ques (Mr. *Amyot*) 98 (i).
 — — on M. for Com. of Sup., 1600 (ii).
 — — COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF PENSION: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 140 (i).
 STRAUBENZIE, COL.: in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
 VALQUETTE, SERGEANT, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1506 (ii).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE—Continued.

- VETERANS OF 1866-70, MEDALS: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 985 (ii).
 — OF 1837, PENSIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Purcell*) 85 (i).
 — OF 1812: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 YORK-SIMCOE BATT. KIT ALLOWANCE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 66 (i).
 YOUNG, CAPT., COR., & C., RESPECTING CLAIM: M. for copy* (Mr. *Scarth*) 866 (i).
- MISSIONARY INDIANS CLAIMS, UNCEDED LANDS, COR: M. for copy* (Mr. *Madill*) 866 (i).
- MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 1611, 1663 (ii).
- MISSISQUOI CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's. Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).
 — ELECTORAL DISTRICT: notification of vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 124 (i).
 — Ret. of Member Elect, 616 (i).
- MOHAWK INDIANS COR. re DISMISSAL OF COUNCILLOR CULBERTSON: M. for copies (Mr. *Burdett*) 977 (ii).
- MONCK, RICHARD, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 712 (i), 899 (ii).
- Moncton Harbor Improvement Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 83 (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*). 1°*, 489; 2°*, 493 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 954. (51 *Vic., c. 105.*)
- MONCTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).
- Money, Counterfeit. See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- MONTAGUE, W. H., Esq., MEMBER ELECT FOR HALDIMAND introduced, 2 (i).
- MONTMAGNY CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).
 — PETITION re RETURN OF MEMBER: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1332, 1468 (ii).
- MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1589 (ii).
- MONTREAL AND QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 71 (i).
- MONTREAL AND QUEBEC RIVER POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
- MONTREAL DISTRICT, SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 647 (i).
- MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION, AMOUNT ADVANCED: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1135 (ii).
- MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSIONERS RELIEF: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 27 (i).
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. No. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 1031; M. for Com., 1280; in Com., 1294; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1391 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 5.*)
 Deb on Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1280; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1283; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1283; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1284, 1290; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1285; (Mr. *Girouard*) 1288; (Mr. *Amyot*) 1288; (Mr. *Curran*) 1289; (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1290; (Mr. *Desjardins*) 1292; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1292; (Mr. *Casey*) 1291 (ii).
- MONTREAL *Herald* AND MR. CURRAN, M. P.: in Com. of Sup., 1170 (ii).
- Montreal Island Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 70 (Mr. *Desjardins*). 1°*, 454; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 63.*)

- MONTREAL POST OFFICE ELECTRIC LIGHT CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 625 (ii).
- MORGAN, H. J.: in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
- MORIN, DR. J. A., CLAIM FOR MEDICAL SERVICES: M. for copy (Mr. *Amyot*) 655 (i).
- Morrison, Catherine. See "DIVORCE."
- MOULIN, REV. FATHER, COR re RESERVE AT BATOUCHE: M. for copy (Mr. *Scarth*) 866. (ii).
- MOUNTED POLICE, COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup. 93 (i), 1610, 1658, 1683 (ii).
 — HEADQUARTERS, EDMONTON: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 965 (i).
 — REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 499 (i).
- MOYLAN, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).
- MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
- MUSKOKA AND PARRY SOUND JUDICIAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Barrow*) 1232 (ii).
- Nationale. See "LA BANQUE."
- NAUFRAGE, P.E.I., NAVIGATION, REP. OF ENGINEER: M. for copies (Mr. *McIntyre*) 70 (i).
- NAVIGATION OF THE HIGH SEAS. See "COLLISIONS."
- NEELY, PRIVATE THOS., DEATH OF, COR., re COMPENSATION TO FAMILY: M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 649 (i).
- NEW BRUNSWICK:
 ALBERT RY. Co.'s LOAN ACCOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 826 (ii).
 — (N.B.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1516; in Com., 1594 (i).
 ATLANTIC OCEAN, OBSTRUCTIONS TO SHIPPING: Ques. (Gen. *Laurie*) 1423 (ii).
 CENTRAL RY. Co.'s (N.B.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1593 (ii).
 CHATHAM BRANCH RY. (N.B.) Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1594 (ii).
 ELGIN, PETITODIAC AND HAVLOCK RY. (N.B.) Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1593 (ii).
 FRASER, MR. JUSTICE, AND re WESTMORELAND ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 115 (i).
 HAWKE, J. T., CASE OF: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1299.
 INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 1607 (ii).
 NORTHUMBERLAND MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1392 (ii).
 — Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 NEWCASTLE POST OFFICE IRREGULARITIES: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).
 PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1468 (ii).
 QUEEN'S: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
 ST. JOHN HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, REP. OF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 86 (i).
 TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1626 (ii).
- [See DEPARTMENTS, "I.O.R.," "SUPPLY," & C.]
- NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION, COR.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 664 (i).
 — Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 111 (i).
- NEW MEMBERS, 1, 238, 309, 646 (i), 866, 1414, 1544 (ii).
- New York, St Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp B. No. 72 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°*, 454; 2°*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1049 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 67.*)
- NEW YORK, WADDINGTON AND OTTAWA RY.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Hickey*) 778 (i).

Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert incorp. B. No.

15 (Mr. *Macdowall*). 1°*, 62; 2°*, 219 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 954 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 108.)

“NORTHERN LIGHT”, CAPT. FINLAYSON'S SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Welsh*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1558 (ii).

— CAPTAIN'S PAY AND EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Welsh*) 37 (i).

— CONDITION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Welsh*) 827 (i).

— NUMBER OF TRIPS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 61 (i).

— TRIPS MADE AND PASSENGERS CARRIED (WINTER 1887-88): M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 672 (i).

— PAPERS *re* EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 416, 456 (i); 1001 (ii).

— WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: Ques (Mr. *Davies*) 140 (i).

NORTH SYDNEY PILOTAGE RETURNS UNDER ACT OF 1873: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*, P.E.I.) 1067 (ii).

NORTHUMBERLAND (N. B) MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1392 (ii).

— RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

— STRAITS SUBWAY, REP. OF ENGINEERS, &c.: M. for copy (Mr. *Perry*) 661 (i).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (ii).

BREYLAOR HALF-BREEDS: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1614 (ii).

COLONISATION INSPECTOR: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 866 (ii).

EXPERIMENTAL FARM, LOCATION, PAPERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 866 (ii).

— PROF. SAUNDERS' REP.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).

FORT MCLEOD AND PIACHER CREEK MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 712 (i).

GOVT. OF N. W. T. EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).

GRAZING LANDS, LEASES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davis*) 866 (ii).

— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 495 (i).

— ALBERTA DISTRICT: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 498 (i).

IMMIGRANTS, ACCOMMODATION AT REGINA: Ques (Mr. *Davin*) 712 (i).

LEASES, OLD AND UNOCCUPIED LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 825 (ii).

LEGISLATION FOR N. W. T.: Mess. from His Ex., 1231 (ii).

MOUNTED POLICE HEADQUARTERS, EDMONTON: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 965 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 93 (i), 1610, 1658, 1683 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1672 (ii).

QU'APPELLE IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 1161, 1169 (ii).

RANCHES, DUTIES OF INSPECTOR: Ques (Mr. *Davis*) 965 (ii).

REBELLION OF 1885. See “MILITIA AND DEFENCE.”

REGINA GAOL: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).

SQUATTERS' CLAIMS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 656 (i).

STRANGE, GENL., REP. *re* REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 98 (i).

TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 1633 (ii).

TRAVIS, EX-JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 114 (i).

[See DEPARTMENTS, “MANITOBA,” &c.]

NORTH-WEST CENTRAL. See “GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL” N. W. T. (Council) Act Amt (Chap. 50, *Rev. Statutes*)

B. No. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 451 (i); prop. Ref., 1174; in Com., 1491; 2°, 1473; in Com. 1480; 3°*, 1547 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 19.)

Nova Scotia Telephone Co.'s B. No 59 (Mr. *Tupper, Pictou*). 1°*, 344; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 954 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 100.)

NOVA SCOTIA:

“CAPE BRETON” DREDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Tupper, Pictou*) 1432 (ii).

COLCHESTER: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

CUMBERLAND: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

DIGBY: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

EASTERN EXTENSION RY., *Cor re* RIGHT OF WAY: M. for Papers (Mr. *Kirk*) 902 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 1231 (ii)

EIGHT-ISLAND LAKE POST OFFICE: Ques (Mr. *Kirk*) 86 (i).

HALIFAX COTTON Co's (N.S.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1593 (ii).

HARBORS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1561, 1673 (ii).

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1232 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1588 (ii).

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY. (CONSTRUCTION): in Com. of Sup., 1230 (ii).

RECEIVER GENERAL (HALIFAX): in Com. of Sup., 88 (i).

SHELBURNE: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

STEEL CO. OF CANADA (N.S.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1594 (ii).

VICTORIA: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

YARMOUTH: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

[See DEPARTMENTS, “SUPPLY,” &c.]

Oaths of Office. See “ADMINISTRATION.”

OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1581.

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1577 (ii).

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND COB.: M. for copies (Mr. *Langcher, Quebec*) 1007 (ii).

O'DONOGHUE, W. F., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 899 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 1163 (ii).

OLIVIER, GEO, DISMISSAL, *Cor* RESPECTING: M. for copy (Mr. *Rinfret*) 654 (i).

ONDERDONK ARBITRATION, PLANT TAKEN OVER BY GOVT.: Ques (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 93 (i).

— DETAILS: presented (Mr. *Pope*) 111 (i).

ONTARIO:

ARKONA POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 712 (i).

— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1018 (ii).

BAY OF QUINTE, BRIDGE AT BELLEVILLE: M. for copies of *Cor.** (Mr. *Platt*) 922 (ii).

BEXLEY POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 58 (i).

BOUNDARIES OF ONT.: Remarks (Mr. *Dawson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1629 (ii).

BRUCE, WEST: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

CARLETON: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

CAYUGA POST OFFICE SITE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 28 (i).

CENTRAL RAILWAY Co.'s PETITION: M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) to ref. back to Standing Com., 700 (i).

CHIPPAWA VILLAGE BRIDGE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 65 (i).

CULBERTSON, ARCHIBALD, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 977 (ii).

DUART POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).

EVEREST, GEO. M., DISMISSAL AS POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 712 (i).

GRAND RIVER BRIDGES, HALDIMAND: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (ii).

G. T. B. CROSSING IN TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 59 (i).

HALDIMAND: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

— DEP. RETURNING OFFICER: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 648 (i); Remarks, 922.

HALTON: Ret. of Member-Elect, 1 (i).

HASTINGS, WEST, ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Vacancy, 85 (i).

— Ret. of Member Elect, 238 (i).

ONTARIO—Continued.

INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 1605 (ii)
 INGOLDSBY STATION, POST OFFICE, PETITION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Barron) 1243 (ii).
 JONES, WALTER, APPOINTMENT: Res (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1524; neg. (Y. 53, N. 98) 1533 (ii).
 KENT (ONT.) ELECTION: Ret. of Member Elect., 1514 (ii).
 KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1871 (ii).
 — DEPUTY POSTMASTER'S IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 899, 965 (ii).
 — Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1012 (ii).
 MIDDLESEX, WEST: Ret. of Member Elec., 309 (i).
 MIDLAND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. Cook) 1259 (i).
 MIDLAND, ORILLIA, &c., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Cook) 647 (i).
 MERRICK, RICHARD, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Trow) 647 (i).
 MONCK, RICHARD, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 712 (ii), 899 (ii).
 ONTARIO AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY.: Ques. (Mr. Elgar) 1431 (ii).
 PELÉE ISLAND CABLE, PETITIONS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 826 (i).
 — Remarks (Mr. Brien) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1011 (ii).
 PENETANGUISHERNE, MIDLAND, &c., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Cook) 647 (i).
 — Remarks (Mr. Cook) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).
 PICTON, EXCISEMAN AT, REVENUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Platt) 1432 (ii).
 — HARBOR, COR., &c., re DREDGING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Platt) 866 (ii).
 — PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COR. &c., re CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Platt) 866 (ii).
 PLATTSVILLE POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. Somerville) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1018 (ii).
 PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY: Certificate of Return of Member Elect., 380 (i).
 PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1537, 1541, 1655, 1672 (ii).
 — Ques. (Mr. Platt) 1432 (ii).
 RENFREW, SOUTH: Ret. of Member Elect., 1 (i).
 RUSSELL ELECTION: Ret. of Member on certificate of Returning Officer, 1415 (ii).
 — Official notification of Ret., 1522 (ii).
 ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBERING CO., COSTS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 20 (i).
 ST. CLAIR RY. BRIDGE AND TUNNEL CO., GOVT. ASSISTANCE: Ques. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 1432 (ii).
 SARNIA AND PORT HURON TUNNEL: Ques. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 1432 (ii).
 SMYTH, HENRY, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 495 (i)
 — Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 647 (i).
 — AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 866.
 SNETSINGER, MR., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 825 (ii).
 STAG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RIVER ST. CLAIR, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. Lister) 1259 (ii).
 STRATHROY POST OFFICE AND CUSTOM HOUSE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 498 (i).
 — SITE: Ques., 1174 (ii).
 TELEPHONE, WOLF ISLAND (ONT.) AND MAINLAND: in Com. of Sup., 1877 (ii).
 THOROLD CANAL WATER POWER: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 647 (i).
 VICTORIA COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 825 (ii).
 WELLAND RIVER BRIDGE AT CHIPPAWA: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 65 (i).
 WELLINGTON HARBOR OF REFUGE, COR., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Platt) 866 (ii).
 WINKLER, MRS. BARBARA, PAYMENT FOR LOSS OF REGISTERED LETTER: Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 750 (i).
 YORK-SIMCOE BATT., KIT ALLOWANCES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Mulock) 88.
 [See DEPARTMENTS, "SUPPLY," "SUBSIDIES," &c.]

Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. No. 45 (Mr. Small). 1°*, 206; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1207 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 53)
 Ontario, Manitoba and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 81 (Mr. Davis). 1°*, 489; 2°*, 498 (i); withdn., 1585 (ii).
 ORDERS IN COUNCIL, &c., COLLECTING: in Com. of Sup., 1618, 1663 (ii)
 ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE:
 ORDER;
 CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RY.: Member's Vote on 2° of B. challenged by Mr. Trow: being questioned by Mr. Speaker and member within the entrance vote allowed to stand, 941 (ii).
 CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY, LATE: Objection taken by Mr. McNeill to discussion on M. for 2 of B. respecting Patents of Invention, 1372 (ii).
 CONTRADICTION OF STATEMENT: Explanation (Mr. McMullan, Huron) ruled (Mr. Speaker) Member not having the floor cannot make a speech, 345 (i).
 DEBATE, DIGNITY AND DECORUM: Member requested by Mr. Speaker to desist from throwing papers, 611 (i).
 DEBATES, OFFICIAL, DISMISSAL OF TRANSLATORS: Member checked by Mr. Deputy Speaker, remarks being irrelevant to Res. before the House, 719, 721 (i).
 DIGRESSION FROM DEBATE: Ruled (Mr. Deputy Speaker) personal charges against a member should be avoided, unless followed up by some distinct proceeding, 443 (i).
 — Member requested by Mr. Deputy Speaker to confine himself to question under Debate, 450, 480 (i).
 DUTIES (REDUCTION) ON CERTAIN ARTICLES: M. (Mr. Landerkin) to adjourn House; Ruled out of order (Mr. Speaker) Orders of the Day having been called, 554 (i).
 ELLIS, MR., M.P., AND ANNEXATION: Objection taken by Mr. Lister to Ques., same containing an averment of facts: Rule relating to Ques. read by Mr. Speaker and Ques. declared out of order, as it reflected on a Member of the House, 45 (i).
 FISHERIES TREATY, PAPERS RESPECTING: Member's attention drawn by Mr. Speaker to the fact of there being no question before the House, and that a debate cannot arise on the non-production of certain papers, 143, 239 (i).
 IMPROPER CONDUCT OF JUDGES: Member's attention called by Mr. Speaker to the Rule prevailing here and in England respecting charges against Judges, and ruling of Mr. Speaker Brand read, 1301 (ii).
 IMPUTATION OF MOTIVES: Objection (Mr. Charlton): Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 523 (i).
 LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL OF LABORERS: In Com. of Sup., discussion objected to by Sir Hector Langevin, subject not being relevant to question before the Chair; objection sustained by Mr. Chairman, but Member allowed to proceed in order to save time, 1564 (ii).
 — Reference to in Com. of Sup. declared irregular (Mr. Chairman) 1173 (ii).
 — Members called to order by Mr. Chairman for using strong language, 1648 (ii).
 LOYALTY AND DISLOYALTY OF MEMBERS: Member requested by Mr. Speaker to withdraw objectionable phraseology and apologise to House, 524 (i).
 MISREPRESENTATION: Explanation (Mr. Paterson, Brant) allowed, by Mr. Speaker; interruptions in Debate should be avoided, 421 (i).
 PROHIBITION: Reference to previous debate checked by Mr. Speaker, 867 (ii).
 PUBLIC DOCUMENTS: Reading and laying same on Table: Ruled not applicable to ordinary Members, but only to Members of the Government, 1435 (ii).
 READING SPEECHES: Objection taken by Mr. Mulock; Ruled (Mr. Speaker) that Rule does not apply, 1101 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Continued.

ORDER—Continued.

REBELLION, CLAIM OF SCOUTS, &c. : prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) objected to by Mr. Mackenzie, same involving a public charge; Ruled (Mr. Deputy Speaker) not objectionable, 1243 (ii).

REBELLION MEDALS: in Com. of Sup., no question being before the Chair, M. that Com. rise ruled in order (Mr. Chairman) and Member allowed to proceed with remarks, 1208 (ii).

RECIPROCITY WITH U. S. : Explanation in deb. ruled out of order (Mr. Speaker), Member must wait his turn for reply, 283 (i).

RELEVANCY OF DEB. : Mr. Chairman's attention drawn to remarks of Member; Ruled not in order, 1639 (ii).

SPEAKER, DEPUTY, RULING: Deb. on, objected to by Mr. Ives, 721 (i).

UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: Objection (Sir John A. Macdonald) 491 (i).

PRIVILEGE :

DISLOYALTY, ALLEGED: Personal explanation (Mr. Amyot) 598 (i).

FARM LANDS IN HURON COUNTY: Personal explanation (Mr. Moncrieff) 392 (i).

"FLIES ON THE WHEEL": Member's veracity questioned and explanation by Mr. Davin checked and ruled out of order by Mr. Speaker, 1093 (ii).

GOLDWIN SMITH: Personal explanation (Mr. Davin) and denial of statement in *Toronto Telegram*, 270 (i).

GREENWAY AND MARTIN, VISIT *re* DISALLOWANCE: Attention of Govt. drawn by Mr. Mitchell to rumored interview with Governor General, 110 (i).

HAWKS, JNO. T., AND WESTMORELAND ELECTION: Remarks (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1299 (ii).

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION: Attention of House drawn by Mr. Mitchell to Official Correspondence appearing in a newspaper, 111 (i).

NEW YORK, WASHINGTON AND OTTAWA RY. : Contradiction of statement in *Evening Journal* (Mr. Hickey) 778 (i).

PAIRING OF MEMBERS: Personal explanation (Mr. Marshall) 1403 (ii).

PROHIBITION DEB. : Member asked by Mr. Speaker to state Ques. of Priv., deb. on same not allowed, 967 (ii).

RECIPROCITY WITH U. S. : Personal explanation (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 239 (i).

PROCEDURE :

CAN. TEMPERANCE ACT AMT. : In Com. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) to repeal a certain section, cannot properly be entertained by the Chair, but it is competent for a Member to bring it up at some other stage, or by Order of House to refer back to Com. (Mr. Chairman) 1254 (ii).

SOUTH-WESTERN RY. Co.'s B. : Amt. to M. for 3° (Mr. Curran) objected to by Mr. Baker and declared out of order by Mr. Speaker, 954 (ii).

UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT Co.'s B. : Mr. Deputy Speaker being present, objection was taken by Mr. Mills (Bothwell) to a private Member being called upon to act as Chairman of Committees; Mr. Mills also objected to Deputy Speaker reporting B. to himself from Committee, 1148 (ii).

"ORIENTAL," LOSS OF BARGE, REP. OF INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 966 (ii).

ORILLIA, MIDLAND, &c., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Cook) 647 (i).

OTTAWA, ADDITIONAL DEPTL. BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).

Ottawa and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 75 (Mr. Ferguson, Renfrew). 1°*, 454; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 65.)

— — — SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546; in Com., 1587 (ii).

OTTAWA CITY AND RIVER BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 1571, 1677 (ii).

OTTAWA COUNTY, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).

Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 50 (Mr. Hickey). 1°*, 270; 2°*, 493 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 954 (ii).

OTTAWA RIVER WORKS AND IMPROVEMENTS, TOTAL COST, &c. : M. for Stmt. (Mr. Amyot) 827 (i).

Ottawa (Upper) Improvement Co.'s B. No. 20 (Mr. White, Renfrew). 1°*, 73; 2° m., 322; 2°, 496 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1148 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 102.)

OVERLOADING VESSELS, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. Guillet) 140 (i).

OVERSEERS AND WARDENS (SALARIES): in Com. of Sup., 1583 (ii).

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY. (CONSTRUCTION): in Com. of Sup., 1230 (ii).

PAMPHLETS, IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 1158, 1165 (ii).

— — — TRANSLATION: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 85 (i).

PAPINEAUVILLE HARBOR, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).

PARLT. HOUSE, QUEBEC, RENT OF OLD SITE: in Com. of Sup., 1655 (ii).

PARLIAMENT, 6TH, SECOND SESSION, 1888, 51 VICTORIA: Opening, 1 (i); closing, 1693 (ii).

PARMELEE, MR., REP *re* KAMLOOPS AS AN OUTPORT OF ENTRY: M. for copy* (Mr. Mara) 498 (i).

PATENTS, APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER: in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).

Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. No. 38 (Mr. Carling). 1°, 124; prop. Res., 125 (i); conc. in, 1513; 2°* and in Com., 1511; 3° m., 1547; Amt. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) neg. (Y. 60, N 93) and 3°, 1548 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 18.)

"PATENT RECORD" EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (ii).

PAUPER IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 1155, 1163 (ii).

— — — Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 964 (ii).

— — — Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1595 (ii).

PEACE RIVER AND ATHABASCA INDIAN TREATIES: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 825 (ii).

Peddlers and Commission men (Nursery Stock) prevention of Fraud B. No. 105 (Mr. Boyle). 1°*, 899 (ii).

PELÉE ISLAND CABLE, PETITIONS, &c. : M. for copies (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 826 (i).

— — — Remarks (Mr. Brien) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1011.

PENETANGUISHERNE CUSTOM HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. Cook) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).

— — — MIDLAND, &c., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Cook) 647 (i).

PENITENTIARIES :

BRITISH COLUMBIA: in Com. of Sup., 1026 (ii).

DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).

DORCHESTER: in Com. of Sup., 1021 (ii).

KINGSTON: in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).

MANITOBA: in Com. of Sup., 1021; conc., 1686 (ii).

REGINA GAOL: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).

REP. : presented (Mr. Thompson) 18 (i).

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL: in Com. of Sup., 136 (i); conc., 1686 (ii).

PENSIONS:

- DELANEY, MRS.: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 FERRAN RAID, ON ACCOUNT OF: in Com. of Sup., 1201, 1639 (ii).
 GOWANLOCK, MRS.: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 58 (i).
 ——— Remarks (Mr. Rykert, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1015 (ii).
 HODGSON, SIR ROBT. (PAYMENT TO GOVT OF P.E.I.): in Com. of Sup., 1671 (ii).
 VETERANS OF 1812: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 ——— OF 1837: Ques. (Mr. Purcell) 85 (i).
- PERLEY, H. F., REP. re ST JOHN HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 86 (i).
- PERMANENT FORCES: in Com. of Sup., 1219 (ii).
- PICTON EXCISEMAN, REVENUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Platt) 1432.
 ——— HARBOR, COR., &c., re DREDGING; M. for Ret.* (Mr. Platt) 866 (i).
 ——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COR., &c., re CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Platt) 866 (i).
- PICTOU TOWN BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1226, 1645.
- PINETTE HARBOR, DREDGING OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 140 (i).
- PION & Co., CLAIM FOR GOODS DAMAGED ON I.C.R.: M. for copies* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1032 (i).
- PLATT, JOHN MILTON, ESQ., M.P. FOR P.E. COUNTY: introduced, 380 (i).
- PLATTSVILLE, POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. Somerville) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1018 (ii).
- PLAYTER, FR., SUBSIDY TO "HEALTH JOURNAL": in Com. of Sup., 1198 (ii).
- PLUMB, HON. J. B., DECREASE OF: Remarks (Sir John A. Macdonald) 124 (i).
- POINT TUPPER, CAPE BRETON, EXTENSION OF RY. PIER: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, Victoria) 1299 (ii).
- Pontiac and Renfrew Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 42 (Mr. Bryson). 1°*, 206; 2°*, 322; in Com. and 3°*, 611 (i). (51 Vic., c. 66.)
 ——— SUBSIDY: prop Res (Sir Charles Tupper) 154; in Com., 1589 (ii).
- Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 21 (Mr. Dawson). 1°*, 73; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 392 (i). (51 Vic., c. 84.)
 ——— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546; in Com., 1591 (ii).
- PORT ARTHUR HARBOR AND KAMINISTIGUIA: in Com. of Sup., 1462 (ii).
- POST OFFICE:
- AUDETTE, ANTOINE, NORTH STUKELY, POSTMASTER: M. for copies of O.C.'s, &c.* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1093 (ii).
 ARKONA POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. Lister) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1018 (ii).
 ——— DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 712 (i).
 BEXLEY POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 58 (i).
 DUART POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).
 EIGHT-ISLAND LAKE (N.S.) POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 86 (i).
 FORT MCKLOD AND PINCHER CREEK MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 712 (i).
 INGOLDSBY STATION POST OFFICE, PETITION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Barron) 1243 (ii).
 KINGSTON DEP. POSTMASTER'S IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 899, 965 (ii).
 KINGSTON POST OFFICE DEFALCATIONS: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1012 (ii).
 ——— Remarks (Mr. Lawrie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1017 (ii).

POST OFFICE—Continued.

- LAND VILLA POST OFFICE, PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Choquette) 102 (i).
- LOTBINIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 98 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE IN P.E.I.: M. for Pet. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 47, 52 (i).
- MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1678.
- MEGANTIC CO. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Turost) 825, 1332 (i).
- NEWCASTLE, POST OFFICE IRREGULARITIES: Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).
- NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.) MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) 1392 (ii).
- OCEAN MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND COR.: M. for copies (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1067 (ii).
- PLATTSVILLE, POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. Somerville) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1018 (ii).
- POSTMASTER GENL.'S DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
 ——— REP.: presented (Mr. McLellan) 20 (i).
- POST OFFICE AND FINANCE DEPTS.: in Com. of Sup., 113 (ii).
- QUEBEC AND DEQUEN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Couture) 98 (i).
- REGISTERED LETTER, PAYMENT FOR LOSS: Ques. (Mr. Lanterkin) 750 (i).
- ST. AGAPIT POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, COR.: M. for copy (Mr. Rinfret) 654 (i).
- SHANNON, WM., DEFALCATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 913 (ii).
- STUKELY (NORTH) POSTMASTERSHIP, &c., PAPERS, O.C.'s: M. for copies* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1093 (ii).
- VICTORIA (B.O.) POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 826 (ii).
- VICTORIA (ONT.) COUNTY, MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 825 (i).
- Post Office and Govt. Savings Banks (Interest on Deposits) B. No. 127 (Sir Charles Tupper). 1°, 1332; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1401 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 8.)
- PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY: Certificate of Return of Member Elect, 380 (i).
 ——— PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Platt) 1432 (ii).
- PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
- ALBERTON HARBOR, DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 712 (i).
- ALLEN, WARREN, CLAIM FOR ICE-BOAT: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 923 (i).
- "ALERT," COR. RESPECTING CONDITION: M. for Ret. (Mr. Welsh) 827.
- BAY FORTUNE BREAKWATER, REP. OF ENGINEER: M. for copy (Mr. McIntyre) 656 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 47, 52 (i).
- "NORTHERN LIGHT." See general heading.
- NAUFRAGE NAVIGATION, REP. OF ENGINEER: M. for copies (Mr. McIntyre) 70 (i).
- NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS SUBWAY, REP. OF ENGINEERS, &c.: M. for copy (Mr. Perry) 661 (i).
- PINETTE HARBOR, DREDGING OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 140 (i).
- TERMS OF CONFEDERATION: M. for copies* (Mr. Perry) 61 (i).
 ——— COMPENSATION FOR NON-FULFILMENT: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 86.
 ——— Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 140 (i).
- TIGNISH AND MININGASH BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 86, 712.
- STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 28, 712 (i).
 ——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Perry) 61 (i).
 ——— Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 140 (i).
- WHARVES AND PIERS, CARE OF: Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 965 (ii).
- WOOD ISLAND HARBOR, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 140 (i).
- Printing and Stationery (Public) Act (Chap 27, Rev. Statutes) Amt B. No. 60 (Mr. Chapleau) 1°*, 344 (i); 2° and in Com., 1005; 3°*, 1137 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 17.)
- PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 92 (i), 1541 (ii).
 ——— PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1617; conc., 1689.
 ——— MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).

PRINTING PAPERS: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (ii).
 ——— **REP. OF JOINT COM.:** M. (Mr. *Bergin*) to code., 454.
PRIOR, E. G., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR VICTORIA, B. C.: introduced, 2 (ii).
PRIVATE BILLS, PETITIONS, EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 50 (i).
 ——— **REPS. FROM COM.:** M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to extend time, 514 (i), 1031 (ii).
PRIVILEGE. See "ORDER," &c.
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 90 (i).
Presbyterian Church and Manse Building Fund for Man. and N. W. incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 97 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°*, 711; 2°*, 790 (i); in Com and 3°*, 1313 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 107.*)
PRESOOTT AND RUSSELL JUDICIAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Labrosse*) 27 (i).
PRESS, LIBERTY OF AND ACTION OF THE BENCH: Remarks, in Com. of Sup., 115 (i).
Procedure in Criminal Cases See "CRIMINAL LAW."
PROCEDURE. See "ORDER" &c.
PROHIBITION: prop. Res (Mr. *Jamieson*) 827 (ii).
PROPERTIES, MILITARY: in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
PROROGATION, notification: (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1625, 1693 (ii).
 ——— (Mr. *Speaker*) 1626 (ii).
 ——— **Me-s. from His Ex by Black Rod,** 1692 (ii).
PROTECTION STEAMERS, FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 1603.
Provincial Courts (Judges' Salaries) Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Thompson*). Res. prop., 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1690 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 38*)
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 18 (i).
PUBLIC SERVICE, NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 495 (i).
Public Service See "LOAN" and "SUPPLY B. 14."
PUBLIC WORKS:
AGENCY, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1633 (ii).
ALBERTON HARBOR, P. E. I., DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 712 (i).
BAY FORTUNE, P. E. I., BREAKWATER, REP. OF ENGINEER: M. for copy (Mr. *McIntyre*) 650 (i).
BONILLA POINT AND VICTORIA (B. C.) TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
BRIDGE AT BELLEVILLE: M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. *Platt*) 922 (ii).
 ——— **AT CHIPPAWA VILLAGE:** Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 85 (i).
 ——— **AT QUEBEC, GOVT. AID:** Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1625
BRIDGES, OTTAWA CITY AND RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1571, 1577 (ii).
CABLE TO PELÉES ISLAND, PETITIONS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 826 (i).
 ——— **on M. for Com. of Sup.** (Mr. *Brien*) 1011 (ii).
CAYUGA POST OFFICE SITE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 28 (i).
COAL SUPPLY, GOVT. TENDERS AND CONTRACTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Guillet*) 866 (i).
ELECTRIC LIGHT, MONTREAL POST OFFICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1625 (ii).
FRENCH RIVER NAVIGATION, DEPTH OF WATER: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 97 (i).
HADLOW COVE PIER, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Guy*) 140 (i).
HARBOR COMMISSIONERS. See "MONTREAL" and "QUEBEC."
ICE-BREAKERS, COUNTY OF BERTHIER: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 45 (i).
ISLE-AUX-NOIX WHARF EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 955 (ii).
LAKE ST. PETER IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 71 (i).
LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK. See "QUEBEC HARBOR COMMISSIONERS."

PUBLIC WORKS—Continued.

MATANE AND RIVER BLANCHE WHARVES, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1367 (ii).
MIDLAND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Cook*) 1259 (ii).
MIDLAND, OSILLIA, &c, PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 647 (i).
NAUFRAGE (P. E. I.) NAVIGATION, REP. OF ENGINEER: M. for copies (Mr. *McIntyre*) 70 (i).
NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS SUBWAY, REP. OF ENGINEERS, &c: M. for copy (Mr. *Perry*) 661 (i).
OTTAWA RIVER WORKS AND IMPROVEMENTS, TOTAL COST, &c.: M. for Simul. (Mr. *Amyot*) 847 (i).
PAPINEAUVILLE HARBOR, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Wright*) 495 (i).
PENETANGUISHENE, MIDLAND, &c., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 647 (i).
PICTON HARBOR, CJB., &c., re DREDGING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Platt*) 866 (ii).
PICTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COR., &c., re CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Platt*) 866 (i).
PINETTE HARBOR, DREDGING OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 140 (i).
PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY, PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 1432 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS REP. presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 18 (i).
RIMOUSKI PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1067 (ii).
STE. ANNE DES MONTS WHARF, PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Joncas*) 1233 (ii).
ST. HYACINTHE PUBLIC BUILDINGS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dupont*) 651 (i).
ST. JOHN HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, REP. OF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 86 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER CHANNEL, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, COR.: M. for copies* (Sir *Donald Smith*) 922 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT ADVANCED: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1135 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER NAVIGATION, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 71 (i).
SAGUENAY RIVER BUOYS, CONTRACT FOR PLACING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1433 (ii).
SARNIA AND PORT HURON TUNNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 1432 (ii).
STRATHROY POST OFFICE AND CUSTOM HOUSE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).
 ——— **PUBLIC BUILDINGS, SITE:** Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 96 (i).
TELEGRAPH LINES, ASSUMPTION BY GOVT.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Denison*) 101 (i).
TIGNISH AND MIMINGASH (P. E. I.) BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 86, 712 (i).
VENTILATION OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright, &c.*) 171 (i).
WELLINGTON HARBOR OF REFUGE, COR., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Platt*) 866 (i).
WHARVES AND PIERS IN P. E. I., CARE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 965 (ii).
WOOD ISLAND HARBOR, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 140 (i).
 [See "PROVINCES," "SUPPLY" &c.]
Punishments, Pardons &c. See "CRIMINAL LAW"
QU'APPELLE IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 1161, 1169 (ii).
QUARANTINE SERVICE OF CANADA: M. (Mr. *Fiset*) for Sel. Com., 657 (i).
 ——— **in Com. of Sup.,** 1195 (ii).
QUEBEC:
BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1625 (ii).
BUOYS IN RIVER SAGUENAY: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1433 (ii).
CARTBRIDGE FACTORY, &c. QUEBEC WATER SUPPLY, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1092 (ii).
CHARLEVOIX: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
COURT OF APPEAL: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 617 (i).
DORCHESTER: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
DRILL SHED, QUEBEC, WATER SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 85 (i).

QUEBEC—Continued.

- DRILL SHED, COR. : M. (Mr. Amyot) for copy, 654 (i).
 ELECTRIC LIGHT, MONTREAL POST OFFICE, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 1626 (ii).
 GAUVREAU, DR. EDMOND, GRANT FOR PREPARING VACCINE : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 140 (i).
 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, OTTAWA COUNTY : Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).
 GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE, FISHERIES PROTECTION : Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 826 (ii).
 HADLEY COVE PIER, EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. Guay) 140 (i).
 ICE BREAKERS, COUNTY OF BERTRIE : Ques. (Mr. Beauvolet) 45 (i).
 ISLE-AUX-NOIX WHARF, EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 965 (ii).
 LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL OF LABORERS : in Com. of Sup., 1170, 1568, 1647 (ii).
 LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY, TRANSFER : Ques. (Mr. Couture) 1432 (ii).
 LAKE ST. PETER IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE : M. for Ret (Mr. Amyot) 71 (i).
 LAND VILLA POST OFFICE, PAPERS, &c. : M. for copies (Mr. Choquette) 102 (i).
 LEDUC, CHAS., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVERNMENT : Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 140 (i).
 LOTBINIÈRE MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 98 (i).
 MASSAWIPPI VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546 (ii).
 MATANE AND RIVER BLANCHE WHARVES, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1067 (ii).
 MEDICAL INSPECTION, QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
 MEGANTIC MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. Turcott) 825, 1232
 MISSISQUOI ELECTORAL DISTRICT : Vacancy, 124 (i).
 ——— Return of Member Elect, 648 (i).
 MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546 ; in Com., 1589 (ii).
 MONTREAL AND QUEBEC RIVER POLICE : in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
 MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSIONERS' RELIEF : Ques. (Mr. Curran) 27
 ——— AMOUNT ADVANCED : Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1135 (ii).
 ——— *Herald* and MR. CURRAN : Com. of Sup., 1170 (ii).
 MORIN, DR. J. A., CLAIM FOR MEDICAL SERVICES : M. for copy (Mr. Amyot) 655 (i).
 OLIVIER, GRO., DISMISSAL, COR. RESPECTING : M. for copy (Mr. Rinfret) 654 (i).
 OTTAWA COUNTY GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).
 PAPINEAUVILLE HARBOR, DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).
 PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546 ; in Com., 1589 (ii).
 QUEBEC AND DEQUEW MAIL SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. Couture) 98 (i).
 ——— AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. Couture) 1432 (ii).
 ——— prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546 ; in Com., 1591 (ii).
 ——— HARBOR COMMISSIONERS (LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK) AMOUNT ADVANCED : Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1136, 1232 (ii).
 QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546 ; in Com., 1593 (ii).
 RIMOUSKI CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1067 (ii).
 ST. AGAPIT, POSTMASTER'S DISMISSAL, COR. : M. for copy (Mr. Rinfret) 654 (i).
 STE. ANNE DES MONT'S WHARF, PAPERS, &c. : M. for copies (Mr. Jones) 1233 (ii).
 ST. RYACINTHE PUBLIC BUILDINGS : M. for Ret. (Mr. Dupont) 651 (i).
 ST. LAWRENCE RIVER CHANNEL, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, COR. : M. for copies* (Sir Donald Smith) 922 (ii).
 ——— NAVIGATION, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, EXPENDITURE : M. for Ret. (Mr. Amyot) 71 (i).
 ——— IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT ADVANCED : Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1135 (ii).
 ——— FLOODS, MONTREAL AND VICINITY, EXAMINATION : in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
 ——— COR., REPS., &c. : M. for copies (Mr. Beauvolet) 60 (i).
 ——— LESSE, CAPT., REPORT *re* FLOODS : Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 899 (ii).

QUEBEC—Continued.

- ST. PIERRE, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, PETITIONS *re* ARTILLERY PRACTICE : M. for copies* (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 672 (i).
 SAGUENAY RIVER BUOYS, CONTRACT FOR PLACING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Couvure) 1433 (ii).
 STUKELY, NORTH, POSTMASTERSHIP, &c., PAPERS, O U.'s : M. for copies* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1092 (ii).
 SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, MONTREAL DISTRICT : Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 647 (i).
 TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546 ; in Com., 1593 (ii).
 [See DEPARTMENTS, "SUPPLY," &c.]
 QUEBEC COUNTY CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. Speaker) 309 (i).
Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. No. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper). Res. prop., 1031 ; in Com., 1296 ; M. to conc., 1383, 1491 ; conc. in, 1^o*, 2^o* and in Com., 1400 ; 3^o*, 1404 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
 Deb. on 2^o (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 1391 ; (Mr. Kenny) 1395 ; (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 1396 ; (Mr. Ellis) 1397 ; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1398 ; (Mr. Welsh) 1399 ; (Mr. Gillmor) 1399 (ii).
Quebec Judiciary. See "PROVINCIAL COURTS."
 QUEBEC WEST, CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. Speaker) 309 (i).
 QUEEN'S, N.B., RET. OF MEMBER ELECT. : notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
RAILWAYS. See
 ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.
 ALBERT (N.B.) RY. CO.
 ANNAPOLIS AND ATLANTIC RY. CO.
 BELLEVILLE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.
 BRANTFORD, WATERLOO AND LAKE ERIE RY. CO.
 BUFFALO, CHIPPAWA AND NIAGARA FALLS STEAMBOAT AND TRAMWAY CO.
 CANADA AND MICHIGAN TUNNEL CO.
 CANADA SOUTHERN AND ERIE AND NIAGARA RY. CO.
 CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. (BRANCH LINES).
 CAPE BRETON RYS.
 CENTRAL ONTARIO RY. CO.
 CENTRAL RY. OF NEW BRUNSWICK.
 CHATHAM JUNCTION RY. CO.
 CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RY. CO.
 CHINOOK BELT AND PEACE RIVER RY. CO.
 COLLINGWOOD AND BAY OF QUINTE RY. CO.
 DERRY BRANCH RY.
 DETROIT RIVER RY. AND BRIDGE CO.
 EASTERN EXTENSION RY.
 EMERSON AND NORTH WESTERN RY. CO.
 ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY. CO.
 GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.
 GRAND TRUNK, CANADA SOUTHERN, LONDON AND PORT STANLEY, &c.
 GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.
 GREAT WESTERN AND LAKE ONTARIO SMOKE JUNCTION RY. CO.
 HEREFORD BRANCH RY. CO.
 INTERCOLONIAL RY.
 INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.
 KINCARDINE AND TERNWATER RY. CO.
 LAKE NIPISSING AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.
 LONDON AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.
 MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
 MASKINONGÉ AND NIPISSING RY. CO.
 MONTREAL ISLAND RY. CO.
 NEW YORK, ST. LAWRENCE AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
 ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RY. CO.

RAILWAYS—Continued.

ONTARIO, MANITOBA AND WESTERN RY. Co.
 OTTAWA AND PARRY SOUND RY. Co.
 ONTARIO AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. Co.
 OTTAWA, MORRISBURG AND NEW YORK RY. AND BRIDGE Co.
 OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY.
 PONTIAC AND RENFREW RY. Co.
 PORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. Co.
 ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. Co.
 ST. CLAIR RIVER RY. BRIDGE AND TUNNEL Co.
 ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. Co.
 SHUSWAP AND OKANAGON RY. Co.
 SOUTH NORFOLK RY. Co.
 SOUTH-WESTERN RY. Co.
 SOUTHWESTERN AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN RY. Co.
 STANSTEAD, SHEFFORD AND CHAMBLY RY. Co.
 THOUSAND ISLAND RY. Co.
 TOBIQUE GYPSUM AND COLONISATION RY. Co.
 WESTERN ONTARIO RY. Co.
 WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RY. Co.

[See "SUBSIDIES."]

RY ACCIDENTS REPORTED TO GOVT. AND ACTIONS PENDING:
 M. for Ret.* (Mr. Denison) 62 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 24 (Mr. Pope). 1° 73 (i);
 2°*, 941; in Com., 1175, 1417, 1492; 3° m. and M. to
 recom., 1507; Amt. (Mr. Edgar) 1568; (neg. Y. 54; N.
 98) 1510; 3°*, 1511(ii). (51 Vic., c. 29.)

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 94 (Mr. Cook). 1°, 598.

RY. COMMISSION, COST: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 494 (i).

— REP.: presented (Mr. Pope) 26 (i).

— REP. AND EVIDENCE: Ques. (Mr. Holton) 778 (i),
 867 (ii).

— Ques. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 646 (i).

Ry. Crossing by Streets, &c., Provision B. No.
 111 (Mr. Lister). 1°*, 964 (ii).

Ry. Employés Protection B. No. 5 (Mr. McCarthy).
 1°, 44; 2°m., 762; deb. adjnd., 770 (i); rsmtd., 916; 2°,
 917; Order dschgd. and ref. to Com. on B. 24, 1247 (ii).

Deb. on M. for 2° (Mr. Denison) 762; (Mr. Cook) 762; (Mr. Jones,
 Halifax) 762; (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 762; (Mr. Shanty) 764; (Mr.
 Lister) 765; (Mr. Tisdale) 767; (Mr. Barron) 768; (Mr. Temple)
 769; (Mr. Armstrong) 769; (Mr. Sproule) 769; (Sir Charles Tupper)
 769 (i); (Mr. McCarthy) 916; (Sir Charles Tupper) 917; (Mr.
 Laurier) 917 (ii).

RY. LEGISLATION, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. Watson)
 1403 (ii).

— M. (Mr. Small) to authorise Ry. Com. to divide a
 Bill, 415 (i).

RYS. AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 96 (i), 1221, 1460, 1620,
 1657, 1644, 1650, 1668 (ii).

— DEPTL. REP.; presented (Mr. Pope) 73 (i).

RYS., CAN., COST: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 141, 170 (i).

RANCHES, DUTIES OF INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 965 (ii).

Real Property Act. See "TERRITORIES."

REBELLION IN N.W.T., COST: Ques. (Mr. Mulock) 171 (i).

— REP. OF GEN. STRANGE: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 98 (i)

— REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: presented (Mr. White,
 Cardwell) 97 (i).

— TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Mulock)
 498 (i).

— LOSSES COMMISSION, REPS., &c.: M. for copy (Mr.
 Laurier) 63 (i).

REBELLION IN N.W.T., CLAIMS OF SCOUTS, &c.: prop. Res.
 (Mr. Davin) 1242 (ii).

— PENSIONS, MILITIAMEN, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1202,
 1642 (ii).

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, CONSOLIDATED FUND: M. for
 Ret* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 38 (i).

RECEIVER GENERAL (HALIFAX): in Com. of Sup., 88 (i).

RECIPROCITY WITH U. S.: prop. Res. (Sir Richard
 Cartwright) 141; neg, 646 (i).

Deb. (Mr. White, Cardwell) 161; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 172; (Mr. Foster)
 183, (Amt) 194 (i).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. Charlton) 206; (Mr. Davin) 228; (Mr. Dessain)
 203; (Mr. Lavergne) 234; (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 194; (Mr.
 McNeil) 240; (Mr. Perler) 193; agreed to (Y. 124, N. 67) 646 (i)

Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 257; deb. (Mr. Amyot) 532; (Mr.
 Baird) 345; (Mr. Barron) 303; (Mr. Beauvolet) 392; (Mr. Béchard)
 463; (Mr. Borden) 358; (Mr. Bowman) 543; (Mr. Brien) 508;
 (Mr. Brown) 288; (Mr. Cameron) 610; (Mr. Chapleau) 565; (Mr.
 Choquette) 294; (Mr. Coekburn) 322; (Mr. Curran) 310; (Mr.
 Dupont) 396; (Mr. Ellis) 335; (Mr. Ferguson, Welland) 458;
 (Mr. Fiset) 612; (Mr. Flynn) 571; (Mr. Freeman) 499; (Mr. Gi-
 yault) 274; (Mr. Gillmor) 635; (Mr. Haggart) 527; (Mr. Hesson)
 583; (Mr. Hickey) 483; (Mr. Huispeth) 467; (Mr. Jones, Digby)
 605; (Mr. Kenny) 381; (Mr. Kirk) 593; (Mr. Landerkin) 476;
 (Gen. Laurie) 371; (Mr. Laurier) 554; (Mr. Macdonald, Huron)
 276; (Mr. McIntyre) 487; (Mr. McKee) 547; (Mr. Mc-
 Mullen) 441; (Mr. Masson) 539; (Mr. Mills, Annapolis) 3:8;
 (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 603; (Mr. Moncreiff) 351; (Mr. Mulock) 626;
 (Mr. O'Brien) 525; (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 401; (Mr. Perly,
 Ottawa) 632; (Mr. Platt) 605; (Mr. Préfontaine) 642; (Mr. Rin-
 fret) 271; (Mr. Robertson) 377; (Mr. Rykert) 416; (Mr. Semple)
 578; (Mr. Skinner) 355; (Mr. Somerville) 618; (Mr. Sproule) 362;
 (Mr. Taylor) 438; (Mr. Tupper, Picton) 257; (Mr. Weldon, Albert)
 576; (Mr. Welsh) 317; (Mr. White, Renfrew) 624; (Mr. Wilson,
 Argenteuil) 613; (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 588; (Mr. Wilson, Lennox)
 511; (Mr. Wood, Westmoreland) 298; neg (Y. 67, N. 124) 646 (i).

RECIPROCITY WITH U. S. AND RETALIATORY BILL: Remarks
 (Sir Richard Cartwright, &c.) 516 (i).

— REDUCTION OF DUTIES: Remarks (Mr. Landerkin)
 554 (i).

— M. to make Res. First Order of the Day (Sir Richard
 Cartwright) 43 (i).

REGINA GOAL: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).

REGISTERED LETTER, PAYMENT FOR LOSS: Ques. (Mr. Lander-
 kin) 750 (i).

REGULATIONS re REGISTRY OF TRADES UNIONS: M. for copies*
 (Mr. Amyot) 50 (i).

RENDERED LARD. See "LARD."

RENFREW, SOUTH, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification
 (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

RIDEAU HALL, REPAIRS, FURNITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup.,
 1542; conc., 1688 (ii).

REPORTS PRESENTED, &c.:

AGRICULTURE (Mr. Carling) 455 (i).

AUDITOR GENERAL'S, REP. (Sir Charles Tupper) 18 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE LIST OF CANADA (Mr. Chapleau) 172 (i).

CRIMINAL STATISTICS (Mr. Carling) 1551 (ii).

INLAND REVENUE (Mr. Costigan) 18 (i)

INSURANCE COMPANIES, ABSTRACT (Sir Charles Tupper) 1207 (ii).

INTERIOR (Mr. White, Cardwell) 18 (i).

LACHINE CANAL WATER POWER, ROYAL COMMISSION (Mr. Pope) 52 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Foster) 138 (i).

REPORTS, &c.—Continued.

- MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 18 (i).
 NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 492 (i).
 PENITENTIARIES (Mr. *Thompson*) 18 (i).
 POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. *McLelan*) 20 (i).
 PRINTING AND STATIONERY, PUBLIC (Mr. *Chapleau*) 138 (i).
 PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 18 (i).
 PUBLIC WORKS (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 18 (i).
 RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. *Pope*) 73 (i).
 RAILWAYS, ROYAL COMMISSION (Mr. *Pope*) 26 (i).
 REBELLION IN THE N. W. T., ROYAL COMMISSION (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 97 (i).
 SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. *Chapleau*) 20 (i).
 TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS (Mr. *Bowell*) 18 (i).

Representation Act (B.C.) Amt. B. No. 55 (Mr. *Baker*). 1°, 309 (i).Representation Act (House of Commons) B. No. 56 (Mr. *Baker*). 1°, 309 (ii).Representation (N.W.T.) Act Amt. B. No. 125 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 1231; 2°, in Com. and 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to recom., neg. (Y. 62, N. 89) and 3°, 1551 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 10.)RETIATORY BILL: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 516.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c., MOTIONS FOR:

- ACCIDENTS, RY., REPORTED TO GOVT., AND ACTIONS PENDING*: Mr. *Denison*, 62 (i).
 "ALERT," COR. RESPECTING CONDITION: Mr. *Welsh*, 827 (ii).
 ALLEN, WARREN, CLAIM FOR ICE-BOAT, PAPERS, &c.: Mr. *Davies (P.E.I.)* 833 (ii).
 ARTILLERY PRACTICE ON ISLAND OF ORLEANS, PETITIONS, &c.*: Mr. *Langelier (Montmorency)* 672 (i).
 AUBREY, REV. M., SERVICES AS MILITARY CHAPLAIN, COR.: Mr. *Amyot*, 654 (i).
 AUDET, LIEUT. COL., AND FRENCH TRANSLATION OF FIELD EXERCISES, COR.: Mr. *Amyot*, 655 (i).
 AUDETTE, ANTOINE, NORTH STUKELY POSTMASTER, O.O.'s, &c.*: Mr. *Langelier (Quebec)* 1092 (ii).
 BAY FORTUNE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER, REP. OF ENGINEER: Mr. *McInyre*, 656 (i).
 BAY OF QUINTE, BRIDGE AT BELLEVILLE, COR.*: Mr. *Platt*, 922 (ii).
 BEHRING'S SEA SEIZURES, COR. RESPECTING: Mr. *Gordon*, 966 (ii).
 BRYANTON, ALBERT, AND ALLAN, COR. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY.*: Mr. *Mitchell*, 866 (ii).
 CABLE TO PELÉE ISLAND, PETITIONS, &c.: Mr. *Patterson (Essex)* 826 (ii).
 C. P. R. See general heading.
 CANADIAN VESSELS LOST ON GREAT LAKES: Mr. *Dawson*, 19, 752 (i).
 CANADIAN WRECKING VESSELS IN U. S. WATERS, COR.: Mr. *Edgar*, 665 (i).
 CAPITAL ACCOUNT, I.C.R., EXPENDITURE: Mr. *Jones (Halifax)* 103.
 CAP CHAT AND GRAND VALLÉE FISHERIES, REPS.: Mr. *Joncas*, 1232 (ii).
 CAPE BRETON RY., EASTERN SECTION, COR.*: Mr. *Flynn*, 1259 (ii).
 CARTRIDGE FACTORY, &c. (QUEBEC) WATER SUPPLY, COR.*: Mr. *Langelier (Quebec)* 1092 (ii).
 CASUALTIES, &c., ON I.C.R.: Mr. *Weldon (St. John)* 61 (i).
 CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS, ELECTION OF CHIEFS, COR.: Mr. *Doyon*, 899 (ii).
 CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION OF 1876, PAPERS, &c., re G. J. MACDONALD*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 866 (ii).
 CHIPPAWA AND OTTAWA NATION INDIANS' CLAIMS*: Mr. *Patterson (Essex)* 498 (i).
 CLANCY, PATRICK, COR. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY.*: Mr. *Mitchell*, 866 (ii).
 CLOTHING FOR MILITIA, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS*: Mr. *Bowman*, 866 (ii).
 COAL SUPPLY, GOVT., TENDERS AND CONTRACTS*: Mr. *Guillet*, 866.
 COLONISATION INSPECTOR, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *Watson*, 71 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- COLONISATION INSPECTORS IN N.W.T.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 866 (ii).
 COLONISATION CO.'S IN MAN. AND N.W.T.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 498 (i).
 CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 38 (i).
 CONFEDERATION TERMS WITH P.E.I.*: Mr. *Perry*, 61 (i).
 CONFEDERATION, ADMISSION OF NEWFOUNDLAND, COR.: Mr. *Laurier*, 664 (i).
 COSTS, &c., re ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBERING CO.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 20 (i).
 CULBERTSON, ARCHIBALD, DISMISSAL: Mr. *Burdett*, 977 (ii).
 CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT QUEBEC, COR., O.O.'s, &c.: Mr. *Langelier (Quebec)* 1068 (ii).
 DERBY BRANCH RY. AND JOHN KNIGHT, &c., COR.*: Mr. *Mitchell*, 866.
 DIAMONDS, &c., SEIZED AT QUEBEC, COR., O.O.'s, &c.: Mr. *Langelier (Quebec)* 1068, 1092 (ii).
 DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. RY. CHARTERS, COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.*: Mr. *Laurier*, 672 (i).
 DOM. LANDS AGENTS' INSTRUCTIONS: Mr. *McMullen*, 36, 45 (i).
 DOM. NOTES, CONTRACT FOR PRINTING: Mr. *Edgar*, 619 (i).
 DOM. SCRIP ISSUED IN MAN. AND N.W.T.*: Mr. *Wilson (Elgin)* 866.
 DRILL SHED, QUEBEC, WATER SUPPLY, COR.: Mr. *Amyot*, 654 (i).
 DUNCAN, WM L., KILLED ON I.C.R., PROCEEDINGS AT INQUEST*: Mr. *Weldon (St. John)* 498 (i).
 EASTERN EXTENSION RY., COR. re RIGHT OF WAY: Mr. *Kirk*, 902 (ii).
 EASTERN EXTENSION RY. AND I.C.R. TENDERS, &c., FOR FENCING*: Mr. *Kirk*, 866 (ii).
 EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 28 (i).
 EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN N.W., PROF. SAUNDERS' REP.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 498 (i).
 EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN N.W.T., LOCATION, PAPERS, &c.*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 866 (ii).
 FIELD EXERCISES, FRENCH TRANSLATION, COR.: Mr. *Amyot*, 655 (i).
 FIRE INSURANCE RISKS, POLICIES, &c.*: Mr. *Bowman*, 866 (ii).
 FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE, COR. RESPECTING*: Mr. *Davies (P.E.I.)* 866 (ii).
 FLOODS ON RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, COR., REPS, &c.: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 60 (i).
 FORTIN, NOEL, COR. re ACCIDENT AND DAMAGES: Mr. *Fisot*, 902 (ii).
 GORDON, COMMANDER, COR. re FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE*: Mr. *Davies (P.E.I.)* 866 (ii).
 GOVERNMENT STEAMERS, SALARIES OF CAPTAINS: Mr. *Welsh*, 37 (i).
 GRAZING LANDS, LESSEES*: Mr. *Davis*, 866 (ii).
 GRENfell (N.W.T.) EXPERIMENTAL FARM, LOCATION, PAPERS*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 866 (ii).
 GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO., PAPERS, &c.: Mr. *Edgar*, 653 (i).
 HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *Watson*, 71 (i); Mr. *McMullen**, 866 (ii).
 I.C.R. See general heading.
 INSTRUCTIONS TO DOM. LAND AGENTS: Mr. *McMullen*, 36, 45 (i).
 INGOLDSBY STATION POST OFFICE, PETITIONS, &c.: Mr. *Barron*, 1243 (ii).
 IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 28 (i).
 JAMAICA, COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH, COR.: Gen. *Laurie*, 903 (ii).
 JUDGES OF SUPERIOR COURT, RETIRED, NAMES, &c.*: Mr. *Small*, 62 (i).
 KAMLOOP'S AS AN OUTPORT OF ENTRY, MR. PARMELLE'S REP.*: Mr. *Mara*, 498 (i).
 KETTLE AND STONY POINT RESERVES, COMPLAINTS AGAINST INDIANS*: Mr. *Lister*, 1259 (ii).
 KIT ALLOWANCE YORK-SIMCOE BATT.: Mr. *Mulock*, 66 (i).
 KNIGHT, JNO. AND ALLAN, COR. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY.*: Mr. *Mitchell*, 866 (ii).
 LABOR COMMISSION, INSTRUCTIONS, &c.*: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 672 (i).
 LAKE ST. PETER IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE: Mr. *Amyot*, 71 (i).
 LAND AGENTS' INSTRUCTIONS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *McMullen*, 36, 45 (i).
 LAND VILLA POST OFFICE, PAPERS, &c.: Mr. *Choquette*, 102 (i).
 LEASEHOLDERS IN ALBERTA DISTRICT, N.W.T., CATTLE, &c.*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 498 (i).
 LEVI, DAVID, SEIZURE OF DIAMONDS, &c.*: Mr. *Langelier (Quebec)* 1092 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, TOTAL AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.* : Mr. Mulock, 498 (i).
- LIVES LOST THROUGH WRECKS ON GREAT LAKES : Mr. Dawson, 19 (i).
- LOBSTER COMMISSION, REPS., &c. : Mr. Flynn, 86 (i).
- MACDONALD, GEO. J., PAPERS, &c., re CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION* : Mr. Landerkin, 866 (ii).
- MAIL SERVICE IN P.E.I., Mr. Davies (P.E.I.) 47, 52 (i).
- MAN. AND N.W.T. HOMESTEAD AND COLONISATION INSPECTORS : Mr. Watson, 71 (i).
- MAN. AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO., PAPERS, &c. : Mr. Edgar, 653 (i).
- MIDLAND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, COR.* : Mr. Cook, 1259 (ii).
- MILITARY SCHOOL, ST. JOHN, QUE., SERVICES OF CHAPLAIN, COR. : Mr. Amyot, 654 (i).
- MILITIA CLOTHING, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS* : Mr. Bowman, 866 (ii).
- MISSISSAUGA INDIANS' CLAIM (UNCEDED LANDS) COR.* : Mr. Madill, 886 (ii).
- MOHAWK INDIANS, COR. re DISMISSAL OF COUNCILLOR CULBERTSON : Mr. Burdett, 977 (ii).
- MORIN, DR. J. A., CLAIM FOR MEDICAL SERVICES : Mr. Amyot, 655 (i).
- MOULIN, REV. FATHER, COR. re RESCUE AT BATOCHÉ* : Mr. Scarth, 866 (ii).
- N.W.T. REBELLION LOSSES COMMISSION, REPS., &c. : Mr. Laurier, 73.
- NAUFRAGE, P.E.I., NAVIGATION, REP. OF ENGINEER : Mr. McIntyre, 70.
- NEELY, PRIVATE THOS., DEATH OF, COR. re COMPENSATION TO FAMILY : Mr. Mulock, 649 (i).
- NEWFOUNDLAND CONFEDERATION, COR. : Mr. Laurier, 664 (i).
- "NORTHERN LIGHT." See general heading.
- NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS SUBWAY, REP. OF ENGINEERS, &c. : Mr. Perry, 661 (i).
- OCEAN MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND COR : Mr. Langelier (Quebec) 1067 (ii).
- OLIVIER, GEO., DISMISSAL, COR. RESPECTING : Mr. Rinfret, 654 (i).
- OTTAWA RIVER WORKS AND IMPROVEMENTS, TOTAL COST, &c. : Mr. Amyot, 827 (ii).
- PARMÉE, MR., REP. re KAMLOOPS AS AN OUTPORT OF ENTRY* : Mr. Mara, 498 (i).
- PELÉE ISLAND CABLE, PETITIONS, &c. : Mr. Patterson (Essex) 826.
- PICTON HARBOR, COR., &c. re DREDGING* : Mr. Platt, 866 (ii).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COR., &c. re CONSTRUCTION* : Mr. Platt, 866 (ii).
- PION & CO., CLAIM FOR GOOTS DAMAGED ON I. C. R.* : Mr. Langelier (Quebec) 1092 (ii).
- POST OFFICE. See general heading.
- P. E. I. MAIL SERVICE : Mr. Davies (P. E. I.) 47, 52 (i).
- NAVIGATION AT NAUFRAGE, REP. OF ENGINEER : Mr. McIntyre, 70 (i).
- RY. ACCIDENTS REPORTED TO GOVT. AND ACTIONS PENDING* : Mr. Denison, 62 (i).
- REBELLION, N.W., LOSSES COMMISSION, REPS., &c. : Mr. Laurier, 73.
- REBELLION IN N.W.T., TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS* : Mr. Mulock, 498 (i).
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE, CONSOLIDATED FUND* : Sir Richard Cartwright, 38 (i).
- REGULATIONS re REGISTRY OF TRADES UNIONS* : Mr. Amyot, 50 (i).
- ROLLING STOCK PURCHASED FOR I. C. R. : Mr. Weldon (St. John) 61.
- ROYAL LABOR COMMISSION, INSTRUCTIONS, &c.* : Mr. Beausoleil, 672.
- RUSSELL, SAMUEL, COR. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY.* : Mr. Mitchell, 866 (ii).
- ST. AGAPIT POSTMASTER'S DISMISSAL, COR. : Mr. Rinfret, 654 (i).
- ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBERING CO., COSTS, &c.* : Mr. McMullen, 20 (i).
- ST. HYACINTHE PUBLIC BUILDINGS : Mr. Dupont, 651 (i).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER FLOODS, COR., REPS., &c. : Mr. Beausoleil, 60 (i).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER NAVIGATION, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, EXPENDITURE : Mr. Amyot, 71 (i).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER CHANNEL, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, COR.* : Sir Donald Smith, 923 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- ST. LAWRENCE FISHERIES, CAP CHAT AND GRAND VALLÉE, REPS. : Mr. Joncas, 1232 (ii).
- ST. PIERRE, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, PETITIONS re ARTILLERY PRACTICE* : Mr. Langelier (Montmorency) 672 (i).
- STE. ANNE DES MONTS WHARF, PAPERS, &c. : Mr. Joncas, 1233 (ii).
- STE. FLAVIE, INQUEST ON BODY OF W. L. DUNCAN* : Mr. Weldon, St. John, 498 (i).
- SAUNDERS, PROF., REP. ON EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN N.W. : Mr. McMullen, 498 (i).
- SCHOOL OF INFANTRY ("C" COMPANY) COR. re DEATH OF PRIVATE NEELY : Mr. Mulock, 649 (i).
- SCRIP ISSUED IN MAN. AND N.W.T.* : Mr. Wilson (Elgin) 866 (ii).
- SEIZURES IN BEHRING'S SEA, COR. RESPECTING : Mr. Gordon, 966 (ii).
- SIMS & SLATER, CONTRACTORS CAPE BRETON RY., COR.* : Mr. Flynn, 1259 (ii).
- SIX NATION INDIANS, CLAIM FOR FLOODING LANDS, COR.* : Mr. Somerville, 672 (i).
- SMYTH, HENRY, EMPLOYMENT AND AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.* : Mr. McMullen, 866 (ii).
- SOURS AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN RY. CO., PAPERS, &c. : Mr. Edgar, 653 (i).
- SQUATTERS CLAIMS IN N.W.T. : Mr. McMullen, 656 (i).
- STAG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RIVER ST. CLAIR, COR.* : Mr. Lister, 1259 (ii).
- STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.* : Mr. Perry, 61 (i).
- STONEY POINT AND KETTLE RESERVES, COMPLAINTS AGAINST INDIANS* : Mr. Lister, 1259 (ii).
- STRATHROY POST OFFICE AND CUSTOM HOUSE* : Mr. McMullen, 498 (i).
- STUKELY (NORTH) POSTMASTERSHIP, O.O.'S, &c.* : Mr. Langelier (Quebec) 1092 (ii).
- SUBSIDIES TO RYS., AMOUNT VOTED SINCE 1880* : Mr. Semple, 110 (i).
- SUBWAY, NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, REP. OF ENGINEERS, &c. : Mr. Perry, 661 (i).
- SULTE, BENJ., FRENCH TRANSLATION OF FIELD EXERCISES, COR. : Mr. Amyot, 655 (i).
- SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES RETIRED, NAMES, &c.* : Mr. Small, 63 (i).
- TRADES UNIONS, COPIES OF RULES : Mr. Amyot, 46 (i).
- UNDER 35 VIC., CAP. 30, &c.* : Mr. Amyot, 50 (i).
- REGULATIONS re REGISTRY, &c.* : Mr. Amyot, 50 (i).
- TERMS OF CONFEDERATION WITH P. E. I.* : Mr. Perry, 61 (i).
- TRENT VALLEY CANAL COMMISSION, COR., &c. : Mr. Barron, 71 (i).
- UNITED STATES WRECKING VESSELS IN CAN. WATERS, COR. : Mr. Edgar, 665 (i).
- VALLERAND, F. O., CUSTOMS SEIZURES ON, COR., O. C.'S, &c. : Mr. Langelier (Quebec) 1068 (ii).
- WATER SUPPLY TO CARTRIDGE FACTORY AND DRILL HALL, QUEBEC, COR.* : Mr. Langelier (Quebec) 1092 (ii).
- WELLINGTON HARBOR OF REFUGE, COR., &c.* : Mr. Platt, 866 (i).
- WRECKS ON GREAT LAKES AND LOSS OF LIFE : Mr. Dawson, 19, 752 (i).
- WRECKING VESSELS (CAN.) IN U. S. WATERS, COR. : Mr. Edgar, 665 (i).
- YORK-SIMCOE BATT. KIT ALLOWANCE : Mr. Mulock, 66 (i).
- YOUNG, CAPT., &c., RESPECTING CLAIM* : Mr. Scarth, 866 (i).
- RETURNS, &c., BRINGING DOWN : Remarks (Mr. Laurier, &c.) 1136, 1433, 1506 (ii).
- PREPARATION, &c. : in Com of Sup., 1615; conc., 1688 (ii).
- Revenue and Audit Act (Chap. 29 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 87 (Sir Charles Tupper).** Res. prop. and 1^o of B., 498 (i); 2^o, 889; Res. in Com., 891; conc. in, 931; B. in Com., 931, 943; 3^o*, 943 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 7.)
- RIDEAU CANAL BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 1646, 1671 (ii).
- RIMOUSKI CUSTOMS COLLECTOR* : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1067 (ii).
- PUBLIC WORKS : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1067 (ii).
- ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 1571, 1675 (ii).

- ROBERTSON, ALEXANDER, LATE M.P.: Remarks (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on decease, 61 (i).
- ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (ii).
- PURCHASE, I.C.R.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 61 (i).
- ROOME, W. F., ESQ., MEMBER-ELECT FOR WEST MIDDLESEX: introduced, 380 (i).
- ROWAND, J., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR WEST BRUCE: introduced, 2 (i).
- ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 1196, 1692 (ii).
- ROYAL LABOR COMMISSION. See "LABOR."
- ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 1218; conc., 1687 (ii).
- RUSSELL ELECTION, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 554 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 455, 516, 525 (i).
- Ret. of Member on certificate of Returning Officer, 1415 (ii).
- notification of Return (Mr. *Speaker*) 1522 (ii).
- M. (Mr. *Laurier*) for Speaker to Issue Writ, 416 (i).
- RUSSELL, SAMUEL, COR. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 866 (ii).
- STE. ANNE'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1459, 1646 (ii).
- STE. ANNE DES MONTS WHARF, PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Joncas*) 1233 (ii).
- ST. AGAPIT POSTMASTER'S DISMISSAL, COR.: M. for copy (Mr. *Rinfret*) 654 (i).
- St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 61** (Mr. *Rykert*). 1°*, 380; 2°*, 530 (i): in Com. and 3°*, 1049; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1345 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 78.*)
- St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 137** (Mr. *Boyle*). Rule suspended, 1°*, 2°* and in Com., 1522; 3°*, 1524 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 79.*)
- ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBERING Co.'s COSTS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 20 (i).
- ST. CHARLES BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1225, 1645 (ii).
- St. Clair River Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 17** (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*). 1°*, 73; 2°*, 219; in Com. and 3°*, 498 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 94.*)
- GOVT. ASSISTANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 1432 (ii).
- STE. FLAVIE, INQUEST ON BODY OF W. L. DUNÇAN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 498 (i).
- ST. HYACINTHE PUBLIC BUILDINGS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dupont*) 651 (i).
- St. John's and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Co.'s B. No. 71** (Mr. *Vanasse*). 1°*, 454; 2°, 530; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i).
- ST. JOHN, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1224 (ii).
- ST. JOHN HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, REP. OF ENGINEER: QUES. (Mr. *Ellis*) 86 (i).
- St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 66** (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1°*, 380; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°*, 612 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 64.*)
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 1453, 1646 (ii).
- CHANNEL, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, COR.: M. for copies* (Sir *Donald Smith*) 922 (ii).
- FISHERIES (CAP CHAT AND GRAND VALLEE) REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Joncas*) 1232 (ii).
- FLOODS, COR., REPS., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 60 (ii).
- EXAMINATION: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
- LEGER, CAPT., REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 899 (ii).
- IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT ADVANCED: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1135 (ii).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER NAVIGATION, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 71 (i).
- St. Lawrence River Navigation Repeal B. No. 28** (Mr. *Guay*). 1°*, 97 (i).
- ST. OURS LOCKS: in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- ST. PIERRE, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, PETITIONS re ARTILLERY PRACTICE: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 672 (i).
- ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 136 (i); conc., 1686 (ii).
- SAGUENAY RIVER BUOYS, CONTRACT FOR PLACING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1433 (ii).
- SAILORS PROTECTION, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 966 (ii).
- SALARIES, &c. (HOUSE OF COMMONS): in Com. of Sup., 1025, 1668 (ii).
- SALMON FISHERIES, HUDSON BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826 (ii).
- SALT IN BARRELS, BAGS, &c., WEIGHT: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 97 (i).
- Salt Packages.** See "WEIGHTS AND MEASURES."
- SARNIA AND PORT HURON TUNNEL: QUES. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 1432 (ii).
- SAULT ST. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1442, 1624 (ii).
- Deb. (Mr. *Dawson*) 1442; (Mr. *Lister*) 1143; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1444; (Mr. *Purcell*) 1445; (Mr. *Cook*) 1446; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1446; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1446; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1447; (Mr. *Hesson*) 1449; (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1450; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1450; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1451 (ii).
- SAUNDERS, PROFESSOR, REP. ON EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).
- SCHOOL OF INFANTRY ("C" COMPANY) COR. re DEATH OF PRIVATE NEELY: M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 649 (i).
- SCOWS, &c., CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 1646 (ii).
- SCRIP ISSUED IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 866 (ii).
- SECRETARY OF STATE:
- CIVIL SERVICE LIST OF CANADA: presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 172 (i).
- NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 495 (i).
- TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 965 (ii).
- COPYRIGHT, PROP. LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 98 (i).
- FRANCHISE ACT: in Com. of Sup., 1641 (ii).

SECRETARY OF STATE—Continued.

- LABOR COMMISSION, REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 98 (i).
- CERTIFIED COPIES OF DEPOSITIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 171 (i).
- COMPLAINTS AGAINST CHAIRMAN, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 171 (i).
- COST: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 494 (i).
- INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 672 (i).
- NUMBER AND SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1468 (ii).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, TOTAL AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 493 (i).
- NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION, COR.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 664 (i).
- Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Witchell*) 111 (i).
- PRINTING AND STATIONERY, PUBLIC, REP.: presented (Mr. *Chap'au*) 138 (i).
- RAILWAY COMMISSION, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 494 (i).
- REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 646 (i).
- RETURNS: Enquiry for (Mr. *Laurier, &c.*) 1136, 1433, 1506 (ii).
- SECRETARY OF STATE'S REP.: presented (Mr. *Chap'au*) 20 (i).
- VOTERS' LIST, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 27 (i).
- SUSPENSION OF REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 965 (ii).
- [See "ELECTIONS," "SUPPLY," &c.]
- Securities to the Crown.** See "LETTERS PATENT."
- SEIZURES IN BEHRING'S SEA, COR. RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gordon*) 966 (ii).
- SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. See "COMMITTEES."
- SESSIONAL CLERKS: in Com of Sup., 1025, 1668 (ii).
- NUMBER AND AMOUNTS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1299 (ii).
- SHANNON, WM., DEFALCATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 965.
- SHEFFORD CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).
- SHELBURNE, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- SHERWOOD, A. P., AND CAPE BRETON RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 965 (ii).
- SHIPPING OBSTRUCTIONS. See "ATLANTIC OCEAN."
- Ship Channel.** See "MONTREAL."
- Ships Safety Act** (*Chap. 77 Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 112** (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 1000; Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 1473 (ii).
- Shushwap and Okanagan Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 43** (Mr. *Mara*). 1°, 206; 2°, 222; in Com. and 3°, 493 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 88.*)
- SIMMS & SLATER, CONTRACTORS, CAPE BRETON RY., COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Flynn*) 1259 (ii).
- SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1067 (ii).
- SIGNAL SERVICE: in Com of Sup., 1582, 1633 (ii).
- SIX NATION INDIANS, CLAIM FOR FLOODING LANDS, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Somerville*) 672 (i).
- SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 1620, 1632, 1684 (ii).
- SMYTH, HENRY, EMPLOYMENT AND AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 866 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 495 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 647 (i).
- SNETSINGER, MR., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 825 (ii).
- SNOW SHEDS, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (ii).

- South Norfolk Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34** (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°, 110; 2°, 128; in Com. and 3°, 496 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 57.*)
- South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54** (Mr. *Hall*). 1°, 270; 2°, 498 (i); in Com. and 3° m., 912; Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 57; N. 86) 953; 3°, 954 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 52.*)
- SOURIS AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN RY. CO., PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 653 (i).
- SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE, 2 (i), 1693 (ii).
- Speedy Trials.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- SPRING HILL, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1225 (ii).
- SQUATTERS CLAIMS IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 656 (i).
- STAG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RIVER ST. CLAIRE, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 1259 (ii).
- STANSTEAD CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 514 (i).
- Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Ry. Co.'s B. No. 72** (Mr. *Fisher*). 1°, 454; 2°, 726 (i); in Com. and 3°, 1207 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 54.*)
- Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 139** (Mr. *Fisher*). Rule suspended. 1°, 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1563 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 55.*)
- STATISTICAL DIAGRAMS, LITHOGRAPHING: in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 99** (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 750 (i); 2°* and in Com., 1402; 3°*, 1404 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 26.*)
- STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH P. E. I. See "NORTHERN LIGHT," and "P. E. I."
- STEEL CO. OF CANADA (N.S.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1594 (ii).
- Stocks and Merchandise (gambling).** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- STONE POINT AND KETTLE RESERVES, COMPLAINT AGAINST INDIANS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 1259 (ii).
- STRANGE, GEN., COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF PENSION: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 140 (i).
- REP. re REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 98 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for Com, of Sup., 1600 (ii).
- STRATHROY POST OFFICE AND CUSTOMS HOUSE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, SITE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 66 (i).
- STRAUBENZIE, COL.: in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
- STUKELY (NORTH) POSTMASTERSHIP, &c., PAPERS, O.C.'s.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1092 (ii).
- Submarine Cables.** See "INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION."
- SUBSIDIES. See
- ALBERT RY. CO. (N.B.)
- CENTRAL RY. CO. (N.B.)
- CHATHAM BRANCH RY. (N.B.)
- HALIFAX COTTON CO. (N.S.)
- ELGIN, PETITCODIAC AND HAVELOCK RY. CO.

SUBSIDIES—Continued.

KENT NORTHERN RY. CO.
 MASSAWIPPI VALLEY RY. CO.
 MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. CO.
 NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RY. CO.
 OTTAWA AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.
 PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.
 FORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. CO.
 QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.
 QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.
 TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.
 STEEL CO. OF CANADA (N.S.)
 TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. CO.

Subsidies to Rys. authorisation B. No. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 1546; in Com., 1587; conc. in and 1^o*, 2^o* and in Com., 1595; 3^o*, 1629 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 3.)

SUBWAY, NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, REP. OF ENGINEERS, &c.: M. for copy (Mr. *Perry*) 661 (i).

SUBSIDIES TO RYS., AMOUNT VOTED SINCE 1850: M for Ret.* (Mr. *Semple*) 110 (i).

SULTE, BENJ., FRENCH TRANSLATION OF FIELD EXERCISES, COR.: M. for copy (Mr. *Amyot*) 655 (i).

Summary Convictions. See "CRIMINAL LAW."

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (*Chap.* 135 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. 57** (Mr. *Baker*). 1^o, 309 (i).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (*Chap.* 135 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 110** (Mr. *Thompson*). 1^o, 964; Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 1402 (ii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (*Chap.* 135 *Rev. Statutes*) **Amt B. No. 120** (Mr. *Thompson*). 1^o, 1135; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 1402; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1549 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 37.)

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, MONTREAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 647 (i).

— RETIRED, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Small*) 62 (i).

SUPERVISION OF BANKS. See "BANKS."

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. OR REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) Canada Temperance Act, 74 (i); Remarks (Mr. *Brien*) Cable to Pelée Island, 1011; Remarks (Mr. *Rykert*) Mrs. Gowanlock's Claim, 1015; Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) Kingston Post Office Irregularities, 1017; Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) Bresaylor Half-Breeds, 1515; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Walter Jones' Appointment, 1524; Remarks (Mr. *Kirk*) Lobster Fisheries, 1551; Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) Duties on Flour, Cornmeal, &c., 1564; Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright* and others) Pauper Immigration, &c., 1595; Remarks (Mr. *Dawson*) Boundaries of Ontario, 1629 (ii).

CONCURRENCE, 1686 (ii).

MS. FROM HIS EX, transmitting Estimates for 1888-89, 50 (i); Suppl. for 1887-88, 962; Suppl. for 1888-89, 1403 (ii).

MS. FOR COM., 17, 74, 88, 104, 112, 128 (i), 1011, 1148, 1446, 1514, 1524, 1551, 1595, 1629, 1681 (ii).

RES. (Mr. *Bowell* for Sir *Charles Tupper*) for Com., 17; in Com., 85, 88, 104, 112, 128 (i), 1021, 1148, 1446, 1533, 1561, 1601, 1629, 1681 (ii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. See "Justice."

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:

Archives, care of, 1149 (ii).

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—Continued.

Agricultural Societies in N.W.T., 1155 (ii).

Census and Statistics, 1155 (ii).

Chipman, C. C., Services, 1149 (ii).

Colonial and Indian Exhibition, 1638 (ii).

Criminal Statistics, 1151 (ii).

Experimental Farms, 1154 (ii).

General Vote, 1148 (ii).

Health Statistics, 1151 (ii).

Patent Record, Expenses, 1150 (ii).

Canals. See "Railways" and "Collection of Revenues."

Charges of Management:

Auditor and Receiver General, Winnipeg, 88 (i).

Dominion Notes, Printing, 89 (i).

Receiver General, Halifax, 88 (i).

Civil Government:

Agriculture, Dept. of, 95 (i).

Auditor General's Office, 95 (i).

Civil Service Board of Examiners, 113, 128 (i).

Contingencies, Departmental:

General Vote, 104 (i).

High Commissioner, 105 (i).

Post Office and Finance Depts., 112 (i).

Finance and Treasury Board, 95 (i).

Fisheries, Dept. of, 96 (i).

Governor General's Secretary's Office, 85 (i).

Indian Affairs, Dept. of, 95 (i), 1637 (ii).

Inland Revenue, Dept. of, 95 (i).

Interior, Dept. of, 93 (i).

Justice, Dept. of, 91 (i).

Penitentiaries Branch, 91 (i).

Militia and Defence, Dept. of, 92 (i).

North-West Mounted Police, 93 (i).

Postmaster General's Dept., 1638 (ii).

Printing and Stationery, Dept. of, 92 (i).

Privy Council Office, 90 (i).

Public Works, Dept. of, 96 (i).

Railways and Canals, Dept. of, 96 (i), 1637 (ii).

Secretary of State, Dept. of, 92 (i), 1640, 1668 (ii).

Collection of Revenues:

Adulteration of Food, 1619 (ii).

Canals:

Repairs and Working Expenses, 1624, 1668 (ii).

Culling Timber, 1619, 1667, 1684 (ii).

Customs, 1629, 1666 (ii).

Dominion Lands, 1635, 1637 (ii).

Excise, 1618, 1667 (ii).

Post Office, 1633, 1684 (ii).

Public Works:

Agency, B.C., 1633 (ii).

Esquimalt Graving Dock, 1632 (ii).

Signal Service, 1633 (ii).

Slides and booms, 1620, 1632, 1684 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, N.W.T., and B.C., 1633 (ii).

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Collection of Revenues—Continued.

Railways :

Intercolonial Ry. (Repairs and Working Expenses) 1620, 1668 (ii).

Culling Timber. See "Collection of Revenues."

Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."

Dominion Lands. See "Collection of Revenues."

Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."

Fisheries :

Fishing Bounty, distribution, &c., 1603 (ii).

General Vote, 1583 (ii).

Litigation (cost) *re David J. Adams*, 1656. (ii).

New Brunswick, 1601 (ii).

Overseers and Wardens, salaries, &c., 1583 (ii).

Protection Steamers, 1603 (ii).

Geological Survey :

General Vote, 1604 (ii).

Government Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."

Immigration :

Agents' Travelling Expenses, 1167 (ii).

Belfast, gratuity to late agent, 1638 (ii).

Dublin Agency, 1166 (ii).

General Vote, 1155; conc., 1686 (ii).

Glasgow Agency, 1166 (ii).

High Commissioner's Office, 1158, 1165 (ii).

Liverpool Agency, 1166 (ii).

London (Eng.) Agency, 1166 (ii).

London *Free Press*, payments to, 1160 (ii).

Pamphlets, &c., payments for, 1158, 1165 (ii).

Pauper Immigration, 1155 (ii).

Qu'Appelle Agent (Mr. Baker) 1161, 1169 (ii).

Quebec Agency, 1160 (ii).

Victoria, B. C., Agent, 1160 (ii).

Indians :

British Columbia, 1682 (ii).

Man. and N.W.T., 1607 (ii).

Man. (Industrial Schools) 1681 (ii).

New Brunswick, 1607 (ii).

Ontario and Quebec, 1605 (ii).

Insurance :

General Vote, 1604 (ii).

Justice, Administration of :

Clerk, Stenographer, Supreme Court, 119 (i).

Contingencies and Disbursements, 119 (i).

Miscellaneous, including N. W. T., 114 (i).

Quebec Judiciary, conc., 1685 (ii).

Legislation :

House of Commons :

Coursol, Mr., Indemnity, 1670 (ii).

Salaries, &c., 1025, 1668 (ii).

Sessional Clerks, 1668 (ii).

Miscellaneous :

American History, printing catalogue, 1030 (ii).

Franchise Act, 1641 (ii).

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Legislation—Continued.

Library, salaries, &c., 1030, 1638 (ii).

Printing, Paper, &c., 1031 (ii).

Works on America, purchase, 1030 (ii).

Senate :

Fortin, Hon. Mr. Indemnity, 1670 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service :

Buoys, &c., St. Lawrence (maintenance) 1582 (ii).

Construction and completion, 1582 (ii).

General vote, 1581 (ii).

Lower Traverse River, 1681 (ii).

Signal Service, 1582 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions :

Campbellton and Gaspé, &c., 1678 (ii).

Canada and Antwerp or Germany, 1679; conc.,

Halifax and St. John *vid* Yarmouth and Port Medway, 1678 (ii).

Lakes Huron and Superior, 1678 (ii).

Magdalen Islands, 1678 (ii).

1689 (ii).

Meteorological Service : See "Scientific Institutions."

Militia :

Ammunition, &c., 1211 (ii).

Barracks, B. C., 1644 (ii).

Brigade Majors, salaries, &c., 1209 (ii).

Clothing and Great Coats, 1212, 1215 (ii).

Contingencies, 1218 (ii).

Deputy Adjutants General retiring allowance, 1644 (ii).

Drill Pay, &c., 1213 (ii).

Military Branch and District Staff, salaries, 1209 (ii).

Military Properties, 1221 (ii).

Permanent Forces, 1219 (ii).

Royal Military College, 1218; conc., 1637 (ii).

Miscellaneous :

Canada Gazette, 1611 (ii).

Canada Temperance Act, expenditure, 1612 (ii).

Commercial Agencies, 1615 (ii).

Débats du Conseil Législatif, Québec, 1663 (ii).

Fabre, Mr., salary, &c., 1612 (ii).

Fishery Commission (Washington) expenses, 1662.

Govt. of N. W. T., Expenses, 1611 (ii).

Half breeds Claims Commission, expenses, 1666.

Hot Springs, Banff, Roads, Bridges, &c., 1617, 1666.

Mounted Police, compensation for Injuries, 1612.

Orders in Council, &c., collecting, 1618, 1663 (ii).

Printing Bureau, Plant, &c., 1617; conc., 1689 (ii).

Printing, Miscellaneous, 1611 (ii).

Returns, preparation, &c., 1615; conc., 1688 (ii).

Statistical Diagrams, Lithographing, 1663 (ii).

Surveys, Lakes Superior and Huron, conc., 1688.

Mounted Police :

General Vote, 1610; suppl., 1658, 1683 (ii).

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Ocean and River Service :

- General Vote, 1577 (ii).
- Govt. Steamers, maintenance and repairs, 1577.
- Life-saving and Life-boat service (rewards) 1577.
- Montreal and Quebec River Police, 1579 (ii).
- Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, 1581 (ii).
- Wrecks, &c., Investigations, 1578 (ii).

Penitentiaries :

- British Columbia, 1025 (ii).
- Dorchester, 1021 (ii).
- Kingston, 122 (i).
- Manitoba, 1021; conc., 1686 (ii).
- Regina Gaol, 1025 (ii).
- St. Vincent de Paul, 136; conc., 1686 (ii).

Pensions :

- Delaney, Mrs., 1201 (ii).
- Fenian Raid, on account of, 1201, 1639 (ii).
- Hodgson, Sir Robt. (payment to Govt. of P.E.I.) 1671 (ii).
- Rebellion of 1885 (N.W.T.), militiamen, &c., 1202, 1642 (ii).
- Veterans of 1812, 1201 (ii).

Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."

*Public Works—Capital :**Buildings :*

- Ottawa, additional Deptl. Block, 1461 (ii).
- Esquimalt Graving Dock, 1653 (ii).

Harbors and Rivers :

- Port Arthur Harbor and Kaministiquia, 1462 (ii).
- Cape Tormentine Harbor, 1462 (ii).
- Kingston Graving Dock, 1671 (ii).

Public Works—Income :**Buildings :*

- Manitoba, 1542 (ii).
- New Brunswick, 1468 (ii).
- North-West Territories, 1672 (ii).
- Ontario, 1537, 1655, 1672 (ii).
- Govt. Printing Bureau, 1541 (ii).
- Quebec, 1533, 1654 (ii).

Dredging :

- Harbors and Rivers generally, 1569 (ii).
- Manitoba, 1656 (ii).

Experimental Farms :

- Buildings, Fencing, &c., 1574 (ii).

Harbors and Rivers :

- New Brunswick, 1673 (ii).
- North-West Territories, 1655 (ii).
- Nova Scotia, 1561, 1673 (ii).
- Ontario, 1566, 1655, 1674 (ii).
- Prince Edward Island, 1561 (ii).
- Quebec, 1563, 1673 (ii).

Miscellaneous :

- Floods, Montreal and Vicinity, Examination, 1678.

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Public Works—Income—Continued.**Repairs, Furniture, &c. :*

- Rideau Hall, 1542; conc., 1688 (ii).
- Site (rent) old Parl. House, Quebec, 1655 (ii).

Roads and Bridges :

- Grand River Bridges, Haldimand 1675 (ii).
- Ottawa City and River Bridges, 1571, 1677 (ii).

Telegraphs :

- Bonilla Point and Victoria (B.C.) 1678 (ii).
- Telephone (Wolf Island, Ont., and Mainland) 1677 (ii).

Quarantine :

- Cattle Quarantine, Expenses, 1200 (ii).
- Grosse Isle, &c., 1196 (ii).
- Medical Inspection, Quebec, 1195 (ii).

Railways and Canals—Capital :**Canals :*

- Cornwall, 1452; conc., 1687 (ii).
- Culbute, 1460 (ii).
- Grenville, 1459 (ii).
- Lachine, 1452 (ii).
- Lake St. Louis, 1453 (ii).
- Murray, towards completion, 1453, 1646 (ii).
- St. Anne's, 1453, 1646 (ii).
- St. Lawrence River and Canals, 1453, 1646 (ii).
- Sault Ste. Marie, 1446, 1624 (ii).
- Tay, 1459 (ii).
- Trent River Navigation, 1454 (ii).
- Williamsburg, Farran's Point division, 1453.
- Welland, 1453; conc., 1688 (ii).

Railways :

- Canadian Pacific Ry. (construction) 1221 (ii).
- Cape Breton Ry. (construction) 1230 (ii).
- Eastern Extension Ry. (construction) 1231 (ii).
- Intercolonial Ry. :
 - Dalhousie Branch, 1226 (ii).
 - Freight Rates, 1650 (ii).
 - General Vote, 1224; suppl., 1644, 1650 (ii).
 - Heating and Electricity in Cars, 1227 (ii).
 - Indiantown Branch, 1646 (ii).
 - Maccan Station, increased accommodation, 1225 (ii).
 - Moncton, increased accommodation, 1225 (ii).
 - Pictou Town Branch, 1226, 1645 (ii).
 - Rolling Stock, 1645 (ii).
 - St. Charles Branch, 1225, 1645 (ii).
 - St. John, increased accommodation, 1224 (ii).
 - Spring Hill, increased accommodation, 1224.
 - Snow Sheds, 1645 (ii).
 - Working Expenses, 1650 (ii).
- Oxford and New Glasgow Ry. (construction) 1230 (ii).

* For Repairs and Working Expenses see "Collection of Revenues."

* For Repairs and Working Expenses see "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Railways and Canals—Income :

Canals :

- Chambly, 1460 (ii).
- Culbute, 1460 (ii).
- Dam at Bobcaygeon, 1460 (ii).
- Lakefield and Balsam Lake Channel, 1461 (ii).
- Miscellaneous, Scows, &c., 1646 (ii).
- Rideau Bridges, 1646, 1671 (ii).
- St. Ours' Lock, 1460 (ii).
- Trent River Nav., R. Stephenson's Claim, 1460.
- Welland, 1460, 1671 (ii).

Railways :

- Surveys and Inspections, 1460 (ii).

Scientific Institutions :

- Meteorological Service, conc., 1688 (ii).

Steamship Subventions. See "Mail Subsidies"

CONCURRENCE :

- Administration of Justice, 1685 (ii).
- Cornwall Canal, 1687 (ii).
- Immigration, 1686 (ii).
- Lakes Superior and Huron Surveys, conc., 1688 (ii).
- Meteorological Service, 1688 (ii).
- Mail Subsidy, Can., Antwerp or Germany, 1689 (ii).
- Manitoba Penitentiary, 1686 (ii).
- Printing Bureau, Plant, &c., 1689 (ii).
- Royal Military College, 1687 (ii).
- Returns, Preparation Extra Clerks, conc., 1688 (ii).
- Repairs, Furniture, &c., 1688 (ii).
- St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, 1686 (ii).
- Welland Canal, 1688 (ii).

Supply Bill No. 141 (Sir Charles Tupper). Res., conc. in, 1^o*, 2^o*, and 3^o*, 1690 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 1)

SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS, RYS.: in Com. of Sup., 1460.

— CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 495 (i).

— (GEOLOGICAL) OTTAWA COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).

— LAKES SUPERIOR AND HURON: conc., 1688 (ii).

TARIFF CHANGES AND NEWSPAPER CORRESPONDENTS: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 24 (i).

TAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, ASSUMPTION BY GOVT.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Denison) 101 (i).

— N. W. T. AND B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1633, 1677 (ii).

TELEPHONE (WOLF ISLAND, ONT. AND MAINLAND): in Com. of Sup., 1677 (ii).

TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546; in Com., 1593 (ii).

TERMS OF CONFEDERATION WITH P.E.I.: M. for copies* (Mr. Perry) 61 (i).

— COMPENSATION FOR NON-FULFILMENT: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 86 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 140 (i).

Territories Real Property Act (Chap. 51 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 104 (Mr. Thompson). 1^o, 899; 2^o*, 1195; prop. Res., 1259; in Com., 1416; in Com. on B., 1412, 1415; 3^o*, 1433 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 20.)

Thousand Island Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 84 (Mr. Taylor). 1^o*, 489; 2^o*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 1067 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 75.)

THOROLD CANAL WATER POWER: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 647 (i).

TIGNISH AND MIMINGASH BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 86, 712 (i).

TOBACCO LEAF, PURCHASE AND SALE: Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 66 (i).

Tobique Gypsum and Colonisation Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 79 (Mr. Burns). 1^o*, 489; 2^o*, 530; in Com. and 3^o*, 790 (i). (51 Vic., c. 71.)

TOBIQUE, VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Res. prop. (Sir Charles Tupper) and in Com., 1626 (ii).

Toronto Board of Trade Acts Amt. B. No. 114 (Mr. Small). 1^o*, 1031; 2^o*, 1067; in Com. and 3^o*, 1313 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 99.)

TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: presented (Mr. Bowell) 18 (i).

TRADE COMBINATIONS: M. (Mr. Wallace) for Sel. Com., 28 (i).

— M. (Mr. Wallace) to employ shorthand writer, 51 (i).

— M. (Mr. Edgar) for Sel. Com. withdn., 60 (i).

Trade Combinations prevention, B. No. 138 (Mr. Wallace). 1^o, 1544; Notice of Motion (Bill to take effect 22nd May) 1691 (ii).

— Remarks on adjmt. (Mr. Mitchell) 24 (i).

TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN G. B. AND COLONIES: prop. Res. (Mr. Marshall) 1069 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. Mc Carthy) 1069; (Mr. Casey) 1078; (Mr. Fisher) 108; (Mr. Tupper, Pictou) 1086; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1083; (Gen. Laurier) 1091; (Mr. Davin) 1091 (ii).

TRADES UNIONS, COPIES OF RULES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Amyot) 46 (i).

— REGULATIONS re REGISTRY, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Amyot) 50 (i).

— UNDER 35 VIC., CAP. 30, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. Amyot) 50 (i).

TRANSLATION OF BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 85 (i).

TRANSLATORS. See "DEBATES."

TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1167 (ii).

— Remarks (Mr. McMullen) in Com. of Sup., 104 (i).

TRAVERSE RIVER, LOWER: in Com. of Sup., 1681 (ii).

TRAVIS, EX JUSTICE: Remarks, in Com. of Sup., 114 (i).

Treason and Felony (forfeitures). See "CRIMINAL LAW."

Treaty between Her Majesty and President of U. S. See "FISHERIES."

Tree Peddlers. See "PEDDLERS."

TRENT RIVER NAV.: in Com. of Sup., 1454 (ii).

— (R. STEPHENSON'S CLAIM): in Com. of Sup., 1460.

TRENT VALLY CANAL COMMISSION, COR, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Barron) 71 (i).

- Tudor, Eleonora Elizabeth.** See "DIVORCE."
- TUPPER, SIR CHARLES, MEMBER ELECT FOR CUMBERLAND:** introduced, 18 (i).
- UNITED STATES WRECKING VESSELS IN CAN. WATERS, COR.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 665 (i).
- VACANCIES:** notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 85, 124 (i).
- VACCINE, GRANT FOR PREPARING:** Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 140 (i).
- VALIQUETTE, SERGEANT, SUPERANNUATION:** Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1506 (ii).
- VALLERAND, F. O., CUSTOMS SEIZURES ON, C.R., O.C.'s &c.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1068 (ii).
- VENTILATION OF HOUSE OF COMMONS:** Remarks (Sir *Richard, Cartwright &c.*) 171 (i).
- VESSELS, OVERLOADING, LEGISLATION:** Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 140 (i).
- VETERANS OF 1812:** in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
- OF 1837, PENSIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Purcell*) 85 (i).
- OF 1866-70, MEDALS: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 965 (ii).
- VICTORIA, B.C., IMMIGRATION AGENT:** in Com. of Sup., 1100.
- POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 826 (ii).
- RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- VICTORIA COUNTY (ONT) MAIL SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 825 (ii).
- VICTORIA (N.S.) RET. OF MEMBER-ELECT:** notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- VOTERS' LISTS, COST:** Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 27 (i).
- SUSPENSION OF REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 965 (ii).
- WALLACE, ROBERT, LATE POSTMASTER, B.C.:** Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 826 (ii).
- WASHINGTON TREATY.** See "FISHERIES TREATY."
- WATERET, P., FOREIGN EMIGRATION AGENT, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 966 (ii).
- WATER SUPPLY TO CARTRIDGE FACTORY AND DRILL HALL, QUEBEC, COR.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1092 (ii).
- WAYS AND MEANS:** Res. for Com. (Mr. *Bowell*) 18 (i).
- THE BUDGET: (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1031; reply (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1049; Amt., 1061 (ii).
- Deb. on Amt. to M. for Com. (Mr. *McLellan*) 1093; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1101; (Mr. *Hesson*) 1113; (Mr. *Trow*) 1114; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1114; (Mr. *Cook*) 1114; neg. (Y. 68, N. 117) 1120 (ii).
- in Com., 1121 (ii).
- Weights and Measures Act (salt packages) Amt. B. No. 118** (Mr. *Costigan*). 1^o, 1093; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 1402 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 25.)
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMT.:** Ques. (Mr. *McMillan Huron*) 97 (i).
- WELLAND CANAL:** in Com. of Sup., 1453, 1460, 1671; conc., 1688 (ii).
- SECTION "A": Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 496 (i).
- WELLAND RIVER, BRIDGE AT CHIPPAWA:** Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 65 (i).
- WELLINGTON HARBOR OF REFUGE, COR. &c.:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Piatt*) 866 (i).
- WEST INDIES, COMMERCIAL RELATIONS:** M. for Cor. (Gen. *Laurie*) 903 (ii).
- Deb. (Mr. *Brown*) 904; (Mr. *Skinner*) 904; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 905; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 905; (Mr. *McNeill*) 906; (Mr. *Ellis*) 906; (Mr. *Kenny*) 907; (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 908; (Mr. *Welsh*) 908; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 909; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 909; (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 910; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 911; (Gen. *Laurie*) 911; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 912; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 912 (ii).
- Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 14** (Mr. *Ward*). 1^o*, 62; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 496 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- WHALE FISHERIES, HUDSON'S BAY:** Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826 (ii).
- WHARVES AND PIERS IN P. E. I., CARE OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 965 (ii).
- WHITE, HON. THOMAS, DECEASE OF:** Remarks (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 962 (ii).
- WILLIAMSBURG CANAL:** in Com. Sup., 1453 (ii).
- WINKLER, MRS BARBARA, PAYMENT FOR LOSS OF REGISTERED LETTER:** Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 750 (i).
- WINTER NAVIGATION, P. E. I. AND N. B.:** Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 712 (i).
- WOOD ISLAND HARBOR DREDGING:** Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 140.
- Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 63** (Mr. *Perley, Assiniboia*). 1^o*, 380; 2^o*, 498; in Com. and 3^o*, 612 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- WORKING EXPENSES, I. C. R.:** in Com. of Sup., 1650 (ii).
- WORKS ON AMERICA, PURCHASE:** in Com. of Sup., 1030.
- Wrecked Vessels Aid B. No. 7** (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1^o, 44; 2^o m., 770; deb. adjnd., 778 (i); resnd., 917, 2^o neg. (Y. 61, N. 84) 921 (ii).
- Deb. on 2^o (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 770; (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 770; (Mr. *Shanly*) 772; (Mr. *Charlton*) 772; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 777; (Mr. *Cusey*) 777; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 778; (Mr. *Tupper*) 778 (i); (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 917; (Mr. *Laurier*) 917; (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 918; (Mr. *Edgar*) 918; (Mr. *Bowell*) 919; (Mr. *Paterson, Essex*) 920; (Mr. *Curran*) 921 (ii).
- WRECKING VESSELS (CANADIAN) IN U. S. WATERS, COR.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Piatt*) 866 (ii).
- WRECKS ON GREAT LAKES AND LOSS OF LIFE:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 19, 752 (i).
- INVESTIGATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1578 (ii).
- WRITS ISSUED.** See "ELECTIONS."
- YARMOUTH, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT.:** notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- York Farmers Colonisation Co.'s B. No. 107** (Mr. *McCulla*) 1^o* 1031; 2^o*, 1067; in Com. and 3^o*, 1313 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
- YORK-SIMCOE BATT. KIT ALLOWANCE:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 66 (i).
- YOUNG, CAPT., COR., &c., RESPECTING CLAIM:** M. for copy* (Mr. *Scarth*) 866 (ii).
- YOUNG, CHAS., DEP. RETURNING OFFICER FOR HALDIMAND:** Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 648 (i).